

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 28 March 2007

The **DEPUTY SPEAKER (Ms Thompson)** took the chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

ROADS, WATERFALL GULLY

A petition signed by 319 residents of South Australia, requesting the house to urge the government to immediately repair the Waterfall Gully Road which was damaged by flooding in November 2005 so as to prevent any further fatalities or injuries to persons using that road, was presented by Ms Chapman.

Petition received.

SCHOOLS, SMALL SCHOOLS PROGRAM

A petition signed by 128 residents of South Australia, requesting the house to urge the government to recognise the value of small school education and endorse the continuation of these schools by reversing its decision to withdraw \$30 000 from the budgets of 19 small schools in this state, was presented by Ms Redmond.

Petition received.

PAPER TABLED

The following paper was laid on the table:

By the Minister Assisting the Premier in the Arts (Hon. J.D. Hill)—

Australian Children's Performing Arts Company—Charter as at October 2006.

LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE

Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens): I bring up the 21st report of the committee.

Report received.

QUESTION TIME

DISABILITY SECTOR

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Leader of the Opposition): My question is to the Minister for Disability. Why is it that the government can afford to spend \$31 million on trams, \$33 million on Victoria Park and \$3 million on grants for the unions but cannot adequately fund the disability sector? New South Wales spends 101.9 per cent more than South Australia per disabled client, Tasmania spends 61.2 per cent more than South Australia, Northern Territory spends 49.9 per cent more than South Australia, Queensland spends 48.7 per cent more than South Australia, Victoria spends 34.8 per cent more than South Australia, the ACT spends 29.3 per cent more than South Australia and Western Australia spends 7 per cent more than South Australia.

We have 10 staff positions not being filled at Christies Beach and Daw Park, the north-east metropolitan service office has only two staff when its allocation is 7.6 and some country offices, such as Port Pirie, are operating with no senior or supervising officers, often leaving juniors to cover the whole region.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Minister for Disability): The Leader of the Opposition, of course, demonstrates that he is an economic ignoramus by suggesting that one-off funding for various capital projects could be used to meet the needs of what is a series of recurrent spending needs. It is, of course, nonsense to suggest that one-off capital projects should be applied. It is the sort of accounting we have come to expect from those opposite. Let us analyse the period when they were in charge of this operation, when they were looking after the disability budget. There were none of these high-minded ideals about putting more money into disability. There was abject neglect of the disability budget. In fact, when they were shown evidence of the decay in the disability budget, they participated in hiding the data. That is what they did when confronted with disability demands. What we have done since coming into government is increase—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Do you want to hear the answer, or just argue amongst yourselves? What we have done since coming into government is increase the disability budget by 36 per cent in recurrent terms. In addition to that, whenever the Treasurer has had any spare budget capacity, I have approached him, and every single time he has responded. He has made available \$40.9 million in one-off commitments into the disability budget every single time I have asked him. That is our commitment to disability services. But I will tell you another thing, Madam Deputy Speaker, and that is that we have taken steps in relation to the way in which disability services are delivered in this state. They were formerly delivered through statutory authorities—the IDSC (Intellectually Disabled Services Council), Julia Farr Services and the Independent Living Centre.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The chair is having difficulty hearing the answer.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: We have replaced a series of statutory authorities. When the Liberal Party was confronted with budget pressures in the past, it simply just spent, and overspent its budget. That is one way of dealing with the demand pressures, but it is not prudent budget management. We are asking the agencies now to live within their budget. Of course more needs to be done in disability services. I am off to Brisbane next week to ask the federal government to match the increases—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: If those opposite wanted to do something practical, they would urge their federal colleague—

Mr Koutsantonis: They don't talk to him.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Of course, that is right.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: I think I might have more influence with the federal minister, but perhaps those opposite could at least lend a hand by asking my federal counterpart to put in the 11 per cent growth per annum that the South Australian government has put into disability services. If they were to match that, we would go a long way to getting down the demand for our services.

WORKCHOICES LEGISLATION

Ms SIMMONS (Morialta): Is the Minister for Industrial Relations aware of evidence showing the impact of AWAs

under WorkChoices on working families in South Australia and, if so, what is it?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT (Minister for Industrial Relations): The Howard government first introduced Australian Workplace Agreements (statutory individual contracts) in 1996. The Howard government's original AWAs led to the slashing of many entitlements for South Australian working families. However, we now have clear proof that under WorkChoices the Liberals' AWAs are like a chainsaw ripping into the basic rights of workers. I am advised that a recent report by Professor David Peetz of the Griffith University Business School found that AWAs under WorkChoices have increased the number of AWAs that abolish overtime pay by 104 per cent.

Before WorkChoices, about 25 per cent of AWAs abolished overtime pay. Under WorkChoices, over 50 per cent of all AWAs abolish overtime pay. Before WorkChoices, 18 per cent of AWAs abolished loadings for shiftwork, taking away the right to better pay for work through the night and taking away the right to better pay for being kept away from your family.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: Madam Deputy Speaker, under WorkChoices—

Mr Pederick interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Member for Hammond, will you please speak quietly in here.

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: Under WorkChoices, the evidence shows that AWAs slashing workers' rights are totally out of control. There has been a whopping 189 per cent increase in the number of AWAs that abolish loadings for shiftwork. The report goes on to find that:

Over three-fifths of AWAs abolish penalty rates altogether. Over four-fifths of AWAs abolish or reduce overtime pay. . . We do not know how many AWAs reduce penalty rates without abolishing, because the data has been suppressed. Most AWAs abolish or reduce meal breaks. Most do the same to public holiday payments. . .

WorkChoices is a savage attack on the rights of working families and a crushing blow for hardworking South Australians. For many working families, WorkChoices is a devastating blow to their chances of spending time together with their family. WorkChoices means people work harder and longer for less. WorkChoices means more and more pressure on working families.

DISABILITY SECTOR

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Leader of the Opposition): Will the Minister for Disability explain where referrals and new clients from the southern area of Adelaide are meant to access programs of Disability SA now that the staff from the southern region of Disability SA have voted not to accept any more referrals or any more clients due to a lack of funding? Yesterday, Public Service members of Disability SA in the southern office voted not to accept any new referrals or any new clients. Ten staff positions have not been filled in the Christies Beach and Daw Park office.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Minister for Disability): We are managing demands for our disability services within our budget, and that involves making decisions about from where we can take resources to meet those pressures. Obviously it has caused a bit of consternation with some of the staff in some of the areas and we are working through that industrial issue. We are committed to ensuring that we

provide front-line services. The economies that we are seeking to make will be quarantining front-line services, and we are presently—

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: There is an industrial dispute going on and there is a bit of toing-and-froing. We are meeting with the relevant unions representing these workers and we are confident that we will reach a resolution.

HIGH COURT, VACANCIES

Ms PORTOLESI (Hartley): Can the Attorney inform the house of vacancies that will soon arise in the High Court, and what expectations does he have for the appointment of a South Australian?

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON (Attorney-General): The High Court is the last avenue of appeal for both civil and criminal matters from the state, territory and federal courts of Australia.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: I hear 'Nominate Rob Lawson'.

The Hon. K.O. Foley: Is he in the parliament still?

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: Yes, he is still a member. The High Court hears matters of federal significance, including the interpretation of our constitution. Its decisions affect the lives of all Australians. Perhaps the most recent important decision of the High Court has been that of determining the constitutional validity of the coalition's federal WorkChoices law in which a majority minimised the history, spirit and intent of our constitution—avowedly so in the case of the Chief Justice in a speech recently.

I have always said that the South Australian legal profession holds a wealth of talented people. As Attorney-General, I have worked with and know many of the state's best legal minds. I want to see at least one of these men or women on the High Court bench in my time as Attorney-General. In the 106-year history of the High Court, there has never been a South Australian High Court justice. Indeed, at the age of 21, I had a letter published in the paper about it. I do not think that it is owing to a dearth of suitable candidates. Names that immediately spring to mind are John Bray, Len King and Dame Roma Mitchell; they would have made great High Court justices.

The High Court is currently made up of legal minds from the Eastern States—indeed, two from the same floor of the same chambers in central Sydney—although I do not doubt for a minute the impartiality of the current honourable justices of the High Court nor do I doubt their ability, despite their invariable states of origin. I simply want to see a court that makes decisions affecting all Australians made up over time of justices who know all of Australia, and I thank the member for Heysen for her support on this. This year, His Honour Justice Callinan will celebrate his 70th birthday and will retire as required under our constitution. I, for one, voted against that constitutional amendment, but it was carried. Indeed, Justice Callinan is far and away my favourite High Court judge and I am very sorry to see him go. Over the next few years—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: No, Justice Callinan writes novels in his spare time, and I commend them to the house. Over the next few years both His Honour Chief Justice Gleeson and His Honour Justice Kirby will similarly retire. I pledge to the house that I will be doing all I can to convince

the commonwealth Attorney-General, whoever that might be, to support a South Aussie. We have the talent and we deserve it. I call on all members, as the member for Heysen has, to put aside party politics on this matter and pursue what is right and best for the state of South Australia.

HOSPITALS, BRAIN INJURY REHABILITATION UNIT

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Leader of the Opposition): Is the Minister for Disability aware that the lack of disability funding is creating a bed blockage at the Royal Adelaide Hospital because patients are unable to be transferred to the Brain Injury Rehabilitation Unit, and what action is the minister proposing to resolve the issue? Minutes of a meeting of the Allied Health Professionals at the Royal Adelaide Hospital indicate:

There is a funding freeze on at the moment which is creating problems for the Brain Injury Rehabilitation Unit and, therefore, [leaving] Royal Adelaide Hospital with bed blockages.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Minister for Disability): I think we need to clarify something. There is no funding freeze. We are spending more money than we have ever spent in disability services; it is just that the demand is greater than the resources that we are presently have to meet those needs. Those pressures have been in the system for some time, but we now have a much clearer picture about the nature of those pressures because we are running these services directly and not through our statutory authorities.

The truth is that in the past these things were dealt with by simply merrily spending more money. If you have received a certain budgeted amount, you simply cannot keep spending beyond that amount because there are additional services that you choose to supply. You have to actually receive that money through the budget process. We are attempting to manage within our budget, and it is difficult. We are attempting to quarantine front-line services, but that is proving difficult as well. So there are pressures, we are alive to them, and we are working hard to get on top of them.

MINING

Mr KENYON (Newland): Can the Premier advise the house about recent developments in South Australia's mining industry?

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Premier): Once again, it would have been nice to have had a bit more notice, but I thank the honourable member for the question. One of the—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I said fandango. I have changed from farrago to fandango. One of the major minerals projects currently taking place in South Australia is OneSteel's \$355 million Project Magnet iron ore development.

Ms Breuer interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I am very pleased to get that support from the back. Last Monday, the Minister for Mineral Resources Development attended a ceremony in Whyalla to mark a significant milestone in this project: the commissioning of a floating off-shore terminal vessel and two transfer barges. These will enable Whyalla to handle some of the biggest vessels ever seen in South Australian waters. The three vessels will form the new trans-shipping system that will allow OneSteel to load the big ore ships in the gulf.

I understand that around 15 to 20 of the cape-size vessels will be loaded each year, each taking around 3½ days to load.

The two self-unloading barges have a capacity of up to 20 000 tonnes and the transfer barge will accommodate a crew of eight during the loading process. The vessels were named following a competition amongst the people of Whyalla. The barge—wait for it, I know members opposite are interested in the naming of various projects—*Middleback* is named after the ranges from which the ore is mined; the *Bungala* is named in honour of the traditional owners of the land on which the steelworks stand; and the off-shore terminal vessel *Spencer Gulf* of course represents the waters off the Whyalla coast. So there was nothing named after any member of the front bench. The trans-shipping process will be tested by OneSteel over the next few weeks, with the process set to be fully operational in the first quarter of next year.

I am also pleased to advise the house about the development of skills that are essential to support the growth of our state's mining industry. Last Friday marked the graduation ceremony in Coober Pedy of Oxiana's pre-employment training program for Prominent Hill. Prominent Hill, as members would know, is one of the great finds in the South Australian Outback, a mixture of gold and copper. This newly established program is a shining example of innovation and training and Oxiana's ongoing commitment to support regional communities in South Australia as a whole.

I have to say that it has been a pleasure to work with Oxiana. Oxiana's commitment to regional jobs, its commitment to skills and its commitment to indigenous employment and training is exemplary. We hope that other companies will follow their lead in committing to training and education in their local regions. Oxiana's 60-day training program has been in operation since September 2006, drawing on trainees from Coober Pedy and other regional towns such as Port Augusta and Oodnadatta. Oxiana and its program partners (TAFE, Bungala, the Department for Employment and Workplace Relations and the Northern Regional Development Board) have all come together to skill these trainees in areas such as computing, first-aid, rigging, money management, equipment operations, environmental controls and career planning. The program was designed to give people who have never worked in the mining industry an opportunity to gain invaluable skills through employment within the industry.

The government is also dedicated to generating further opportunities to secure the future of our regional communities. Development of the new Minerals Resources and Heavy Engineering Skills Centre for South Australia is further testament to our support for the resources industry for new regional training and skilling programs and for the development of new employment opportunities in South Australia. Oxiana is active as board members of the centre along with other major mining companies in South Australia.

The centre will expand youth learning and work programs in new mineral project areas, including improving transitions for young people from school to further learning and employment. It will also ensure that indigenous communities have training opportunities to allow them to take full advantage of the jobs on offer at new mining projects across the state. I am also very pleased to announce to the house that the new Bachelor of Engineering (Mining) degree, launched last year at the University of Adelaide, currently has 67 first-year students enrolled. In addition, first-year geology at the university has over 200 students, making it the largest intake in the nation. Again, I think that is a signal and a symbol of what is happening in South Australia.

The Fraser Institute in Toronto rates 65 mining jurisdictions around the world in terms of mining prospectivity. We have moved from 31st position, to 18th position, to sixth position, to fourth position in the world out of 65 jurisdictions. So, it is not surprising that, obviously, we want to maximise the amount of local employment that we get out of this mining boom. In addition, South Australia is today enjoying the early stages of a resources boom, and our state has never been a more attractive place to invest and do business.

Not only is South Australia recognised as one of the most attractive jurisdictions in the world for mining exploration, the latest ABS figures—I think these are from about a week or so ago—show that the value of exploration expenditure in South Australia has reached \$191.4 million during 2006—a 92.6 per cent increase from the previous year, which was the all-time record. So, 2005 was the all-time record in South Australia for mining exploration expenditure, and it is up 92.6 per cent a year later.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Members opposite might want to regard the mining boom as a mirage in the desert; they are in for a huge shock. So, either get on board or let us move forward without you. Mining companies are—

The Hon. K.O. Foley: Knockers step aside.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Yes, knockers step aside—fullstop, fullstop, fullstop. Mining companies are translating their confidence into significant investment, and the government is working with the industry to deliver the skilled workers that are so critical to maximise the benefits of mineral expansion for all South Australians. I am delighted to say once again that we are working very closely with the mining industry; obviously, with BHP Billiton and the work that is going on—a massive amount of work in terms of infrastructure, water, desalination, and also, of course, dealing with issues such as—

Ms Chapman: The three mines policy?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I do not support the three mines policy. In fact, the three mines policy was actually removed years ago. There is now a no new mines policy, which has not been an impediment to this state. It has, in fact, given mines such as Roxby Downs, Beverley and Honeymoon a head start over the rest of the nation. I have made no secret of the fact that I will be moving to change this policy which is illogical. It does not make any sense at all to have a policy that says that the world's biggest uranium mine is okay but others are not. So we will be moving to change that. But I warn members opposite that, if they believe that the Roxby expansion is some kind of mirage in the desert, then go to Escondida and have a look at a mine which I understand is the biggest copper mine in the world but which will be dwarfed by the mining expansion at Olympic Dam.

ABORIGINAL HOUSING

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett): Why is the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation refusing to take immediate action to address the urgent need for safe housing in Ceduna for Aboriginal women and children who are the victims of serious family violence and sexual assault? The opposition has been told that several cases of acute family violence are reported in Ceduna every week. Women have been burnt and stabbed. They have been beaten so badly that they have gone into cardiac arrest. Women have been kicked and bashed while pregnant, resulting in premature births and

children born with permanent disabilities. They have been taken out bush and left with wounds to become flyblown.

They have had their skulls fractured and suffered permanent brain damage, and there have been numerous cases of internal bleeding, repeated rapes, leg and arm fractures and spinal injuries. Victim support groups have told the opposition that the current options for these women and their children to escape the violence in the region are limited to short-term motel accommodation in Ceduna or relocation to regional towns some distance away. This situation can result in victims returning to cycles of violence, social dislocation, increased burden on family members who are trying to offer support, and additional stress for victims.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation): It sounds as though the bipartisan approach in the Aboriginal Lands Parliamentary Standing Committee has just come to a sudden end! Because I sit on that committee, the honourable member asked me informally to address the question of the Ceduna safe house as part of a broader strategy. Indeed, the commonwealth and the state are working closely in relation to that issue. They have established a Ceduna family violence strategy, a joint project between the Australian and South Australian governments. The safe house will provide Aboriginal women and young people fleeing violence with temporary respite from violent situations or with a pathway to moving away from violent relationships.

Housing SA has placed an offer on a property for the safe house and scoped upgrades, and it should be available for use in June this year. There are plans for another property to be purchased as a second safe house. The Ceduna council wants the five units at Kuhlman Street to be used as safe housing instead of the houses within the town. However, security issues mean that these units are not appropriate for use as safe housing in the longer term. The Kuhlman Street units will provide pathway housing for Aboriginal people requiring living skills support prior to accessing longer-term tenancies. There will also be a pathway option for families leaving the safe houses.

I have agreed to allow the request of the honourable member and other members of the Aboriginal Lands Parliamentary Standing Committee who have had the opportunity to visit Ceduna, an opportunity they never would have had under the previous government, because this committee never met. In fact before this government, not since the Premier was minister for aboriginal affairs had this important committee of the parliament been allowed to meet on these things. So, some important work has been done by the Aboriginal Lands Parliamentary Standing Committee. They made a request of me to allow the Kuhlman Street units to be used for safe housing if needed as an interim measure until the safe house is open, and I have agreed to do that. That is what I was asked to do and that is what I have done.

I had thought that this committee was to operate in a bipartisan fashion, but it seems that point scoring is going to become the order of the day once again in Aboriginal affairs, when it is crying out for a bipartisan position.

UNIFORM GOVERNMENT BOUNDARIES

Ms BREUER (Giles): My question is to the Minister assisting the Premier in public sector management. What are the latest developments in attempts to create uniform government boundaries?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Minister Assisting the Premier in Cabinet Business and Public Sector Management): For some time now, the government has been learning of frustrations about inconsistent boundaries between government agencies. Concern has been expressed in a range of sectors, including business, local government and non-government organisations. Most recently, those concerns have been expressed around consultations for the update of the South Australian Strategic Plan.

Confusion is, of course, created by inconsistent boundaries and complicates the planning and delivery of services, and makes it much harder for the community to have access to those services. For a citizen it must be perplexing to deal with one state government but have an abundance of different boundaries for different agencies. It seems that this question of having common boundaries has been on the agenda since the 1970s but there have been little advances made in addressing it—issues like a single-gauge railway. These simple solutions seem to evade us. What has really been lacking is the will, and we have finally had a breakthrough. I am happy to announce today that South Australian government departments have agreed to adopt uniform regional boundaries. Twelve regions will be established and used by all departments and agencies. Four inner metropolitan, three outer metropolitan and five rural regions will be implemented and completed, with a target date of December 2008. The NRM boundaries will remain, due to, obviously, the physical nature of those boundaries which do not necessarily match up with the people boundaries.

For the first time important services such as police, ambulance and emergency services will line up, which will improve the chance of a well-integrated and efficient response to members of the community. These changes have been led by the Government Reform Commission headed by former Queensland premier Wayne Goss, and the GRC has put this forward as a recommendation as part of the broader attempt to improve government service delivery. It is also a reaffirmation of the government's commitment to the principle of one government, grappling with the issues which require a whole of government approach. The new boundaries closely align with existing local government boundaries, and for the first time local and state governments can work together to address and plan for the needs of their communities.

ABORIGINAL HOUSING

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett): Why is the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation ignoring the advice of the Ceduna community, the victims and the Aboriginal Lands Parliamentary Standing Committee to permanently change the purpose of the recently constructed Kuhlman Street units in Ceduna from transitional Aboriginal accommodation to safe housing for women and children who are victims of family violence? Commonwealth funds have recently been used to build a cluster of home units in Ceduna. The units were originally funded as transitional housing, but the commonwealth has agreed to permit their use as permanent safe houses. There is overwhelming support for the purpose of these units to be changed to provide safe housing. This includes support from the local council, the Ceduna community, the Aboriginal community, the victims, the Ceduna Aboriginal Family Violence Prevention Legal Service, SAPOL, and the Aboriginal Lands Parliamentary Standing Committee. Despite this the minister has blocked

the permanent transfer of the commonwealth funded facility for this use, only permitting its use as an interim measure. Instead, he has proposed in the future, to provide two conventional houses as 'they have greater capacity to be managed by an appropriate agency.'

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation): I wish the member had listened to my previous answer, but perhaps I will go through it again. I have made available the property for the purpose that has been requested. There is a need for both sorts of houses. There is a need for safe houses. Safe houses have a particular role. They of necessity have to be available to enable refuge for people who are fleeing violence. Their location and their integration into the service system is different from a transitional house which is to enable people to move into some more settled form of accommodation. They are two separate roles, but we have heard what has been suggested, the urgent need for a safe house, and we have made the Kuhlman Street properties available for that purpose.

HOSPITALS, MODBURY

Ms BEDFORD (Florey): Can the Minister for Health give us an update on the transfer of Modbury Hospital back into public hands?

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Minister for Health): I thank the member for Florey for her question. I acknowledge her very great interest in this issue, and all matters to do with Modbury Hospital and health in her electorate. The government announced in early 2006 that it would seek to return Modbury Hospital to public management as soon as possible and before the current privatisation contract expires in 2010. As members are aware, Modbury Hospital is the only public hospital in South Australia that is privately operated. It was the first of many hospitals that the former government had planned to privatise. No doubt if it had been elected to office other hospitals in our state would have been similarly run.

Our Premier, though, has a very different approach, so we are putting Modbury back into public hands to properly join the state's network of public hospitals. Previously, I advised that the government was seeking to negotiate with the hospital's current management, Healthscope, to mutually agree to end this contract. I have always said that we want the best outcome for the state and that we would not rush this process. Our aim has been to seek an agreement to end the management of the hospital by Healthscope and have it returned to the state government by July 2007.

I am very pleased to be able to confirm that we are on track to achieve this goal. The Department of Health is in the final stages of negotiations with Healthscope for the return of Modbury. Meanwhile, Healthscope continues to operate the hospital in accordance with the management contract. That means that it continues to be responsible for the day-to-day management of the hospital, including small equipment purchases. In relation to that matter, recent complaints were made by a doctor at Modbury about a lack of working scopes for ENT at the hospital. It is my understanding that, following a request from my department, Healthscope has responded to this issue by placing an order for an additional two scopes. Meanwhile, one scope has been offered to be loaned to the hospital while others are being repaired. The return of Modbury Hospital will provide certainty for doctors and nurses who will gain all the benefits of working as part of the network of public hospitals.

ABORIGINAL HOUSING

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett): My question is again to the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation. Given his previous answers, does the minister disagree with the former minister for the status of women that cluster housing is the best model for Aboriginal women and children escaping family violence? In October 2003, the former minister for the status of women twice advised parliament of the development of the Sturt Street cluster units for Aboriginal women and children. The former minister told the house that the new cluster housing model for women and children escaping family violence provides a holistic approach and improved and more appropriate responses for Aboriginal women and children.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation): Of course I agree with the former minister. Cluster housing does provide an appropriate model for women and children fleeing domestic violence. Indeed, there are numerous examples of that form of housing around not only the metropolitan area but also regional areas. I fail to see what relationship that has to the question in issue.

YOUTH CONSERVATION CORPS

Mr PICCOLO (Light): My question is to the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education. What is the state government doing to assist unemployed young people with a commitment to the environment to gain relevant work experience skills?

The Hon. P. CAICA (Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education): I thank the honourable member for his question, and I note his commitment to the training and education of younger people; and, indeed, I note his very throaty voice today. I am pleased to inform members that the state government has committed \$1 million to assist 300 young people to undertake environmental training and work experience in projects across this state. The South Australia Works Youth Conservation Corps Program provides South Australians—

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The Hon. P. CAICA:—it is a very good idea—aged up to 25 years with the opportunity to participate in environmental projects that preserve, protect and restore the state's natural and cultural heritage in areas of local significance to the community. At the same time, this experience provides opportunities to develop relevant work and life skills. The projects operate in conjunction with Conservation Volunteers Australia and Employ SA and are of six months duration. They involve activities in aspects including Landcare or Coastcare, data collection, bush regeneration, habitat protection, restoration activities, cultural heritage, ecotourism and community education.

The Youth Conservation Corps Program is designed to provide participants with opportunities to improve confidence and self-esteem, interpersonal and team work skills and leadership qualities. The two new projects to commence this year include assisting the River Murray Urban Users Group through the preservation of native vegetation and undertaking drought monitoring activities to assist in future drought relief assistance measures. Participants will learn about the value, importance and history of the River Murray in South Australia.

The other program is developing a vegetation corridor across the northern foothills, protecting and linking remnant native vegetation for the Playford conservation and rehabilitation project. This will create a habitat that will sustain wildlife and preserve threatened indigenous plants. Participants will be involved in experiencing seed collection, habitat control, revegetation and roadside pruning.

Each project will involve up to 20 young people who will undertake both accredited and non-accredited training. Accredited training is delivered through the Certificate II in Conservation and Land Management and incorporates senior first aid, volunteering, and occupational health, safety and welfare. Last year, 212 young people participated in this project—89 gaining employment and a further 34 undertaking further training or education. The state government remains committed to providing opportunities for young South Australians to enhance their employment prospects through relevant training and educational experiences.

EDINBURGH RAAF BASE

Ms CHAPMAN (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Will the Minister for Health inform the house what action his department has taken in response to 50 cases of gastroenteritis at the Royal Australian Air Force Base at Edinburgh which has resulted in the closure of the RAAF Base swimming pool and aviators' mess?

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Minister for Health): I will certainly take advice, but I would have thought a RAAF base was under the control of the commonwealth.

Ms Chapman: No, it's not, and you know it.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYMENT

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop): Can the Treasurer advise the house at what number the Public Service will be capped as at 30 June 2007? During the budget estimates on 18 October last year, when asked if the 76 654 full-time equivalent estimated total public sector employment number for 30 June 2007 was the cap, the Treasurer responded:

That number was the expected cap. That number is being worked through, and we have further work to do to finalise that number between Treasury and other government agencies. We hope to have that number consolidated by the end of this calendar year.

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

Mr WILLIAMS: Can the Treasurer advise the house of the total reduction in public servant numbers since the budget was handed down in September last year? When the budget was handed down in September, the Treasurer announced an expected reduction of 1 571 public servants.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I thank the member for his question. I will take that one on notice, also.

WORKCOVER

Mr HANNA (Mitchell): Why has the Minister for Industrial Relations not assessed the likely impact on WorkCover's unfunded liability of the High Court ruling in Attorney-General v Andrews last week, which allows a new range of large corporations to opt out of the state workers compensation scheme?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT (Minister for Industrial Relations): The advice I have received from the board is that it will not affect the unfunded liability.

MONARCH COLLEGE

Ms CHAPMAN (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Will the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education release the report logged with TAFE SA and the executive summary provided to TAFE SA academic board in relation to the issues surrounding the Monarch College and TAFE SA course; and, if not, why not?

The Hon. P. CAICA (Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education): I was interested to read in the paper that the accusation levelled at the report was that it was, in fact, secret. The information from the academic committee is not secret. As it concerns personal information from students, it is not made publicly available. All information concerning the meeting of the academic committee and academic board conforms to agreed processes of conduct under the relevant act, that being the higher education act, with which the deputy leader would be quite familiar. Of course, it is available for normal internal audit in respect of fulfilling requirements under the Australian qualifications framework and the higher education guidelines. As I have said on numerous occasions, upon request, I would certainly make a briefing available to the shadow minister.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. P. CAICA: Well, it is not a secret report, and last night I did report this particular matter to the parliament through a ministerial statement.

WORKCOVER

Mr HANNA (Mitchell): My question is again to the Minister for Industrial Relations. How many employees are anticipated to depart from the state workers compensation scheme as a result of the Attorney-General v Andrews ruling? Will the minister make public the advice from the WorkCover Board in relation to this case?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT (Minister for Industrial Relations): I would need to check those numbers, but as I said before, the advice that I have received is that the board has put procedures in place regarding this High Court action. To the best of my memory—and I would need to check this for the member and I am happy to check those numbers to which he refers—I think that this case goes back to about 2004 (or thereabouts). However, as I said earlier, I have been advised that, under the current circumstances, this decision will not have a significant financial impact on the South Australian scheme because safeguards have been put in place to ensure that large employers who leave the South Australian scheme are required to pay a fee for exiting the scheme. That is a process that the board has put in place. With regard to the specific question about how many employees have left the scheme, I will take advice and come back to the house on that.

MONARCH COLLEGE

Ms CHAPMAN (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Will the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education confirm that Indian students undertaking the Advanced Diploma in Hospitality Management are awarded a joint parchment with both TAFE and Monarch?

The Hon. P. CAICA (Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education): My understanding (and if it is not correct, of course I will get back to the house) is that a parchment is issued by Monarch College and it is not a TAFE parchment.

TAFE, LEIGH CREEK

Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder): Will the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education confirm that the government is planning to close the Leigh Creek TAFE campus, and can he assure the house that this closure is not part of a broader strategy to close regional TAFEs and centralise TAFE services in major centres?

The Hon. P. CAICA (Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education): As the shadow minister is aware, Leigh Creek has a declining population and there is an intention to close the TAFE college in Leigh Creek. In fact, I have met with the local member and others to advise them of this particular situation. People currently undertaking courses will be able to finish the course that they have started. Again, to date it has been common knowledge. I thank the member for his question. In answer to the second part of the honourable member's question: it is not part of any broad-ranging closure of our regional campuses, as might have been indicated in his press release today.

TRANSADELAIDE, TRAINS

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite): I have a question for the Minister for Transport. Why do almost one in three trains in metropolitan Adelaide run late and what is the government doing to fix it? Answers to questions on notice have revealed late running across the metropolitan area by TransAdelaide, including that almost 20 per cent of trains on the Belair line (or one in five) are six minutes or more late, thus missing bus connections, and that 14 per cent of trains on the Outer Harbor line and the spur line to Grange also six minutes or more late. Information obtained under FOI has also confirmed that late running is much worse in the 0 to 6 minutes category, with one in three trains running late.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Minister for Transport): It is good to hear from the member for Waite. I thought we must have done a condolence motion for him, it has been that long since I have heard from him. It is probably not new—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: They never want me to say anything, do they? They never ask a question but when they do they do not want me to say anything.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Listen to the pain. Don't you love the pain? I think the issue of trains running on time has been somewhat a vexed issue in politics for some considerable period. I remember that Mussolini back in the 1930s—

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: The twenties.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: In the 1920s; it was one of the benefits of fascism that he could make the trains run on time—

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: And they did for a month.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON:—and he did, but regrettably we do not have the sort of tools available to a democratically elected government, but the good 'il Duce' did. There are a number of reasons why trains will run late. One of the principal reasons in recent weeks and months, especially on the Belair and Noarlunga lines, has been that very good

project that we are undertaking to replace the Bakewell Bridge. Of course, you will never hear about that very good project from the member for Waite. You will not hear about the very good bridges we are building at the Port and the upgrade of the terminal to bring in the biggest shipping container we have ever seen in South Australia as a result of this government's initiative to deepen the Outer Harbour. The new grain terminal is making Ivan Venning a wealthier man as he sits there.

Mr Williams: That was an initiative of the previous government.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: An initiative of the previous government! Let me explain that, because nothing could be further from the truth. In fact, when they privatised—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: You are going to have to listen to this. You cannot make dopey interjections and not listen. When they privatised Flinders Ports—remember Lord Armitage privatising Flinders Ports—they decided upon a deep sea grain terminal in the middle of the river, which was the entirely wrong place, and that was their initiative. That was going to be what they got out of the privatisation—a deep sea grain terminal in the wrong place.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: On a point of order, I point out that trains do not go underneath the surface of the water at Outer Harbor. I draw the minister back to the question. I seek your guidance, Madam Deputy Speaker.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: There is no point of order.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: If they do not want me to address their dopey interjections, the best thing would be not to make them. But the truth is that Ivan Venning will tell you that the grain terminal was in the wrong place. Wasn't it, Ivan? We moved it and, because of that, we were able to deepen the port. Ivan is nodding because at least he is an honest man. To return to the trains, can I say that there is not a train system in Australia that does not have delays. I see that Morris Iemma managed to get re-elected after a gridlock for two hours on the Sydney Harbour Bridge. One of the reasons is the works we are doing; another—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: It is good to be back. It is so much fun to be back on my feet. For a while, I was frightened it would never happen again. Another reason for delays in trains has been the success we have had in increasing patronage, as we have set out to do. Of course, there is more funding for more services. I did hear a better approach just last week at a tram forum at the Property Council—the one that I apparently was not going to attend because I was frightened of the member for Waite—where they asked the opposition spokesperson for his vision for the future.

The Hon. K.O. Foley: What did he say?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: He was very comical. It could be this, it could be that, it could be anything, he said. He had not really worked that out yet; you cannot really work that out unless you are in government. We all had a very good laugh about it after, thank you very much to the member for Waite. It is a difficult system to run and there are a lot of challenges. We always like to do better. There are a lot of reasons why trains run late, but I can assure people that we are carrying more public transport passengers than the previous government ever did. It is a challenge that we like to have.

WORKCOVER

Mr HANNA (Mitchell): My question is to the Minister for Industrial Relations. Approximately when did the minister receive advice from the WorkCover Board in relation to the Attorney-General v Andrews case, to which I referred earlier during question time?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT (Minister for Industrial Relations): I will check that detail and get back to the member. What this is all about, of course, is private corporations exiting state schemes and joining the ComCare scheme, as the member would be well aware. The reason they do that is that it is a race to the bottom when it comes to occupational health, safety and welfare. It is another tactic by the Howard government to take away rights and benefits of workers. I will check on the number of inspectors they have, but I think it is something like 25, 30, 35 Australia-wide, even though they promised to increase the number, which they have failed to do. I will check the answer to the member's question.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Leader of the Opposition): I have a supplementary question, Madam Deputy Speaker. Given the minister's answer about a race to the bottom and worker's benefits, will the minister take the opportunity to rule out changes to WorkCover that disadvantage workers?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: I have already answered that question.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The Minister for Industrial Relations may continue his answer.

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: Thank you. What the member knows full well is that the former government left WorkCover in a mess, and that is well evidenced by the failure of return to work. We are going to arrest that problem. We are going to arrest the problem of return to work and help get people back to work.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

TRANSADELAIDE, TRAINS

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite): My question is again to the Minister for Transport. Why, during his watch as minister over the past two financial years, have almost 1 400 train services either been cancelled or failed to complete their scheduled journey at all? Information from TransAdelaide documents, released publicly in February, confirmed that 1 390 train services were cancelled or failed to complete their scheduled journey at all.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Minister for Transport): I think there were several thousand mentioned, so it may take me a while to get all of that information for the member and bring it back to the house. I suspect there may have been different circumstances on each occasion. Sometimes there are accidents that cause a train not to arrive, sometimes there are breakdowns. I note that the *Sunday Mail* thought I should be out there fixing fanbelts on buses as they break down, but I am not quite that hands-on. I am more than happy to bring back some information to the member for Waite about those several thousand, or whatever it was.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

ABORIGINAL HOUSING

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett): Today in question time I asked the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation about the provision of safe housing in Ceduna. During his response the minister said that he thinks bipartisanship has gone out of the Aboriginal Lands Parliamentary Standing Committee. I assure the minister that one of the jobs that I enjoy most—and I enjoy being a member of parliament—is being on that parliamentary standing committee, because it is a committee that works really well, as it did under the late Terry Roberts. The members of that committee are dedicated, and we all work together under difficult circumstances. However, this is one particular issue that the committee has been really worried about. We have not been able to progress.

I would be failing in my position as shadow minister for Aboriginal affairs and reconciliation if I did not speak up on behalf of the women and children of Ceduna. What we have in Ceduna are ongoing (today even) horrendous cases of domestic family violence, and they have been going on for many years. There is an opportunity in Ceduna to have a cluster of five homes paid for by the federal government dedicated as safe houses. It would only take the minister a stroke of a pen to say, 'Yes, this is happening, they are permanent, here is the funding for them.'

I think the issue of funding is the big bugbear, because the minister does not want to admit that there is no recurrent funding—there is no recurrent funding even for the conventional house that has been proposed—but the big issue here is that these women and children are being taken out of their communities away from family support, and they are not able to have their issues addressed in an appropriate manner.

We have seen the former minister for the status of women acknowledge that cluster housing development is the best way of trying to deal with some of the stresses and issues that these women and children are facing. The minister is being derelict in his duty to protect these women and children if he does not do something immediately to change the use of the Kuhlman Street units from transitional pathways housing to housing that will be used for the safe accommodation of these women. You cannot take these women and children down to Port Augusta, Port Lincoln or Ceduna, or put them in hotels and motels, because their partners find them. Sometimes, when they are so dislocated they feel so alienated that they are being forced to come back to the communities.

I refer to an email that was sent to the Department for Families and Communities from one of the support groups. It states:

The minister's decision has not come too soon. The Legal Service is being inundated with calls for help from women who are victims of family violence. Only this morning we have had five women in our office who are victims of separate incidents including an attempted choking, threat of killing with a screwdriver held to the throat, follow up with a minor raped by [a family member] plus counselling of her twin sister similarly abused, the rescue of woman battered to the face and body by enraged partner. Last night we secured one of the women in the local motel only to find this morning that her husband knew of her whereabouts and could have got at her at any time. . .

This email states further that the writer cannot understand why the Kuhlman Street units have not been approved for permanent use by the minister. It goes on to confirm the view expressed by many members of the community, many people

in the social service industries, that the cluster housing development is the best way of housing these women.

These women and children need immediate support, and if the Treasurer does not give the minister the money, the Treasurer is at fault. The Treasurer pontificated about the APY lands. He said then that he was looking after the women and children. The Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation said he was listening to the women and children in the APY lands. Well, listen to the women and children on the West Coast. Listen to these communities, and listen to the people who are supporting the groups over there. It is not just this Aboriginal Lands Parliamentary Standing Committee; it is not just me. It is the Ceduna council; it is SAPOL. There are so many groups over there, including Centacare, the Family Violence Legal Service, the Attorney-General's Department, the Department of Health, Yalata Community Inc, Koonibba Community Council Inc. and Weena Mooga Gu Gudba Inc.

The whole community, white and Aboriginal, want this to happen. If this minister does not do something about it he is being derelict in his duty. It is the one thing that the Aboriginal Lands Parliamentary Standing Committee is really desperate to achieve. There are so many good things that could happen if they are allowed to happen, but not when the committee and communities are being stonewalled by the department and a minister who, for some reason, just cannot see the wood for the trees.

HAWKER DISTRICT

Ms BREUER (Giles): I am pleased to follow the member for Morphett, because he raised some issues in question time today and just then in his grievance. I must say that I certainly hope that the Aboriginal lands committee can continue in a style that it has in the past. It is an excellent committee to be on, and I have the greatest respect for the member for Morphett and work very well with him. We are a very bipartisan committee. Our role is to look out for the people in those communities.

I know that we will continue to work together in the future on this, and I noted with great interest the comments today. I want to speak now about a visit that I had last week to Hawker. Hawker was recently at the centre of some of those terrible floods that occurred and that incredible rain that we had in recent weeks (on, I think, 19 and 20 January). The reason I visited Hawker is that it is part of my electorate and I had come in for some criticism in recent times from the residents of Hawker because I had not been up to see them since those rains. As people would be aware, I have had a family bereavement and I am afraid I was on leave at the time, so I was pleased to visit and talk to the people up there.

At the time, I saw television footage of what was happening up there. I saw the floods, an incredible amount of water, but I must say that until I went there last week I really was not aware of the devastating after-effects of these floods. We see issues such as floods and bushfires on television and think how terrible it is, but it is not until you actually go to the area a few weeks later and see the after-effects that you realise the impact these events have on communities. This is what has happened in the Hawker area. People do not understand the damage that was caused there, the costs to people in the community, because we do forget about these things once they are off our screen. I was taken round and saw many of the areas that were affected.

I was amazed at the amount of fencing that had gone down and at the number of spectacular old trees that were probably 200 or 300 years old that were just pulled out of the ground and disappeared and will take hundreds of years to grow back again. Damage to the roads was incredible. In some places there was damage a kilometre each side of breaks in the road of creek beds. I must congratulate the Department of Transport, because it is doing an excellent job in repairing many of these roads, but there is still an amazing amount of work to do. I gave a commitment to the people of Hawker that I would come back and speak to the minister about what has happened there, because I went with his blessing. He knew that I was going and asked me to report back to him, so I will be meeting with him again in the near future to talk about this.

I want to point out to the house the amount of damage that has been caused and the cost to the farmers. Many of these farmers and pastoralists are in dire straits, having been greatly affected by these floods. I was particularly concerned about the Hawker/Cradock area. Estimates of damage are something like \$160 000 worth of fencing damage; roads, private on property, over \$18 000; earthworks, dams and banks, over \$39 000; other sundries about \$7 000; and for repairing tanks etc., you are looking at about \$5 500. There is also another \$65 000 in the area of the Cradock township, so they are looking at probably \$300 000 worth of damage and there are still about four landholders who have not given estimates. They are in serious trouble.

In other areas around there, I estimate that about 500 kilometres of fencing went down on the various stations. On Moralana it was 100 kilometres; Vespers, 50 kilometres; and on Merna Mora it was 100 kilometres, and you are looking at \$2 000 per kilometre to replace this fencing. Road repairs are about \$100 a kilometre. Many of these pastoralists and farmers have been in drought conditions for many years. They do not have their fences insured, and people say to me, 'Why not?' The reason is that you cannot insure your fences against flood damage, so the farmers and the pastoralists are having to foot this bill themselves. What they are asking the state government to do is look at giving them some sort of compensation, some sort of disaster fund, some way they can be assisted in this, because they do not have the cash flow to be able to afford this.

There will be benefits from the flood, of course, because the country will look very green and beautiful very quickly and their stock will benefit. But that is down the track. They need immediate help and I will be speaking to the minister about it.

Time expired.

EDINBURGH RAAF BASE

Ms CHAPMAN (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Today in question time I asked the Minister for Health what his department was doing in respect of an outbreak of over 50 cases of gastroenteritis at the Edinburgh RAAF base, and I was staggered to hear his response that that matter would be in the commonwealth jurisdiction—and I am paraphrasing his answer—because it was on commonwealth land.

A few days ago the opposition was advised that there was a significant outbreak of gastroenteritis—there was uncertainty as to whether or not it was cryptosporidium—and we were informed, following this gastroenteritis outbreak which had occurred on the base, that there had been a practice of filtered water being trucked into the base for cooking and drinking

purposes. That in itself is quite a concern, because a number of people live on the base. It does not mean that they live there and never go out. These people, who are largely employed with the RAAF, obviously have access to and interaction with the outside civilian world; it is not as though the base is quarantined in that sense. Therefore, it was of great concern to hear this.

The opposition made some inquiries and it was clear that there had been a serious gastroenteritis outbreak at the base; that the RAAF itself had consulted with the South Australian Department of Health—as it would, of course, because of the public health responsibilities of the South Australian department. The RAAF took samples from the victims with this condition and sent those samples to laboratories—in accordance with the South Australian Department of Health's advice, guidelines and support—to identify whether, in fact, there was any reportable disease or virus that needed to be attended to.

The RAAF took action. I understand from our inquiries that there had not been a practice of carting water but that the RAAF administration had very responsibly closed down its swimming pool and that it had closed down the airmen's mess—which I understand is a social facility—to ensure that there was no contamination or cross-infection with this apparently highly contagious gastroenteritis virus. It appeared on the face of it that the action taken by the RAAF was prompt and that it had complied with its obligations to report the matter to the Department of Health.

I asked the minister today what his department was doing to deal with this outbreak, because it might have escaped his attention that he is responsible for 1.5 million people in South Australia—that is, civilians in this state who are exposed to public health risks when we have serious contaminants, viruses and diseases in the community. That is his job. He is directly responsible to this parliament and to South Australians to protect and keep them safe in these circumstances. It is staggering that, today, he not only appears not to know about it but is quite dismissive of it as being some commonwealth exemption and therefore not his responsibility. I hope he comes back to this parliament and makes absolutely clear what he is doing to protect the rest of the civilians of this state.

This matter is of particular concern because, as at 17 March 2007, 270 people have been infected with cryptosporidium which, as we know, is a water-borne virus, a killer. We know this is a condition from which some people have died. One of the most recent significant outbreaks was in Milwaukee in the United States of America where 100 people died from being contaminated with cryptosporidium. The concern we have here is that the number of cases as at 17 March this year is 270, whereas at the same time last year it was 53; and almost 50 per cent of the state's salmonella cases have been recorded in the first three months of this year as well. This is a serious situation. We have had numerous E. coli outbreaks. The last victim of whom I am aware who died from E. coli bacteria is an 18 year old woman who was eight months pregnant. It is alarming that the government continues not to address this issue and that after three months we have no idea of the source of this outbreak.

Time expired.

CALL CENTRES

Ms FOX (Bright): I rise today to speak again on the matter of call centres. Members may recall that in this place

some weeks ago I raised the matter of staff at various call centres in South Australia being given very small amounts of personal time. This personal time, as opposed to scheduled breaks, is the time in which call centre staff can go to the toilet, have a cigarette or have a cup of coffee. This matter was brought to my attention by a constituent. I spoke about it here and *The Advertiser* was good enough to publish those comments. As a result of the story in *The Advertiser*, I have been approached by a number of people who work in call centres, and the tales they tell me are hair-raising.

I should point out that one of the call centres I mentioned—not actually in a negative fashion—was Optus. Someone from Optus has contacted me on a number of occasions since and has invited me to visit its centre. The other company, AGL, has not extended a similar invitation, although a senior executive from interstate did ring my office and leave a rather peeved message. I have called him back, but he has not returned my call. That is customer service for you! I hope I do not get home and find that the gas has been cut off, but I digress.

While I appreciate that there will be some disgruntled former employees from call centres who have contacted me and not told me the entire truth, I am persuaded by the sheer volumes of calls I have received from former and current call centre workers that this is an industry where people are often treated shabbily. In fact, I wonder whether the call centre of today is actually the Lancashire cotton mill of the 19th century. I am advised by one AGL employee that, following my initial remarks in this parliament and the subsequent story in *The Advertiser*, along with his colleagues he was told that they were not to speak to any journalists or politicians again.

Staff were sent an email instructing them what to do should the occasion arise. Is this freedom of speech? Apparently, if you work in an AGL call centre you are not allowed to discuss your working conditions with your elected representatives or with the members of the fourth estate. Well, I am very glad that we have a parliamentary system where I can speak out loud without fear of retribution, where I can say that I am concerned about these workers and where I can put managers who bully, harass and dehumanise their workers under the spotlight.

I am advised of one call centre where a manager decided it would be a good idea to have fresh fruit in the work area and thus provide a healthy snack packed full of energy to those workers who wanted it—an excellent alternative to coffee or cigarettes. However, after six months the financial manager decided that this was not a sensible allocation of resources and the fruit was withdrawn. The manager who had the bright idea was castigated for this radical and, no doubt, financially ruinous concept.

My message to those who work in call centres is this: document what happens to you; talk to your friends; talk to your members of parliament; talk to the Ombudsman if you need to; and stand up for yourself. If you are too nervous to do that, join a union. The reason for unions—which is something that sometimes gets lost under the avalanche of John Howard's elderly rantings about them—is that they represent those who cannot do it alone. Unions exist to protect you from unfair treatment in the workplace and they improve your job security. That is what they are there for. The member for Kavel looks confused. If you do not want to go down the union path, as a call centre worker, you still have rights. Remember your rights, because it sounds to me as if a lot of the companies who run these centres will not.

NEW SOUTH WALES ELECTION

Mr VENNING (Schubert): I want to speak today about the New South Wales election last Saturday.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson interjecting:

Mr VENNING: It was a surprising and alarming result. The Attorney-General might laugh but he should listen to what I have to say. As many of us know, people do not like the New South Wales government, but what did they do? Basically, they returned the government with almost exactly the same numbers. The New South Wales election, as previous premier Neville Wran said, was the dirtiest campaign Australia has ever seen. These are the words used by Labor itself. I have cut this straight out of Labor's own document.

The question is: why did this result occur? On its own figures, Labor out-spent the coalition 4:1—that is Labor's own admission. Our people are saying that it could be more like 6:1. How can you get your argument across when you are up against odds like that, and we are talking millions of dollars, not to speak of the government-paid advertising over a long period. They had heaps of money and heaps of resources. They just spent heaps of money personally destroying good people with a vicious and malicious smear campaign.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr VENNING: And you only need to read *The Latham Diaries* to work out how smear campaigns work. You have had more than your share of that. You have destroyed many people in your time in here.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Koutsantonis): Order! The Attorney-General has a point of order.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: Mr Acting Speaker, the member for Schubert has made reflections on me, as a member, and has continually referred to members of the opposition in the second person, plural, and I ask you to bring him to order and require him to withdraw.

Mr VENNING: Mr Acting Speaker, to save time, I will withdraw it.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! We have stopped the clock for the member. The Attorney-General's point of order is well put. However, perhaps the Attorney-General cannot interject on the member and possibly that would limit the quarrel in the house. I ask the honourable member to address his remarks through the chair, which could probably solve—

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: And withdraw.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! The Acting Speaker will decide the fate of the Attorney. The member for Schubert will address his remarks through the chair and engage in his usual polite banter.

Mr VENNING: Thank you. Mr Acting Speaker, I appreciate your advice and protection from the Attorney-General. But, seriously, how can you have a campaign that is so weighted? Not only has the government got the trappings of being in office, but it also then has so much more money.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: We raise more money than you. It is as simple as that.

Mr VENNING: Through the unions, through business, through their own investments. You only need to read *The Latham Diaries* to see how the system works, and I have had a week off and have read Latham's diaries. I am astounded, particularly when you read Richardson's diaries as well, and you understand how the Labor Party works with its factions.

Some people think it is a game, but it keeps on keeping bad governments in power.

Really, the New South Wales people deserved a better government. They deserved to have a change. But it did not happen, because of a very powerful, strong, highly funded, effective campaign. I am saying that: it was an effective campaign. You can do anything when you have the money. New South Wales deserved a change of government but there was a huge amount of campaign funds available to Labor, together with the trappings and the abuse of the privilege of government in office, pork-barrelling in key seats, and use of a huge PR machine from all over Australia. All Labor states supplied the Iemma party with PR people: all Labor states provided people to help them. They reckon they had a work force of 600 people there—all highly paid PR people—which some of our taxpayers were paying for—to ensure that this juggernaut fell over the line on election day. Well, it did. It had to fall over the line.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: It didn't just fall over the line: it was a landslide.

Mr VENNING: It fell over the line, with the same result it had before. So, the dirt campaign was organised by the champions of dirt, Loosely and Richardson. We know them well—read their books. The previous premier, Carr, left because he was sure the government would not be re-elected. They are not my words: they are the words from the Labor Party. A scandal-wracked government should have been punished. Another tactician's comment was that Labor's multimillion dollar attack campaign on the opposition leader, Peter Debnam, was just massive. Read page 44 of the *Sunday Mail*, but I will not go into that—'Iemma's win shows voters' expectations are plunging'. It is not so much a case of voters' expectations as the fact that they really just have given up, and they went along not knowing what to do and just basically voted.

Toll roads are now becoming the norm. How else are you going to be able to get anything in the state? You go around New South Wales and all their new roads are toll roads, and they are asking, 'What is happening to the money?' So, what is happening here in South Australia? It is more of the same. We have a huge Premier's public relations outfit—100 people at least—costing the taxpayer here \$9 million per year. Add to this the huge amount of government-funded advertising that goes on all the time. Is this fair? We need an independent assessment.

The ACTING SPEAKER: The honourable member's time has expired. I call the member for Morialta.

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

Mr Venning: Are you going to interject the whole way through like you did to me?

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! Stop the clock. The member for Morialta sat silently during your grievance. However, the Attorney-General did not. So, when he makes a grievance, have a go. The member for Morialta has the call.

BUSINESS AMBASSADORS

Ms SIMMONS (Morialta): Today I would like to speak on the very successful Business Ambassadors for South Australia Network. This unique and effective program was borne out of the South Australia Business Vision 2010 project which was started by the previous government, to give credit where it is due. However, SABAN is a non-political organisation and it is a program of the premier of the day. It is a highly effective means of promoting South Australia as the

right place to live, visit, work, invest and do business. SABAN provides an important rallying point for business leaders committed to making a difference to the future of the state. Additionally, the program provides added benefits to the ambassadors themselves for high level personal networking opportunities.

The business ambassadors are recommended to the Premier for consideration based on their reputations as current influential business leaders or hand-picked leaders of tomorrow who are passionate about their own businesses and our state. They may be based in South Australia, interstate or overseas, and are very ably assisted by Ms Hilary Hurrell of Business SA to identify and to refer opportunities which could benefit South Australia in a variety of areas. These diverse areas include: skilled and business migration; tourism and business tourism (two different things); attracting and retaining talent to South Australia; inward investments; imports and exports; and bilateral trade. SABAN currently has over 200 ambassadors located in over 20 countries around the world. The UK, US and South-East Asia have been the primary geographical recruitment focus regions for 2007, together with an emphasis on women in business and young ambassadors who will make up our future business leaders.

Over 80 of the current business ambassadors reside outside Australia, providing SABAN with a unique global network of influence. They include a number of well known names, including John Olsen, Cheong Lieuw (who is the senior chef at the Adelaide Hilton) and Robert Champion de Crespigny. I was pleased to present membership certificates on behalf of the Premier last week to Jim Hilston, Greg Keegan and Tom Bowen, who are all South Australians based in Vietnam and part of the Austrade market between South Australia and this new tiger of South-East Asia (as Vietnam has recently been described). SABAN is funded by the South Australian government through the Department of Trade and Economic Development. The program is housed and supported by Business SA and also receives some sponsorship and significant in-kind support from the business and community sector.

However, the business ambassadors are all engaged, active and passionate volunteers. I would like to show my personal appreciation for the ongoing commitment that the SABAN ambassadors have made to the state of South Australia through this valuable and innovative volunteer business leaders program.

Time expired.

TOBACCO PRODUCTS

Mrs PENFOLD (Flinders): I move:

That the regulations made under the Tobacco Products Regulation Act 1997 entitled Tobacco Products Variation Regulations 2006, made on 9 November 2006 and laid on the table of this house on 14 November 2006, be disallowed.

The Labor Party freely admits that it is not a party for small business and nowhere is this more evident than in its decisions relating to red tape, fees and charges. These decisions often hit small businesses far harder than big businesses, despite small businesses making up about 94 per cent of all businesses in South Australia and being the biggest employers. They are also the incubators for innovation and

development that are the source of most of our big businesses. South Australia has one of the smallest domestic markets in Australia but, with steep payroll, property and land tax contributions, it has the heaviest state tax burden.

It is from this background that I have addressed the Tobacco Products Variation Regulations 2006. It is clear that fees and charges need to be reduced and certainly not increased; however, that is exactly the effect of this regulation—a huge increase. The government is already shackling South Australian businesses with many expensive fees and charges, and it is unacceptable that the effect of these regulations is to increase the tobacco merchants annual licence fee from \$12.90 to \$200—that is a whopping 1 450 per cent increase per licence.

One small business, namely the Snack Shack Deli, in my electorate, which is owned and operated by Coral and Vivian Thompson, provides a mobile lunch service for fishing and manufacturing industry employees. It is required to have an individual licence for each of its vans, additional to their base. That equates to six licences when one should have done. This is a rise in fees from what should have been \$12.90 per year to \$1 200 per year, which is a huge 9 200 per cent increase in fees for this one small regional business. The profitability of this small business is severely compromised, yet a supermarket selling substantially more tobacco products would only pay \$200.

South Australian state taxes and charges are hurting small businesses and employment opportunities in this state. They are even forcing some to close, put off their staff and compete with them for local jobs. The majority of Australian states have minimal licence fees, so imposing this increased fee on South Australian retailers unfairly disadvantages them. It will either reduce their profit margin or the additional cost will have to flow on to all customers, not just smokers; so, the negative impacts are being felt by all South Australians. These regulations will act as a disincentive to sell perfectly legal products and, ultimately, reduce the competitiveness of their industry.

The Liberal Party supports initiatives that will improve conditions for South Australian small businesses and, therefore, it is concerned that the Rann Labor government is burdening them with further taxes and charges. As noted, the Tobacco Products Variation Regulations were gazetted on 8 November 2006 to commence on 1 January this year. All retailers of tobacco products in this state are required to have an annual licence and there are currently 3 010 licences. Small corner stores pay the same licence fee as large volume discounters and supermarkets. The Australian Retailers Association states that the fees have been increased to fund the Tobacco Compliance and Licensing Program in the South Australian Department of Health. Its official position is that a fee could be based on the size of the retailer and the amount of tobacco it sells per annum to avoid smaller retailers being burdened unnecessarily and to ensure that the licensing system does not discourage employment, retail profitability and productive commercial investment. Obviously, that is not what is happening.

I understand the government's reasons for these regulations are to increase the fees and to enable cost recovery for increased surveillance in bars and clubs. One may be sceptical of the claim that the additional revenue—theoretically, \$563 000—will be used on increased surveillance. It is more likely that it will be another windfall to government revenue. No evidence has been produced to prove that this money will be used for more surveillance or that an overall

reduction in non-compliance of smoking in bars and clubs will result. The probable effect will be to reduce the number of mums and dads in small business outlets who are able to legitimately sell tobacco products and provide a service to the public. Instead, the big players—namely, multinationals, supermarkets and discounters—will increase their monopoly market share of tobacco sales and take away other business from small businesses, as customers have to go into their stores to buy cigarettes. As my constituents Helen and William Lovegrove from Streaky Bay stated:

How unfair to expect small businesses to pay for the funding to assist with an anti-smoking campaign. It is not our responsibility to provide money to assist with reform—you are targeting a very hardworking group of taxpayers, who are already burdened with a large number of licence fees.

This is much in line with what the Thompsons stated:

Surely business should not be punished for selling cigarettes to customers, as it is still their choice as to whether to smoke or not. If cigarettes are so bad, why won't the government simply remove them from sale altogether?

That is food for thought, or perhaps the government would notice too much of a revenue drain on their own coffers. In the Labor government response to the Business SA Blueprint for South Australia's Future, released in March 2006, the Premier stated:

A major assault on unnecessary regulation and compliance costs will be a future of a re-elected Rann government.

Regulations such as this show that the major assault on business costs pledged by Labor throughout the lead-up to last year's election was nothing more than rhetoric and another broken promise. The intention of the assault was to increase, not decrease, costs. There were no incentives in the budget to encourage small businesses to grow. Existing problems are actually being exacerbated by proposed regulations such as this. With a regulatory environment to unreasonably increase fees like this, it can be no surprise that business investment in South Australia is below that in other states, and the retail sector is stuck in the slow lane. Despite all its promises, the Rann government has failed to outline a long-term vision and demonstrate action to establish a more competitive marketplace for small businesses to help boost economic growth and job growth for the future.

There is clearly a balance to be struck between the health issue and the legitimate expectations of businesses selling a legal product. I believe that the legislation should provide either a single licence for a business at the old rate or two rates, reflecting the value of products sold to provide balance and also a reasonable relationship between the fees paid and the size of the business. Small business owners in South Australia, as well as groups such as the Australian Hotels Association and the Australian Retailers Association, want to know why the Rann government continues to do nothing to make it cheaper and easier for them to do business, despite its election promises. These regulations will provide yet another hurdle for the small business sector and are a symptom of what is happening in other jurisdictions where this government is raising funds for a purpose for which the payer should not be responsible. The government is hiding behind what appear to be warm and cuddly reasons which it believes will not be challenged.

Based on past experience little, if any, of the revenue raised by this measure will be used for the purpose claimed. The regulations must not be agreed to. Given the Labor promise that it will be 'cheaper to make business' was a key election platform for the government, the government needs

to outline a long-term vision and demonstrate action to establish a more conducive environment, particularly for small businesses, to help boost economic growth and create more jobs for the future. It is vital to reduce business taxes and charges in this state if we are to keep pace with our interstate competitors, and these regulations are a very pronounced step in the wrong direction. Whilst it has been proven that tobacco damages health, it is still the right of the individual to make their own choice as to whether or not they buy or sell a legal commodity. Again, I quote from the Lovegroves:

It is the responsibility of good governments to target funds that are sourced in a fair and just way and not by fleecing money from retailers who are simply providing a customer service.

The Hon. L. STEVENS (Little Para): I want to speak very briefly, just to say that the member for Flinders has given a typically blinkered speech on a topic about which I think she probably knows very little. I remember that, in my time as minister for health, South Australia's tobacco licence fees were way below those of other states in Australia. The proposition by the Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse is entirely reasonable in terms of raising these fees and using the proceeds for important issues, including the checking of adherence to the provisions regarding the sale of cigarettes and tobacco products to minors. The regulations and the government's moves are entirely correct and entirely within the government's tobacco control strategy and, I might add, within the tobacco control strategies of the other states and jurisdictions in this country.

Motion negatived.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (ENTITLEMENTS OF ELECTED REPRESENTATIVES) BILL

The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher) obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the City of Adelaide Act 1998; the Local Government Act 1999; the Parliamentary Remuneration Act 1990; the Parliamentary Superannuation Act 1974; and the Remuneration Act 1990. Read a first time.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

I will be very brief, because I think that the principles underlying this bill are very simple. I indicate to members that, as a result of moving this measure, notice of motion 8 becomes redundant. This bill puts in the hands of the Independent Remuneration Tribunal all the financial aspects relating to members of parliament in terms of salary and superannuation allowances, and likewise provides a mechanism whereby, in local government, the elected members' remuneration entitlements—not the paid staff; the elected members—are handled by the independent tribunal.

The reason for this bill is that we are often criticised because we have a hotchpotch of mechanisms for determining our salary, our superannuation and our various allowances. I believe that the appropriate tribunal is the Independent Remuneration Tribunal, which I am sure is capable, with the proper research facilities, to determine salary and other allowances. One of my main concerns and one of the motivating reasons for this bill is to ensure that the new members of parliament actually get some justice in terms of their superannuation. Members will recall that one of the unwise things that Mark Latham did was to create a public furore about superannuation for MPs. The Prime Minister, I

think unwisely, jumped on the bandwagon and said, 'We've got to cut it; it's outrageous', but, of course, superannuation was cut for new members, not for existing members. If it is wrong in principle, it is wrong across the board.

I am one of the beneficiaries of the old superannuation scheme, and I will try to live for a long time to get maybe some of my money back. The new members of parliament on both sides in this house and in the other place are being treated unfairly. Someone said, 'Wait until the New South Wales election is over, and the government here will fix it'. I am not so sure about that. The Treasurer has already indicated to me that he does not like this bill. I do not think that it is fair and reasonable that the new members of parliament in here and in the other place should get what is a very miserly superannuation provision.

We hear other members, such as the Hon. Nick Xenophon, saying that the parliamentary super scheme is ultra generous, but it is not very generous at the moment. The old scheme was. Scheme 1 was quite generous if you lived for a long time. Scheme 2 was pretty generous if you were in that scheme, but the current arrangement for new members of parliament is pretty miserly in many respects. Members do not come in here to make money. I have never come across an MP who chose this profession to make money. Anyone who comes in here and thinks that they are going to make money is obviously kidding himself, but you have to provide fair and reasonable superannuation for people, otherwise you will not get people giving up a career midway to become a member of parliament.

When I came in here I had to shut down my superannuation scheme. I had tenure where I was employed: they could not sack me. What we have done now is make it very difficult for people to come in mid-career, and I do not think that is good. I do not think that is good for the state and I do not think it is good for this parliament. I want to see some fairness and justice for the new members of parliament. If the government is prepared to address the superannuation aspect in the near future for those new members, I would be pleased to hear about it. I note that, having cut back the federal scheme, the Prime Minister and the federal government have rejigged that scheme to increase the benefit to new members of parliament, to provide something better than they were getting under the original reaction to the silliness of Mark Latham.

In essence, this bill is about having an independent body to look at all those matters and to make a determination. I indicated to the LGA what my bill was, and I quote from its response in a letter dated 10 October 2006—that is how long this matter has been before the parliament. Wendy Campana, the Executive Director, in a letter to me dated 10 October said:

The LGA cannot support the changes proposed in your bill as they do not go far enough.

I am happy for this bill to be amended and, after prorogation, I will reintroduce a bill, but the LGA is saying it does not go far enough. I am a very modest man: I did not want to be too radical; but I think it is the start of not only justice for new MPs but of providing a more transparent, fairer system of determining our salary superannuation allowances, and I think the parliament should welcome it. The public certainly will welcome it and I commend the bill to the house.

Mrs GERAGHTY secured the adjournment of the debate.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT

Notices of Motion, Private Members Business, Bills/Committees/Regulations, No. 8: Hon. R.B. Such to move:

That he have leave to introduce a bill for an act to amend the City of Adelaide Act 1998; and the Local Government Act 1999.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher): I indicate that I no longer wish to proceed with this motion.

Motion withdrawn.

CONSTITUTION (CASUAL VACANCIES) AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher) obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Constitution Act 1934; and to make related amendments to the Electoral Act 1985. Read a first time.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

This bill seeks to simplify the arrangement whereby a casual vacancy occurring in the House of Assembly, in particular, can be filled without unnecessary expense to the community. For example, if a seat became vacant through the death of a member in the House of Assembly—Liberal or Labor—

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: Or incapacity in the case of Kavel.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Koutsantonis): Order! I ask members on both sides to show the member for Fisher some courtesy and allow him to make his remarks.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: For example, it would enable the Labor Party or the Liberal Party to nominate someone to replace the person who was deceased in that electorate, or maybe someone who had to retire through ill health, without having to go to a by-election. That by-election would happen if it was within three months of an election date, so this process would not occur close to an election. It would be similar to what happens in the Legislative Council when parliament meets to endorse a nomination to fill a vacancy. Under my measure, this would apply also to an Independent or a Greens member in the lower house. Obviously if a sitting member dies they cannot nominate anyone, so there would have to be a by-election. The nomination—where that is possible—by Labor, Liberal, Independent or whatever, would have to be endorsed by a sitting of the parliament. If parliament rejected that nomination, the seat would have to go to a by-election. If the Labor Party put up a nomination and it was rejected by a sitting of parliament, it would have to go to a by-election and be decided by the people. That rarely happens with the procedure in the upper house.

In essence, this seeks to replicate aspects of what can occur in the upper house so casual vacancies can be more easily and readily filled in a way which is cost-effective and does not take away from the intention of the electorate in regard to that seat. As I say, the bill contains safeguards. Parliament can reject the nomination and if that happens it must go to the people by way of a by-election. It also provides other safety mechanisms, which members can take into account themselves. If a member were elected under part 2 of the bill, transitional provisions would apply to cover particular circumstances. If members can suggest improvements and amendments, I am more than happy to take them on board, and I will have to reintroduce it after prorogation.

I commend the bill to the house, and members now have a chance to consider it and see whether, in their view, it has merit.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: Can we vote on it now?

The ACTING SPEAKER: No, we cannot.

Mrs GERAGHTY secured the adjournment of the debate.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (AUDITOR-GENERAL) AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher) obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Local Government Act 1999. Read a first time.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

This bill provides that the Auditor-General may at any time—but at least once in every year—audit the accounts of each council and each subsidiary of a council. The version introduced today differs from an earlier version in that new section 128(6) gives authority to the Economic and Finance Committee to inquire into, consider and report on any matter concerning an audit conducted under this section, and I will come back to that in a moment.

Members would understand that the Auditor-General does not personally conduct audits and neither do his staff necessarily personally audit government departments. They contract that function out to authorised and qualified auditing companies, and I expect that practice would continue in relation to local government. Many auditing firms audit local government accounts now and, no doubt, they would be engaged to undertake this task. The reasons for this measure are that it is very difficult to know whether a council's financial performance is what it should be. I am not suggesting there is malpractice but, at the moment, the annual reports of councils give a variable presentation.

For example, one city council gives details of staff assessments of their wellbeing. One council has done a nutritional analysis, a skin analysis, of its staff and that is all very useful and interesting. I am not saying they do that instead of financial accounting, but some councils present their accounts—which all must meet the Australian auditing standard—in a way that is not easily comparable with other councils, and I believe they should be. At the moment, their subsidiaries, which include things such as cemeteries (and we know from the past that some have run flower farms and other things), should all be subject to the Auditor-General's oversight.

I point out, for example, that the cities of Unley and Mitcham operate a large cemetery in the state, Centennial Park, which is a multimillion dollar operation. I believe it is run very efficiently and effectively now by Bryan Elliott, his staff and the board. However, I can tell members that, a few years ago, a few things were not so hunky-dory there. Some significant abuses were occurring. For example, the honorary historian was provided with a Saab motor car of his choice. His wife also received some benefits. I think that, at that time, the honorary historian's Saab was worth about \$60 000. The manager got a Saab of his choice and the manager's wife got a Saab of her choice. I do not know why they particularly liked Swedish vehicles, but they seemed to have an interest in them.

The point is that the cities of Mitcham and Unley are financially responsible for any debts incurred by Centennial Park Cemetery, and that means the ratepayers, but they are

not guaranteed any profit. What an unusual situation that is. I just use that as an example. I am not in any way suggesting there is anything wrong with the way in which Centennial Park is administered now. If members look in the annual reports of councils they will find very little information about the business subsidiaries of councils, and I believe it is important that ratepayers know that.

In drafting this bill, I took advice from the former auditor-general who is fully supportive of what I am doing. He said to me that, in order to find out what is really happening in councils, the bill needed to be worded in this particular format. I took advice from Ken MacPherson, for whom I have the highest regard, and the wording here is the result of his guidance in its drafting. I do not believe that local government has anything to fear from this proposal. In fact, Mayor Tony Zappia is on the public record as strongly supporting the auditing of council accounts by the Auditor-General.

I believe that, if the Auditor-General carried out this function, councils would not need audit committees. I do not think they would be necessary. It would be a cost-saving measure because the work would be contracted out to a qualified auditing firm that meets the Australian standards. The reports would be presented in a similar manner for each council. They would be easy for ratepayers and MPs to compare; and if any practice is untoward it would be more readily apparent. New section 128(6), which I mentioned previously but which was not in the earlier notice, gives the Economic and Finance Committee the authority to look into aspects raised as a result of an audit, and I believe that is appropriate.

I was on that committee some years ago when we looked at what was then the water catchment boards. I believe that, through its scrutiny, the Economic and Finance Committee can save the community a lot of money. It does not have to but, if it chooses to inquire into a matter arising out of an audit, I think it is an appropriate forum for it to do so. In essence, this bill would mean that, in the future, the Minister for State/Local Government Relations in his or her role (whoever is the minister) would be accountable to parliament in a way that is currently not the case.

The Auditor-General—being answerable to parliament in his or her reports (maybe we will have a female Auditor-General in the future)—could be asked questions and members could follow up if they had a query in relation to a council both in the house and, if they happen to be a member, in the Economic and Finance Committee. This is a reasonable proposition. It exists in some of the other states. The other states that do not have it are moving towards doing this. I think the public would welcome it. I know that many people in local government would welcome it. The old argument, which I think is still valid, is that if you have nothing to hide why would you be concerned if the Auditor-General had general oversight of local government finances?

I repeat the point I made at the start: the Auditor-General can contract out for private companies to do the audit, as he does in relation to government departments. So, it does not mean that current auditing firms would lose work; it means that they would do their audit under the general umbrella of the Auditor-General within a consistent framework making it easier for everyone to study and note financial movement in relation to a council or all councils. I think it is a reasonable proposition. I commend the bill to the house.

Mrs GERAGHTY secured the adjournment of the debate.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: PORT LINCOLN MARINE SCIENCE CENTRE

Ms CICCARELLO (Norwood): I move:

That the 252nd report of the committee, entitled Port Lincoln Marine Science Centre Stage 1 Redevelopment, be noted.

The aquatic marine related industries research and education institutions have developed the Marine Innovation SA initiative with the goal of establishing South Australia as a centre of excellence for marine science, education and industry development. The redevelopment of the Port Lincoln Marine Science Centre will establish it as a centre of international excellence for marine research and education and as a major contributor to regional development.

SARDI, together with PIRSA and Flinders University, will jointly finance the design and construction of the Port Lincoln Marine Science Centre Stage 1 Redevelopment at an estimated cost of \$6.59 million. The redevelopment will include the acquisition of 9 608 square metres of land from the adjacent Kirton Point Caravan Park and the construction of a new 887 square metre single-storey building with associated infrastructure for marine scientific research and education purposes. The expanded site is crown land under the custodianship of Flinders University, which will be responsible for the ongoing management of all built assets and associated infrastructure. The brief for the new building includes:

- a centralised entry and reception area to provide a public focus and an information and security point;
- amenities for staff and visitors;
- two meeting spaces;
- office and work station accommodation for permanent staff and post-graduate students;
- group offices to provide each research team with a base;
- low humidity laboratories for specific scientific purposes, and to support the MISA research nodes;
- small laboratories for specialist equipment for shared use by all research groups;
- controlled temperature rooms of varying temperatures;
- specialist storage areas for dangerous materials;
- plant equipment; and
- car parking for staff and visitors.

The redevelopment will address a number of shortcomings in the existing facilities which include overcrowding in some offices and research areas. This is exacerbated by visiting staff who require space at regular intervals throughout the year. Postgraduate students are accommodated in temporary buildings, and there are inadequate meeting room facilities.

Disability access to the building does not comply with current code requirements. There is no ramp between the disability access car parks and the front entry to the existing building and the gradients along the route between the car park and entry exceed 1 in 20 in places. In addition, there are no tactile markers. There is one disability access toilet, including a shower, and there is insufficient area within the room to comply with code requirements currently. The redevelopment aims to:

- utilise the existing building as a focus for undergraduate teaching;
- provide new facilities for the research nodes which have specialist requirements that require customised accommodation;
- upgrade existing power, sewer and water infrastructure; and

upgrade site access and provide an entry and design that expresses the scientific focus of the centre.

The new building will enable access from the existing car park and connection between the entry foyers of the new and existing buildings. The orientation is parallel to the site contours to minimise excavation and simplify connection between the building and the surrounding site.

The existing power capacity on the site is inadequate for the proposed redevelopment. Upgrade of the capacity will include a new high voltage supply cable, transformer and main switchboard. The existing sea water reticulation system is also inadequate to meet the requirements and is at the end of its serviceable life. An upgrade of this system has been allowed for. The new building will accommodate research laboratories and support spaces for the three MISA research nodes as well as associated office space and amenities.

Sewer drainage will be connected to the existing main sewer ejector station for disposal into the SA Water sewer system. Separate sea water drainage will be provided to drain to the existing sea water disposal system, which effectively drains back into the sea. A third drainage system is required to deal with laboratory waste. A neutraliser pit will be provided with drainage connected into the sewer system in accordance with SA Water's trade waste requirements.

Preliminary discussions with the Port Lincoln City Council indicate that there is no requirement to install stormwater quality improvement measures. However, there are opportunities for ESD initiatives for surface stormwater drainage. The discharge will be at a location to be determined on site with council.

The state's Seafood Plan aims to more than double the value of seafood production by 2015, and the state seeks to be a national leader in innovation in the conservation of the marine environment. The committee is told that MISA is a vital plank that will largely deliver the science capability to meet these aims. It is expected that 3 500 jobs will be created by 2015 as a result of growth in the aquaculture and associated supporting industry sectors. The increased employment is likely to be seen primarily in regional areas, particularly Eyre Peninsula and the Upper Spencer Gulf. Key outcomes for the seafood industry will be improved product, quality and food safety which will secure market access and positioning for seafood products.

Discovery of bioactive products through bio-prospecting and enhancing biosecurity through managing invasive pest species will develop new opportunities and protect international market access. Tourism will also benefit from the improved understanding of marine and coastal processes, particularly the growing ecotourism sector. MISA will also support broader marine planning initiatives, including delivery of the Living Coast Strategy, through increased knowledge and information sharing to support management and planning of marine and coastal environments and their resources.

In establishing South Australia as the centre for southern temperate marine research and development in Australia, MISA will deliver innovative solutions through research, industry incubation, technology transfer and education. Fisheries and aquaculture industries throughout the coastal regions of the state will benefit from both increased economic activity and the flow-on benefits to be derived from the new marine industries. Other market sectors including minerals exploration, conservation and ecotourism will also benefit from research in the sector. MISA is also expected to provide new industry opportunities for indigenous communities.

The estimated cost of the project is \$6.8 million, but refinement of the project scope is occurring during the design and development phase and the estimated cost will align closely to the current \$6.59 million budget when tenders are called. The state government contribution is \$4.49 million, and any shortfall in funding resulting from the tender call will be for Flinders University to provide the variance or negotiate a reduction in scope with the preferred building contractor. Pursuant to section 12C of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991, the Public Works Committee reports to parliament that it recommends the proposed public work.

The Hon. P.L. WHITE (Taylor): I concur with the comments of the member for Norwood. This is a very good project which will benefit particularly aquaculture and related industries.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite): I commend the member for Taylor for saying that she would speak for five seconds and for doing just that.

Members interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: She is a woman of her word, I tell you what—no flies on the member for Taylor. If we were all that brief and concise, how quickly we would race through the business of the day. I suggest that all members of the government take note of the member for Taylor's example because you would never hear any waffle from this side of the house!

I indicate that the opposition is in full agreement with the report, as noted in the papers tabled and in accordance with the comments made by my friend the member for Norwood and chair of the committee.

The Hon. P.L. White: And Taylor.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: And, of course, the member for Taylor. Before concluding, I indicate to the chair of the Public Works Committee that, as this is the last week before the parliament prorogues, if she wants to deal very expeditiously with the remaining items one by one, I do not expect that members on our side will need to speak for more than 30 seconds on each item. If she wants to abbreviate her comments, given that the papers have been noted and tabled, we would be happy to race through them so as to ensure that they are dealt with by the house before the parliament prorogues. I am quite happy to speak for no more than 30 seconds on each item. Having said that, with regard to this motion, we look forward to its swift passage.

Motion carried.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: WINE INNOVATION CLUSTER CENTRAL BUILDING

Ms CICCARELLO (Norwood): I move:

That the 253rd report of the committee, entitled Wine Innovation Cluster Central Building—Waite Campus, be noted.

It is proposed to build a new four-level, 7 523 square metre office and laboratory building on land owned by the University of Adelaide at the Waite campus at an estimated cost of \$29 140 000. Construction will commence in April 2007 and be completed in May 2008. The participants in what will be known as the Wine Innovation Cluster Central Building will be the Australian Wine Research Institute, the University of Adelaide and SARDI. The University of Adelaide will contribute \$9 630 000 (including \$630 000 for land), the state government will give a \$9 500 000 grant, the Australian Wine

Research Institute will contribute \$9 535 000, and the balance of the funding will come from \$475 000 interest earned on state government funds.

To achieve operating synergies for the three organisations, the required space allocations are provided over three levels, with a small lower ground area. All areas have common design criteria to allow maximum flexibility for future development and interaction between the principal occupants. The lower ground floor area consists of receivable/loading docks, with wet and dirty laboratories, wine cellars and engineering service rooms, incorporating cold rooms, waste bin storage, gas bottle storage and plant areas. A room to house nuclear magnetic resonance equipment is incorporated in the lower ground floor and is separately funded by the University of Adelaide.

The ground floor is to be principally tenanted by the Australian Wine Research Institute and will accommodate administration, marketing and office/reception areas. The first floor incorporates laboratory and research areas, utilising the benefits of common laboratory, clean-up, storage and preparation areas. The common staff area and the mass spectrometer room are also located on this floor. The second floor incorporates University of Adelaide administration staff and specialist laboratory areas. A Waite campus master plan study has been undertaken by QED Consulting to identify car parking needs. The study identified an under-utilised car parking area to the north of the campus. An at grade car park is being designed to provide additional car parks for this building and the adjacent Wine Innovation Cluster buildings and is to be located south of the central building. The University of Adelaide will fund the construction of the car park and recover operating costs from the users.

The Wine Innovation Cluster Central Building has been designed with many environmental features and energy saving initiatives. The building is at the conceptual design stage and as a centre of excellence for the wine industry will include other effective and affordable ESD credentials as the design develops. Current facilities cannot house the growth required to maintain the current level of service to the industry. It is estimated that productivity of the Australian Wine Research Institute could increase by 20 per cent with upgraded facilities and that the enhanced synergies will increase the effectiveness of research at the Waite campus. The new centre will enable more collaborative research to meet the need to improve applied research by bringing researchers and industry closer together and facilitating improved interaction through focusing these activities in one location.

The new building will establish the Waite campus as the research and development hub that underpins the next phase of the Australian wine industry. It will place South Australia as the focus of international wine industry research and development, innovation and education. The project will also increase the international competitiveness of the Australian wine industry by:

- integrating research in viticulture and oenology with a 'grape to glass to consumer' focus;
- developing a world-class research capability in whole-of-chain management to meet marketplace demand for quality wine;
- collocating a multidisciplinary research and education team with access to shared state-of-the-art infrastructure collaborating on a national scale with wine centres across Australia and with strategic international links; and

- effectively deploying industry funds by developing innovative tools, solutions and commercial know-how to assist the Australian wine industry's export growth.

Australian grape and wine research is predominantly based in this state. Our competitive advantage in grape and wine research and development is based on internationally competitive research groups located at the University of Adelaide's Waite campus. The partners in the wine innovation cluster will enjoy enhanced synergistic collaborations and economies of scale.

The project will maximise the outcomes from wine and grape research and development and is South Australia's opportunity to take the leadership role in demonstrating a successful centre of excellence as a benchmark for other industries. Large organisations have based their head office wine operations and technical divisions in Australia. World-class research and development facilities will help to ensure that global players strengthen their investment in Australia and will encourage other organisations to do likewise.

There is also clear synergy between strong local research and development and attracting the technical centres of multinational wine companies to Australia. The facility is modest in comparison to wine and grape research and development organisations internationally, but the dynamic fusion of the complementary skills of the AWRI, CSIRO, the University of Adelaide and SARDI—matched by the proactive innovation ethos of the Australian wine industry—will ensure that Australia's competitive advantage is maintained and strengthened. Development of a world-class research capability and integration of research in viticulture and oenology from the vineyard to the winery to the consumer is a whole of chain management approach which will meet marketplace demand for quality wine.

The integrated wine innovation cluster facility is unique. It will bring together oenology and viticulture research with commercial development and education which offers a new level of leadership for the Australian wine industry, and which firmly cements Adelaide as the global home of wine innovation from the vine to the consumer. This concept will allow the organisations to share enhanced facilities and relieve the need for costly duplication by individual organisations. This will also ensure more efficient and integrated use of research funds and more effective communication and administration. This shared facility also creates a better environment to educate future technologists and researchers. The intellectual and physical research cluster has the potential to attract national and international visiting research scientists and to benefit the Australian wine industry.

Upon completion, the University of Adelaide will own the building and be fully responsible for its operating costs. Individual agreements determine the rental agreement and back-charging arrangements for each user organisation. Based on the floor area occupied, the SARDI tenancy will have an annual tenant cost of some \$18 300 in the first year of occupancy. A threshold analysis has been conducted which focuses only on the grape and wine related research benefits. The conservative estimate indicates that, if the increased effectiveness of national grape and wine research improves productivity by 0.11 per cent per annum, then the project is a sound investment. In fact, it is estimated that viticulture research provides productivity improvements of 2.3 per cent per annum in South Australia.

The \$9.5 million government grant to the project is a one-off for the purpose of construction of the WIC Central building. No additional government funds will be sought.

Based upon this evidence, pursuant to section 12C of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991, the Public Works Committee reports to parliament that it recommends the proposed public work.

The Hon. P.L. WHITE (Taylor): Excellent programs and research will be further enhanced with the provision of this fine facility.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite): Perhaps the chair of the Public Works Committee could hand the remainder of her speeches to the member for Taylor! I indicate that the opposition fully agrees with this proposal and will be supporting it. Since the reports have been tabled, and to get through them all, the chair of the Public Works Committee may wish simply to move that the report be agreed to in accordance with the documents tabled: it is wholly her choice. However, we agree to this proposal and look forward to its swift passage.

Motion carried.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: KINGSCOTE AREA SCHOOL REDEVELOPMENT

Ms CICCARELLO (Norwood): I move:

That the 254th report of the committee, entitled Kingscote Area School Redevelopment, be noted.

I think the member for Finnis indicated his very strong support for this project. Pursuant to section 12C of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991, the Public Works Committee reports to parliament that it recommends the proposed public work.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite): The opposition fully concurs with the comments made by the member for Norwood and with the report and documents tabled. This is a good project, and we look forward to its construction.

Motion carried.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: SOUTH ROAD UPGRADE/ANZAC HIGHWAY UNDERPASS

Ms CICCARELLO (Norwood): I move:

That the 255th report of the committee entitled, South Road Upgrade, Anzac Highway Underpass, be noted.

Again, in the interests of expediency, this project has been much discussed, and it is a very good project, so pursuant to section 12C of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991, the Public Works Committee reports to parliament that it recommends the proposed public work.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite): We note the comments of the member for Norwood. We have had our disagreements over this project. We have had our say about the cost blow-outs and other issues, but we note that the project is going ahead, we agree with it and look forward to work commencing.

Ms CICCARELLO (Norwood): In response, I want to clarify that we had a full explanation during our committee hearing that the scope of the project had changed from what had originally been proposed. That is the discrepancy between the original amount stated and the amount at which the current project is valued.

Motion carried.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: CLAY WELLS-PENOLA ROAD WIDENING AND PAVEMENT STRAIGHTENING

Ms CICCARELLO (Norwood): I move:

That the 256th report of the committee, entitled Clay Wells-Penola Road Widening and Pavement Straightening, be noted.

This is a very important and useful project for the South-East and there was much consultation done there. In fact, both the Mayor and the CEO of the Wattle Range Council came to the Public Works Committee, and they were very supportive of the project. Pursuant to section 12C of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991, the Public Works Committee reports to parliament that it recommends the proposed public work.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite): The opposition supports the measure and we look forward to the project's early commencement. As I have mentioned, we have raised our issues in committee. We note that the report is comprehensive and, as I have indicated, we look forward to work beginning on the project.

Motion carried.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: HENLEY HIGH SCHOOL REDEVELOPMENT

Ms CICCARELLO (Norwood): I move:

That the 257th report of the committee, entitled Henley High School Redevelopment—Stage 2, be noted.

This is a very important project. The Hon. Mr Caica, who is the local member, has been supportive of this project over the years. It will certainly enhance all the facilities available at this school. This is the second stage of a project which has already commenced and which, as I have said, will enhance the education facilities for the students of Henley High School. Pursuant to section 12C of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991, the Public Works Committee reports to parliament that it recommends the proposed public work.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite): The opposition fully supports the project. It is a good project. We note that a full account of it is tabled and we look forward to the construction beginning.

Motion carried.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: BIRDWOOD HIGH SCHOOL REDEVELOPMENT

Ms CICCARELLO (Norwood): I move:

That the 258th report of the committee, entitled Birdwood High School Music, Home Economics and Technical Studies Redevelopment, be noted.

Again, we had a very good presentation regarding the needs for the work to be done at this high school. The report from DECS, and also from the principal, was very expansive and, again, justified the works going ahead. Therefore, pursuant to section 12C of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991, the Public Works Committee reports to parliament that it recommends the proposed public work.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite): The opposition fully agrees with the proposal, full details of which have been tabled in the report and are available for the public record. Of course, this school is in the electorate of my friend the member for Schubert. It is an excellent proposition and we

look forward to work commencing forthwith. I thank the member for Norwood for the expeditious way in which she has dealt with these matters. This is the last report this committee will deal with, I think, in this parliament before it is prorogued.

The Public Works Committee is a very hardworking committee. Having been on some of those very slack committees such as the Economic and Finance Committee, for example, I can say it is a very hardworking and productive committee. Apparently one member of the committee is constantly causing trouble, but I am sure that he will improve over time, although perhaps I am not so sure about that. It depends—I will go home, have a look in the mirror and think about it! The committee is very productive and very enjoyable; we got through a fair bit, and I hope we will do so in the coming year as well.

Ms CICCARELLO (Norwood): I would like to commend the comments of the member for Waite. It is indeed hardworking committee. We have managed to get through a lot of projects and we look forward to many more projects in the coming parliament.

Motion carried.

SUPPLY BILL 2007

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 27 March. Page 2173.)

Ms CHAPMAN (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Having dealt with some important issues in relation to portfolio expenditure which, as I have expressed, are deserving of attention in the forthcoming budget, I wish also to briefly comment on some urgent capital work that would be beneficial not only to my electorate of Bragg but also to neighbouring electorates. If I were to be undertaking as a child a psychology test, in which frequently the psychologist asks for three wishes of the child being interviewed, the response would be: Britannia roundabout, Britannia roundabout, Britannia roundabout. I re-emphasise the importance of this, because even this government has recognised the importance of remedying what is apparently the worst metropolitan intersection as far as transport hazards go, according to the Royal Automobile Association, of which there are, on average, two and half accidents a week. If it was not for the diligent attention of Mr Patrick Francis, the person driving me this morning, I suspect that I would have been one of those victims as we came through the Britannia roundabout.

This government has actually recognised this problem. Under the stewardship of a former minister for transport, the member for Taylor, she actually publicly announced an \$8 million proposal for the redevelopment and realignment, under a twin signal system for this roundabout, obviously because of the determination that she had led in cabinet for approval. Well, within months we had an announcement by the new Minister for Transport, who currently holds that position, that the whole project would be scrapped, and we have had nothing since. And yet, the government announced a \$55 million redevelopment, on 20 December last year, for Victoria Park and did not even mention the words, Britannia roundabout and how that issue might be resolved at the important time when there will be some redevelopment in the area.

Not only that, the proposal that the government put forward to plant 1 000 trees within the vicinity of the corner of the Britannia roundabout will clearly only exacerbate the potential future problem of having to deal with, in one way or another, that intersection, whether it is by this government or subsequent governments. I applaud any redevelopment that encourages trees and replanting in the Victoria Park vicinity. What disturbs me is that, at a time when there will be infrastructure redevelopment of some kind, there is no mention of this and it is not being tidied up while we are doing it. That is why the Liberal opposition made it very clear in the public endorsement of this project that the government would proceed to redevelop, that there would be a number of conditions, and that was, importantly, one of them, that is, the Britannia roundabout. I can only hope that the government realises that whatever project it renegotiates with the relevant parties for the redevelopment of Victoria Park, it will sensibly include this issue. It is a problem for all of those who reside in the eastern suburbs and in the foothills, particularly for transport in and out of the city.

The second is the Glenside Hospital. This is now a campus of the Royal Adelaide Hospital. It is a statewide service, particularly for a number of levels of mental health facilities, including a secure residency for aged people and a secure residency for those who are chronically ill with mental health issues. Sometimes it acts as an area to carry over those who have criminal behaviour associated with the illness as well. With the government's announcement that it will relocate the drug and alcohol services, Commissioner Cappo's recommendation to the government that it relocate Aboriginal mental health services, and a number of Commissioner Cappo's recommendations for the redevelopment of the site, I can only urge, with all the stakeholders being at one on this, that the Glenside Hospital, with some step up step down facility, is redeveloped urgently, because that is a magnificent site that is in a very sad state of disrepair, and we are in urgent need of the mental health services which it could expand upon and provide.

The third is a \$105 million stormwater proposal for retention dams, which start with the broadening of the culvert under the Fullarton Road and Greenhill Road intersection coming out of the north-west corner of the Glenside Hospital site, which currently has a large stormwater catchment area, and to expand that culvert and then proceed again with stormwater retention dams and aquifers which are proposed and which have been costed and considered and of which summaries and costs have been put under the Natural Resource Management Board instruction by the relevant experts. The paperwork is there; it has been tabled and available to government since December. We hope that the government will seriously look at this.

Again, let us take this opportunity. With whatever is going to happen with the future services and facilities at Victoria Park, here is the ideal opportunity to identify and install a water reservoir and a provider for water in the whole of the parklands area. I think it is a magnificent initiative. It has had public support from a number of mayors of relevant councils in the vicinity. There has been some brief public comment as to any intrusion that it might have on the parklands. Obviously, it is a matter that must be considered, but it is very important that we also deal with the extraordinary amount of water that flows off the eastern foothills area and flows through my electorate every year which could be captured, retained, or detained, or pumped underground into an aquifer and reused. They are very important projects to consider.

The timeliness of continued repair of a number of public schools remains the same as many others in the state. I hope that they will advance reasonable funding so that we can get on with what has been commenced in the Linden Park Primary School redevelopment and junior primary school amalgamated campuses, particularly as they had a fire this year, and that urgency is important to advance. Finally, I will have something to say later this evening on the Waterfall Gully Road, because this is a dangerous and disgraceful situation which has been allowed to persist.

Time expired.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): I am pleased to make a contribution to the bill that is before the house—the Supply Bill—that looks to obviously fund those necessary requirements of government through the respective agencies and departments for the period leading up to and until the actual 2007-08 budget has passed through the parliament, the estimates committees, and the like, and those monies are then distributed for the ensuing 12 months for the satisfactory operation of the state.

There are a couple of points I would like to raise at the outset. In terms of the contributions that we have heard so far on this legislation, I want to focus on the only two contributions thus far from government members. It is really quite astounding that, if you look at yesterday's *Hansard* and scan the speeches of both the member for West Torrens and the member for Enfield, you actually do not see where they have spoken in relation to this legislation as it relates to supply. That applies particularly to the member for West Torrens, who spent I think 19½ out of his 20 minutes focusing his attention on the Liberal Party. It is interesting to note his comments, because he said:

But I do not spend much time worrying about the Liberal Party, because I am more concerned about what this state government is doing for the people of South Australia.

Goodness me: what a statement that is! As I say, he spent about 19½ of his 20 minutes endeavouring to criticise what occurs on this side of the house.

The Hon. R.G. Kerin interjecting:

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: The member for Frome is extremely accurate, saying 'hitting us around with a wet lettuce leaf'. It is also interesting to note the remarks of the member for Enfield. In the time that I have allocated this afternoon, I could turn my attention to talking about the intricacies of the ALP internal machinations, but I do not particularly want to waste my valuable parliamentary time on an issue like that. The only comment I will make is that the member for West Torrens proudly declared that the Premier of the state is in charge of the parliamentary Labor Party, but I will tell members the absolute truth of the matter. It is not the Premier who runs the Labor Party but the unions. It is the well funded, cashed-up unions. We know that every Labor member and every Labor candidate relies heavily on union financial backing to run their campaigns.

You have only to cast your mind back less than 12 months ago and listen to every Address in Reply speech from each and every Labor member who contributed to that debate, and the majority of them thanked Don Farrell, one of the senior power brokers within the ALP structure. I know that the minister at the bench is not a mate of Mr Farrell's, because he is actually on the other side of the party factions. He is from the left and not from the right. It is just interesting to note those comments. We know that the unions run the ALP: not the Premier, not the ministry; it is the unions behind the

scenes who pull the strings because they have the money. They are the ones who fund the campaigns.

I also want to talk briefly about the Deputy Premier's comments yesterday in answer to questions in relation to this huge fight that he has created with the Adelaide City Council over the proposed redevelopment of Victoria Park. It is another example of the Deputy Premier really going in boots and all, being highly critical, indulging in character assassination and all those extremely negative traits that seem to spill out of the personality of the Deputy Premier when he is challenged on any issue. We have seen it over the past five years since he has been Deputy Premier and Treasurer and a minister with other areas of responsibility.

Having a look at *Hansard* yesterday, where the Deputy Premier answered a question on the Victoria Park redevelopment, he basically—and I am paraphrasing here—accused the Adelaide City Council of caving in to representatives of the community, namely the residents association and the Parklands preservation people. It is pretty cute to accuse the Adelaide City Council of such action when, if we cast our mind back only three or four years, we saw the Deputy Premier in his own community down at Port Adelaide in some trouble over the new bridges that were being proposed over the Port River. I remember clearly television footage of the Deputy Premier in a community meeting down at Port Adelaide where he was coming under some pretty severe attacks over the proposal to put the bridges across the river.

What came out of that community meeting is these terribly expensive opening bridges across the Port River, and the only reason that the Deputy Premier committed to that was because of community pressure. It is all very well for him to say, in not so many words, that the Adelaide City Council is caving in to community pressure, but we saw exactly the same thing occur when the Deputy Premier was put under pressure in his electorate. He caved in to his community. It was policy on the run. He was under pressure at the public meeting. There was an issue with the boaties getting their boats into Inner Harbor and he said, 'We'll make them opening bridges.' It is all a bit convenient for government members to weigh in and criticise other institutions for making decisions and then having the element of hypocrisy in the way that the government has been dealing with their issues.

Notwithstanding those points, I want to talk about areas that affect the portfolios for which I have responsibility on this side of the house, particularly local government, emergency services and volunteers. I will focus on local government. I note that the minister for local government is in New Zealand attending a forum in relation to that sector of government as well as, I think, planning matters. I will highlight a couple of important points. First, the Minister for State/Local Government Relations—being the title of the ministry that the government places on that responsibility—has criticised the supposed lack of federal government funding for the local government sector, but let us focus on the funding that this state government gives to local government, particularly in relation to the maintenance and upkeep of our local road network.

I have some information that outlines how that works. I can tell the house that the majority of funding for the local road network comes from the federal government. It is all very well for the minister for local government to criticise the federal government's funding arrangements, but the vast majority of the money for the local road network comes from the federal government under what is called the Special Local

Roads Program, which was established with the joint approval of the state government, the commonwealth and the South Australian local government. Funding for this program is provided from a pool of money: 15 per cent of what is called identified local road grants and 15 per cent of the Roads to Recovery money that has been received from the federal government, which is a really outstanding contribution and a real boon to local government for maintaining and improving their road network.

That is all federal government money. Compare that to the absolutely meagre amount of money that the state government puts toward the local roads program, particularly the Black Spot Program. I will quote some statistics. The sum of \$6.8 million has been allocated to black spots, but that has mainly been distributed to state government administered and managed roads. The local road component (according to statistics received by the opposition) is only about \$1.6 million, which is an absolute pittance. It is not clear what the government is going to do in this year's budget. The budget allocation last year was \$2.3 million, but in this current budget we have no detail of the proposal for the coming 12 months. That funding is on an ad hoc basis: if the government thinks they have a little bit of money, they will just throw it out there for the local road network, so there is no real structure in the way the funds are to be distributed to local government in South Australia for the management of their roads.

Compare that to a scheme that operates in Western Australia. I think this is an extremely good scheme because it provides a real guarantee and real surety to the local government sector for funding on an annual basis for their local roads program. The state government in Western Australia allocates to local government a percentage of the estimated vehicle licence fees every year, and that current percentage is 27 per cent. Imagine what 27 per cent of all vehicle licence fees would mean to local government here in South Australia. I have not done the sums for South Australia, but it would add up to a significant amount of money and provide a significant boost to the current ad hoc system that we have in this state at the moment. It would mean a significant boost to the approximately \$1.6 million that black spot funding on local government-managed roads receives at the moment.

What do we hear from the minister for local government on these issues? Nothing whatsoever. What is clearly evident is that the minister is regarded as a weak link on the ministerial bench. She is protected by government minders. She will not go on the media, particularly Radio 891, before 9 o'clock in the morning, and we know that is a media managed strategy of the government. All her responses and all the material for the media are scripted and you can tell that she is reading those scripts, but the Minister for State/Local Government Relations is not doing anything. What is the policy? Where is her policy on improving road funding to local government? It is not there. It is a policy vacuum within the Office for State/Local Government Relations.

There is no action. The minister has a sit-on-her-hands approach. She has no plans. We see the backbench of the government driving the agenda in relation to local government matters. We see the member for Enfield carrying out his own inquiry into local government issues and, in his report, coming up with nine recommendations. Where is the Minister for State/Local Government Relations on that issue?

The Hon. R.G. Kerin: The member for Mawson should take over.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: The member for Mawson? I am not sure about that. We hear nothing from the minister at all in relation to policy developments and where she thinks the local government sector should be. We saw another example of that towards the end of last year, in October, when it was getting to the 11th hour as to her making a decision concerning council allowances. Previously, it had been in the too-hard basket of the former minister for state/local government relations, the member for Mount Gambier. It was then passed on to the current Minister for State/Local Government Relations after the election in March last year, and she sat on it for months.

She ignored the recommendation by the Local Government Association to group councils together and then have an allowance structure applied to those bands or groupings. She ignored that and basically said, 'It's all a bit too hard for me.' In not so many words, she said, 'I'm a new minister; I don't really have the experience to deal with those decisions. I'll put it back onto the local government sector and let it make the decisions.' When a member is sworn in as a minister they assume the responsibilities to make those difficult decisions from day one. There are no excuses. A minister goes to Government House and puts their hand on the Bible; or, if they do not want to do that, they make the affirmation. From day one, a newly-appointed minister must be prepared to make those decisions. Unfortunately, we have seen this Minister for State/Local Government Relations fail to meet those responsibilities.

In months to come, when the independent panel is established to set council allowances, there will be a heck of a mess to fix up, because some councils have made the decision that the mayor can draw the \$60 000 annual allowance and councillors can draw \$15 000. What happens if the independent panel says, 'Well, no, you can't have that amount. You've got to have something less.' What sort of a problem will that create in the community? It will be an enormous issue with which to deal.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Leader of the Opposition): I want to make some comments in relation to the Supply Bill, and I really want to address a principal question about the government's capacity to manage in at least, I think, three key areas: first, WorkCover; secondly, infrastructure projects; and, thirdly, the management of the Public Service. WorkCover is a classic example of the government's incapacity to be able to manage an entity such as WorkCover. We have had the situation with WorkCover where we have had the same minister for five years.

Unlike transport, where we have had a revolving door leadership with three ministers and three CEOs in five years, the same philosophy has been sitting over the top of WorkCover with the same minister for five years. What do we have? We have a WorkCover scheme that its own CEO, Julia Davison, describes as the worst in Australia. That is what this government has delivered after five years—the worst WorkCover scheme in Australia. If members want some evidence of that they have to go no further than the unfunded liability.

The parameters of the scheme have not changed since the government changed in 2002. The benefits to workers and that aspect of the scheme have not changed, and there is no legislation here to change significantly the make-up of the scheme and how the benefits are paid. What we have, though, is an unfunded liability that has blown out from about \$67 million in 2002 to what we believe is a figure approach-

ing \$1 billion, according to the last annual report. The last reported unfunded liability was \$694 million. There is a note in the annual report that if the assumptions they have made to get the unfunded liability figure to \$694 million do not turn out to be true, another \$250 million to \$300 million could be added to the unfunded liability.

There is a chance that WorkCover's unfunded liability will blow out to around \$1 billion, and why is that? That is the fundamental question this government has failed to answer or address. However, the one thing we do know is that the one minister has been responsible for it and the one minister has overseen it; and, after five years, the minister still has not taken any legislative action to improve WorkCover's unfunded liability. Every time we ask the minister a question in the house he gets up and goes around the answer.

I suspect that what the government will do is to hide any WorkCover changes until after the federal election. I think that because it would be extraordinarily difficult for Kevin Rudd to run around Australia and for all the South Australian Labor MPs and candidates to run around South Australia saying that the Howard government's WorkChoices, as they allege, undermine workers' benefits and entitlements while, at the same time, the state government is out there promoting a bill to cut WorkCover benefits to workers. So, any time we ask the minister, he fudges the answer, and I think that is the reason.

If members want further proof why WorkCover needs some reform, look at the WorkCover levy rates that are being charged around South Australia. South Australia has the highest WorkCover levy rate in mainland Australia. Our levy rate, on average, is around 3 per cent. In other states the levy rates are: 1.2 per cent in Queensland; about 1.6 per cent in Victoria; and about 2.02 per cent in New South Wales. Some of those schemes have had three, four and five premium reductions over the last two or three years. Of course, under this government our premiums immediately went up, and they have stayed there. If the scheme is not improved, the advice the government is giving is that they could be paying the higher level of WorkCover liability for many years to come. Other schemes interstate are actually returning surpluses to the WorkCover scheme and not running in trouble, as this scheme is. So, I think WorkCover is a good example of the capacity of this government, and particularly of this minister, not to be able to manage that particular portfolio.

The second area about management and the government relates to its infrastructure projects. Apart from being extraordinarily slow to get any infrastructure projects up and going (in fact, the first four years of the government we struggled to find an infrastructure project that it commenced and completed), look at what it has done now in relation to its transport and other infrastructure projects. The Anzac Highway project was originally costed at \$65 million and, depending on which budget you want to believe, it is either \$120 million or \$140 million in the budget now. That is a blow-out of some \$55 million to \$75 million.

The Northern Expressway project has had an enormous blow-out. It was originally costed at \$300 million and it has blown out to \$550 million. To restrict the blow-out to \$550 million, the proposed upgrade of Port Wakefield Road has been removed. The blow-out is limited to that \$250 million and the total cost limited to \$550 million. The other issue is the Grange Road/Port Road project, originally announced at \$120 million, and that seems to have disappeared. We have not had the final estimate yet of what that

will be but, based on the others, you can expect a significant blow-out on those projects.

The Queen Elizabeth Hospital was originally announced as a \$60 million upgrade and it is now around \$300 million, and it will not be completed now until 2011. Adjacent to my own electorate, the Sturt Road/South Road underpass project, glowingly announced on a front page during the election campaign, has hardly been mentioned since the election. So cost blow-outs is another area in which the government's management comes into question, as it does in relation to WorkCover, as I mentioned earlier.

The other area where the government's management comes into question is the Public Service, and the biggest single investment this state government has made has been in the Public Service. It has invested an extra \$500 million over and above what it budgeted in the Public Service. We know it budgeted for around 1 000 extra public servants and employed around 8 000 to 9 000 extra public servants. The number of public servants over and above budget was around 7 750. The cost to you and me of those extra public servants who were not budgeted for is around \$500 million each and every year, or \$2 billion over the four-year budget cycle. So, its biggest single investment has been in the extra public servants that it never actually budgeted for.

It is bigger than the Northern Expressway project, it is bigger than the Anzac Highway project, and it is bigger than the QEH project. It is actually its single biggest investment. That is why the government had to come in straight after the election and announce that, regardless of all its promises prior to the election, it was going to slash the Public Service by around 1 500 to 1 600 jobs—a clear breach of promise by the Rann government, the Premier and Treasurer Foley in relation to the slashing of the Public Service. We note that this week's *Advertiser* carried a story that the government is now looking at changing the way the Public Service operates with a view to making it easier to sack public servants, and that in itself is another clear breach of the promises made during the recent election campaign.

So, bad management in those three areas means that the government needs a higher tax base. It needs the higher tax base to prop up its cost blow-outs in infrastructure and it needs the higher tax base to cover the blow-out in the Public Service. So, what has the government done with the tax base? It has essentially offered no relief other than that offered through the GST arrangement with the commonwealth. Stamp duties are still outrageously high. Stamp duty, particularly on first home owners, is a direct disincentive for young people to invest in their first home in this state. From memory, the difference in stamp duty in South Australia for a median-priced house compared with a house of the same value interstate is about \$10 000 extra and, if first home owners are borrowing that money over the life of the loan, of course, that extra cost blows out to \$20 000. That is a direct disincentive for young people to invest in their first home in South Australia.

I turn to payroll tax. This government looks like being the first government in South Australia's history to collect more than \$1 billion in payroll tax. That should happen by about 2009-10. South Australia has the worst payroll tax system, and that can be combined with the highest WorkCover levy. The WorkCover levy is simply a tax on payroll. We already have a 1 to 2 per cent disadvantage to South Australian business on the WorkCover levy, but when you add that to the worst payroll tax regime, it means that we are missing out on some opportunities to create employment, because some

employers will say, 'I cannot be bothered: it is simply too expensive'. Some businesses from interstate or overseas will not invest in South Australia because the extra cost on payroll is simply too much.

In my view, the reality is that South Australia can do much better than it is doing. We have the highest unemployment rate on mainland Australia, and in trend terms the unemployment rate has increased every month for the past six months. On economic growth, we are the second worst of all states. If members look at the gross state product from 2001-02 to 2005-06, they will see that South Australia is the second worst of all the states. Even after the mid-year budget review, the state government said that it was expecting economic growth of about 1 per cent, yet states such as Queensland and Western Australia are growing at 7, 8 and 9 per cent. If members look at state final demand, they see that South Australia is travelling along at about 1.8 per cent, with the rest of Australia at 3.4 per cent.

Members can go to exports, if they want another example. In 2002, exports were \$9.1 billion. In 2006, they were \$9 billion. In other words, over that four-year period it had dropped by 1 to 2 per cent. At the same time, exports throughout the rest of Australia had grown by some 37 per cent. The government will say, 'Hang on, we have had a drought in the last year'. Well, the drought has been everywhere. The government has taken its eye off the ball in relation to some of the key industries such as the food industry, by way of example. All these things add up to a slower retail growth. Our retail growth from January 2006 to 2007 is the third worst in the nation. My view is that South Australia can actually do a lot better than it is doing.

The reason that we are not doing as well is that the government has said, 'We have a big mine coming on stream at Roxby, the federal government has given us a big ship contract and we really do not have to do much else.' Essentially, this government has turned its back on 80 000 small businesses. It has said, 'We will continue to tax you at extraordinarily high levels and we will make it harder for you to employ people as a result of the payroll tax and WorkCover levy; and just for cheap political gain leading up to the federal election, we will turn the union movement on you.'

I wish to conclude my remarks by commenting on the way in which this government is using taxpayers' funds to turn the union movement onto small business in this state in the lead-up to the federal election. The Minister for Industrial Relations announced this \$3 million grant program to the union movement to conduct occupational health and safety training. The union movement has no legislated obligation or responsibility for workers' safety. That is actually a responsibility of the business operator. This government has taken \$3 million of taxpayers' funds, given it to the union movement with a wink, wink, nudge, nudge under a grant scheme, and essentially said, 'Go into the businesses, and while you are there under the guise of occupational health and safety, do the best work you can to undermine the federal IR laws.'

To back that up, the government is proposing a change to the regulations so that the union movement can go into any workplace and peddle their wares, even if the employees at that particular workplace are not members of the union. This is all about the government using every taxpayer advantage it can to try to undermine the federal government and the WorkChoices legislation in an election year. Another example is the announcement only this week that it will ask the Industrial Relations Commission to prepare a report in relation to the WorkChoices legislation—and if members

look at the terms of reference, they will find the word 'employer' once. It is obvious what that report will be delivered in a timely manner for the government. It is looking at undermining small business during a federal election year. It has really turned its back on the small business community, to a large extent.

The other thing that it is doing to small business is making changes to the occupational health and safety laws, with the original draft making directors more liable for injury in the workplace. Of course, if the equal opportunity bill proceeds in its original form, it would be an absolute disaster for small businesses. The question I raise about this government is its capacity to manage. WorkCover is one example. It has been under the control of one minister for five years: the unfunded liability has blown out and rates have gone up. It is no-one else's fault but this government's and that particular minister's. Every major capital works project has blown out significantly due to the government's poor preparation and design of the projects.

The Public Service has blown out to the point where the government is now desperately trying to reel it in under a range of different measures. It is families and businesses that are paying inflated and high taxes to underpin the blow-outs and to support the inflated Public Service and, as a result, South Australia is not doing as well as we could in a whole range of areas including economic growth, employment, exports and retail growth. I look forward to a budget that says to business that it wants to support business. I look forward to the budget delivering on some tax relief for the long-suffering businesses and households of South Australia.

Mr VENNING (Schubert): I commend my leader on a great speech, and certainly he raised some very pertinent points. I say at the outset that I support the Supply Bill. It is a relief to know that this year's Appropriation Bill will be introduced on 7 June, unlike last year when we had to wait until 21 September—ostensibly because of the state election in March, which was an absolute nonsense. They could have done it at the normal time in May or June. This was a totally unacceptable delay and threw departments into chaos for months because they had to wait so long to learn what their budgets would be for the 2006-07 financial year.

In turn, this created delays and uncertainty for businesses and industries that had tenders and contracts with public works. I am sure there were many more short-term contracts in the past year, because the budget delay caused so much disruption and confusion in relation to the forward planning. As we have just heard, this government is a typical Labor government: a poor financial manager unable to make the necessary financial decisions. I cannot believe that we have been highlighting the big problem of WorkCover's unfunded liability in this house now for nearly a year, and what is being done? Absolutely nothing! The clock ticks, and the problem is compounding and out of control. The unfunded liability was \$67 million for the first year of the government in 2002, and now it is \$694 million, which would fix all our roads. The magic figure—the cash pot, if you like—is the big \$1 billion, which is just around the corner according to all the statisticians. I repeat that: \$1 billion. That is one-eleventh of the State Bank debt, and the clock is still ticking away. What is the government doing about it? We hear nothing. The same hapless minister is in charge; he gets up in this place and skirts around the questions, and I cannot believe that.

Remember there is also stamp duty. I myself have children who are all buying their homes. The stamp duty for first

home buyers in our state is a huge impost. Family members (and I know that other members are in the same position) are looking to move interstate not only for the better job opportunities that exist but, more importantly, so that they can build a home more cheaply. They do not have this extra cost of \$10 000 up-front in stamp duty. That is not much of an incentive, is it? First, the employment opportunities are greater interstate and, secondly, it is less difficult for people who want to build a house.

Then we have the matter of payroll tax. This government, as the leader has just said, will collect more than \$1 billion. It is the first state government to achieve that landmark—and what a landmark! That is \$1 billion that will be collected from the working sector, from the employers of our state. It is ridiculous when you tax employment like that. Combining this with the WorkCover levy, as I have just said, means that we are missing out on huge business opportunities. In addition, our unemployment is climbing, and I do not think it will be long before we will be on the bottom of the barrel because in terms of employment we are already the lowest mainland state, and I think it will just be a matter of time before we are the lowest state in Australia. It is pretty sad. I wish that there were more positive things to do.

I note that the Treasurer could be planning a spending spree on infrastructure, according to *The Advertiser* of 27 March. I hope it is true because we need a massive injection of funding into our infrastructure, and it is certainly about time. A report from the Parliamentary Library late in 2005 showed that, relative to its population, South Australia has the lowest public sector capital expenditure budget in Australia, at \$482 per capita. That is a pitiful figure. In Queensland, that figure is \$1 540 per capita. The difference between those two statistics is disgraceful. The financial press recently reported on research indicating that, in the 12 months to June 2006, the state Labor government planned to spend only \$1.04 billion on infrastructure, while other state governments spent a total of \$26 billion. South Australia's share of that is a mere 4 per cent. That is purely a token, and it is a disgrace.

Let us look at road funding for a start. We would see a marked improvement in our roads if the money collected from fees and charges that South Australian motorists pay actually was spent on roads. Instead, according to the RAA—and I do not want to use that organisation for political reasons—the following is the case:

SA motorists will pay \$880 million in fees and charges (including GST on fuel) this financial year, while only \$172 million is earmarked for road-related capital works projects and maintenance.

I agree with the RAA. Much more of the money collected from motorists should be invested back into our roads, as it always used to be years ago. Soon this state government will be raising close to \$1 billion per annum from the motorists (and that is all of us), the vehicle industry and transport operators. The impacts on country people in particular will be higher. It is a staggering sum, and all this happens while our road infrastructure crumbles, and it gets worse every day. The RAA Public Affairs office states:

Governments often argue that they can't afford to spend more money on roads; that spending more money on roads will divert funds from other critical areas. This is an all too familiar excuse; it is the same old government rhetoric. Last year 147 people died on South Australian roads and almost 10 times as many suffered serious injuries. The emotional toll borne by families and friends is impossible to calculate, but the direct financial cost to the South Australian community was more than \$1 billion. By improving our roads, we can minimise the likelihood of road accidents and limit the

severity of those that do occur. As a result, the demands on our hospitals, emergency services, rehabilitation providers and others will all be substantially reduced.

This is why the Liberal Party is proposing a 20-year infrastructure plan and, as Steve Shearer, the Executive Director of the South Australian Road Transport Association, indicated on radio recently, the trucking industry has been calling for such a plan for a few years now, since the Labor Party won government in 2002.

It is a shame that back in the 1980s the state Labor government decided to sell off the land that the previous Liberal government had earmarked for Adelaide's metropolitan transport needs for the next 25 years under the MATS plan. We are really paying a high price for this. Every day our streets are getting more congested. Every day it takes me longer to get here to work. What took me 20 minutes to get here five years ago now takes me 40 minutes, and it is getting worse every day. People are waking up, but what are the solutions? It really is a matter of great concern. All today's problems seem to have their sources in current or previous Labor governments.

I believe the selling of the MATS plan will be a bigger problem for this state than the State Bank. That is a big call. The cost of overcoming the problems we now have in this state—because we are the basket case in transport needs in Australia—will put the State Bank debacle in the shade. I believe that the sale of the MATS plan and all the land that was already acquired and paid for will probably be the mistake of the century for this state.

The 1980s boom offered promise but ended in tears with the collapse of the State Bank and the total mismanagement of the state's finances by the then Labor government. The accumulated public debt of over \$11 billion, as I said earlier, and the current account deficit of over \$300 million per annum by 1993, in effect, left us bankrupt. Major highway and roadwork projects were few, with hundreds of millions of dollars spent on questionable infrastructure priorities such as the Myer REMM Centre, and other things.

We Liberals had to take over the reins of a bankrupt state and pick up the pieces. I have been here for that whole time. I was here when the State Bank debacle surfaced and I have been here ever since. I know what has happened and how we have climbed out of the huge abyss that was left. I know members will say they have heard all this before, but South Australians must never forget how tough it was at that time. Liberal governments, time and time again, have had to rebuild our finances after a Labor government has left them in shreds. We Liberals did rebuild the finances after 12 years of government—from 1994 to 2002—and it was not an easy task. This is not just rhetoric; it is historical fact.

We simply did not have the funds to rebuild infrastructure as we would have liked, but we did a pretty good job irrespective of that. The Adelaide Airport runway was extended and the South-Eastern Freeway was built. Although money was scarce, we found \$170 million to build the Southern Expressway and provide land for its stage 2 duplication when the money was available. All we get from the government today is criticism that we did not do the dual highway then. It was either half of it or nothing, and the people who use it daily are very pleased that they at least have that. I put to this government that it ought now put in the other half, because the land has been acquired and bridges have been built. It should not now be a very big deal to complete the dual highway and have the Southern Expressway going both ways.

A Liberal government saw the Convention Centre expanded and rebuilt along with the major cultural institutions along North Terrace. We Liberals were the first to take action to construct the Adelaide to Darwin railway line, to develop Holdfast Shores, redevelop the Port of Adelaide (including the Port River Expressway), and to construct the new Adelaide Airport. The Liberals, with the help of two Labor MLCs who crossed the floor, privatised ETSA and put the \$6 billion worth of proceeds into the coffers to pay for our future.

The achievements of the 1990s were quite astounding considering the dire financial position in which the state found itself in 1993-94. It would have been politically safe, even easy, to do nothing, while blaming the State Bank, but we did not do that—we took action. By 2002, the major structural problems in our state economy had been fixed and government cash revenues were moving. Then the government changed, the Treasurer came in, got the new credit rating and took all the credit—and that was about six months after coming into office. How shallow was that. It was not fair.

We did not have the funds in the 1990s to implement as large an infrastructure plan as we would have liked but, now that the state is receiving enormous amounts of revenue, infrastructure must be addressed. The Infrastructure Report Card for South Australia, released in August 2005 by Engineers Australia, and the RAA's vision for South Australia's roads entitled 'Backwater to Benchmark' (released in November 2005) are both excellent and instructive pieces of work on roads in South Australia in recent years.

Along with Business SA's 'A Blueprint for SA's Future', these documents all tell the same story: we need a plan; we need to invest; we need to do more. Where has all the money gone? After five years of government, what does Labor have to show for it? Our roads are in a shocking state with a \$200 million backlog in road maintenance and no plan to fix it quickly. In fact, it could take 40 years to fix. We are so far behind the other states, it is a tragic embarrassment.

In the 1960s and 1970s, we had the best roads in Australia—that is when I started to drive on them—and now we have the worst. Regional roads in general are in poor shape as the state government attempts to offload responsibility to either the commonwealth or local government when it should be providing leadership and cash incentives to both other levels of government to help fix these problems.

Our public transport, particularly buses and trains, needs new investment. Labor opposed the outsourcing of our bus network to the private sector. How quickly the government has learnt to slice the contracts to the bone. We operate the only diesel rail fleet in the country. It is obsolete. There are problems with on-time running, as we heard today in question time, and the condition of our tracks. There is terrible overcrowding at peak times—just ask anyone travelling on the 7.46 a.m. express from Gawler Central to Adelaide. The train is almost full by the time it gets from its starting point at Gawler Central to Gawler four minutes later, and often there is standing room only for passengers getting on at any of the next five stops. It is a long way to stand on a train from Smithfield to Adelaide. This overloading means that the driver has to slow down and the train is often late arriving in Adelaide, resulting in some passengers missing their connection to another bus or train or even being late for work here in Parliament House.

'Adelaide—nation's traffic basket case' was the headline of an article in the *Sunday Mail* last weekend. According to that article, Adelaide has recorded the worst increase in peak-hour traffic congestion of any Australian capital city over the past decade. With public transport in disarray and roads in gridlock, is it any wonder? Hello. What have we been saying over the last five years? If the Treasurer is going to release his hold on the budget purse strings this year, as suggested in yesterday's *Advertiser*, then I look forward to more money being spent on regional roads, public transport infrastructure and public health infrastructure. The government seems to be able to find \$31 million for a tramline down King William Street and North Terrace as a dubious top priority and \$46 million to fit out a new Taj Mahal on Victoria Square for SA Water. Then, of course, there are the 8 000 more public servants we needed to have who were not there five years ago as the government swells and becomes very bloated at the waistline. No problem there. It is just total waste and poor management.

My Liberal colleague the shadow minister for transport (the member for Waite) makes a good point that, if we had a real infrastructure plan and program, our spending priorities might be more clearly enunciated. Some different priorities might be in and others might be out. We need to have a priority list as a matter of urgency and do the important jobs first, not just for political reasons but for state strategic reasons. As the member for Waite stated yesterday, according to the latest 2006-07 budget figures, this Labor government will collect a total of \$11.4 billion in revenue this year—that is \$2.9 billion more in revenue than the former Liberal government, which collected \$8.5 billion in its last year in 2001-02.

Since 2002, this additional revenue has been building and building, amounting to a cumulative \$9.8 billion of additional revenue over and above what the last Liberal government had to spend. Total taxation revenue is up 43 per cent. As I said earlier, payroll tax collection is 40 per cent higher and taxes on property are up 36 per cent. The GST windfall over and above what South Australia would have received under the old federal/state funding system will be \$1 690 million over the seven years to 2009-10. This Labor government is awash with cash. Never in the state's history has the government been more flush with money.

Add to this the government's rewards from our resources boom. All this money—where has it gone? What are you doing with it? And what happens when the boom ends—and it will—and the economy retracts—and it will? Release the purse strings, Mr Treasurer, and spend it wisely. Spend it on infrastructure that will assist all South Australians to have a better quality of life that will have long-term positive effects on the state. I put out a challenge to members of the government, particularly on the backbench—and you are included as a senior member, Mr Acting Speaker—to have more to say in your caucus room. Do not let your frontbench totally bully you like it has in the last four or five years. Have your say, because you know what needs to be done and we are all going to wear this. We in the opposition will wear the blame too.

We are going to leave to generations to come worn-out product. The only new roads that we will leave them are toll roads. Are you going to leave people toll roads? I hate toll roads. I believe I have paid my taxes. We have all paid our taxes, and I believe it is an insult to turn around and say, 'If you want a new road, we will get private enterprise to build it, but we are going to make you pay to drive on it.' Well, that is a disgrace. That is what is happening in New South Wales

and it will certainly happen here, because how else will you get these roads.

I say to the member standing in the middle of the floor reading his magazine that he might smile when he hears this rhetoric coming from the side of the house, but he will be targeted with this. I am looking at my twilight years in here. I look back with some pride at what I have been able to achieve, but I must say that I am not happy—and I will wear it—about the state of the assets in this state. Not one of the 47 members in here can walk away and say, ‘Well, it’s not my fault’, because collectively it is. We are the opposition and you are the government, and you are going to make the right decisions in the long-term. You can employ all the people you like but, in the end, I say to all members, you must have something to show for it. If you are going to put it away and waste it, we will all pay that cost.

I certainly support the Supply Bill. Let us hope that recent newspaper articles show that the government will spend the money in the right place and that we will see a huge boost in infrastructure expenditure. I certainly would welcome that, and I offer my apolitical support for anything along those lines.

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond): I rise today to speak in support of the Supply Bill. First, I want to comment on some of the overall revenue collections of the Rann Labor government. State finances continue to benefit from the GST, which Labor opposed. Currently, GST funding is \$3.4 billion of about a \$10.6 billion budget, which is about one-third of our state budget. If we did not have that money we would not be functioning as a state. Something that Labor opposed was debt reduction through the privatisation of ETSA. State budget figures also show that the Rann government is the highest taxing government in this state’s history. Taxes combined with GST payments from the federal government make this the wealthiest government South Australia has ever had.

Labor’s first budget in 2002-03 broke a key election promise by introducing new or increased taxes and charges, including the introduction of a gaming machine supertax and the River Murray levy as well as increases in stamp duty on conveyances and regulated fees and charges. The latest 2006-07 budget shows that the government will collect \$2 900 million more in revenue than the former Liberal government in its last year (2001-02). What has happened to all the money and where is the dividend for South Australia? What has happened to the extra \$2.9 billion per year?

An honourable member: It’s gone to health.

Mr PEDERICK: That’s an interesting comment. We have not seen \$2 900 million worth of improvements in hospital, school and police services.

I will now comment on how the government underestimates its revenue collections every year. Over the past four budgets the government has collected an average \$610 million more per year than originally budgeted. Where is the fiscal management here? As I said, it is the highest taxing government in South Australia. Taxes are up by 43 per cent. I note that that comment got quite a reaction from the member for Newland. He is obviously outraged because he did not realise that this was the position. Taxes are up by \$949 million compared with the last year of the former Liberal government in 2001-02.

Tax and revenue collections continue to rise, but there is no relief for struggling families and businesses. There is no stamp duty relief for struggling home owners, no extra

concessions for financial assistance for older South Australians and no payroll tax relief. The South Australian payroll tax threshold, at \$504 000, is the lowest of all states and territories in Australia. Payroll tax collections in 2006-07 will be 40 per cent higher than in the last year of our Liberal government in 2001-02. These payroll tax collections are predicted to increase by around \$200 million per year by 2009-10. The government claims in its budget that over the next five years a further \$296 million of taxes will be cut, making the total amount of tax relief since coming into office over \$1.57 billion by 2010-11.

This claim is a furphy, as the \$296 million is a revised figure on the tax relief package announced in the last budget. That tax relief package was forced by Peter Costello as a result of the GST negotiations with the commonwealth, which were originally negotiated by the former (Liberal) government. Most of the land tax relief only starts to kick in from 2009-10. I want to make some comments on property taxes. This Labor government is the first government in the state’s history to collect more than \$1 000 million in property taxes. In 2006-07, it is budgeted at \$1 194 million. With stamp duty conveyance figures, in 2005-06 the government collected \$116 million, 24 per cent more than budgeted for—one of the Premier’s broken promises.

Land tax relief packages announced in early 2005 have been ineffective and collections are continuing to rise. Total land tax collections increased from \$256 million in 2004-05 to \$342 million in 2006-07, even after the rebate and relief package. Some of our speakers have already noted the cost of the public servant blow-outs. The Liberal Party, as part of its policy package, was quite open before the 2006 election when it announced that it would be cutting 4 000 public servants.

The Hon. J.D. Hill: Please have the same policy at the next election, won’t you!

Mr PEDERICK: One thing that I will say in reaction to the Minister for Health is that at least we are up front with our policy and did not do it by default after the election.

The Hon. J.D. Hill: So, you’re accusing us of increasing the numbers and then decreasing the numbers. Is that the basis of your argument?

Mr PEDERICK: I would say to the minister that Labor comes in and the government takes out nearly half the 4 000 public servants with the 2 000 people that it is cutting. One of the reasons why Labor members figure they need to cut public servants is that there has been a blowout of almost 8 000 over the last four years. Labor budgeted for 1 135 and the actual increase was 8 885. Our party supports extra police, teachers and nurses, but obviously the government has just gone out of control and has people shuffling paper for no reason, costing the state \$500 million per year, or \$2 billion over four years. Ministerial staff have also increased, with costs amounting to more than \$16 million over four years, and the Independent ministers’ offices amounting to \$2.5 million per year, \$10 million over four years.

With the Queen Elizabeth Hospital redevelopment, there is nothing wrong with having a redevelopment of a hospital, but you have a blow-out from \$60 million to \$317 million and the project completion now delayed until 2011. I have a few comments on the public servant cuts. Mr Rann’s and Mr Foley’s hypocrisy on the issue of public service cuts is stunning, given the promises that they themselves made during the last election. Using the words they used during the election, Labor announced the sacking of 1 571 public servants on top of the 222 public servants who accepted

separation packages this June. That, as I indicated, is almost 2 000 public servants, and it has taken five years for the government to take action on these blow-outs.

The government promised no cuts in the public sector and, in particular, that key areas such as health, education and police should be quarantined from any efficiency dividend. We expect to see the full impact of these cuts in last year's budget come to light in future years, as undetailed elements of the budget impact on the community and the public sector. The current Labor government likes to take all the credit for the credit rating at the moment, but part of the reason we have that AAA credit rating is the nil investment in infrastructure. The former (Liberal) government ensured that the AAA credit rating was within reach through debt reduction and negotiation of the GST deal that is providing the state with growing GST income and financial flexibility.

I also have a comment on the unfunded superannuation liability. The budget papers show that, as at June 2001, the general government unfunded liability was \$3.2 billion. Under Labor, the unfunded superannuation liability has blown out to \$6.1 billion in June 2006 and is forecast to increase over the forecast estimates. The WorkCover unfunded liability is, I believe, heading towards \$1 billion. The latest figure we have is \$694 million, but who knows where it is exactly at the minute. Unless some reform is done in the WorkCover sector—and we are told that deals are done with unions not to cut benefits—I cannot see that happening. The worrying factor is that the figure of \$694 million comes from June 2006. As that figure we are referring to is nine months old, it would be interesting to see where it is at the moment.

I digress to some local issues in relation to the Hammond electorate and road funding. Works are planned for the South Road underpasses, the Bakewell Bridge is under construction, Northern Expressway, tramline extension, opening bridges and other works, which I believe over four or five years will cost the state up to \$1 billion, by the time all the blow-outs are factored in. I ask for more money to be spent on regional roads. Recently I was at Pinnaroo on the edge of my electorate and was asked by a local farmer to go for a ride into Pinnaroo in his truck. It was a fairly modern truck, only three years old, and I soon saw that the road is not wide enough and that 10 kilometres of the Pinnaroo-Loxton road needs not just patching but ripping up and a complete rebuilding.

When I arrived in Pinnaroo, a couple of the crew from the local ambulance service met me, and they wanted to tell me what it was like riding in an ambulance on that road towards Loxton, where they ferry a lot of patients at times. Instead of backing off to 60 or 70 km/h as they would with a patient with a hip injury, they held it to 100 km/h. I was just glad I was strapped in and had the grab-rails to hold onto. We certainly need a lot more money spent on regional roads. Approximately a billion dollars is going into urban infrastructure projects and, although I do not have a problem as such with money being spent on urban infrastructure, this government just seems to have let regional South Australia go to pack.

A few other local issues that are affecting my area are the aquatics, instrumental music and small schools programs that are under threat. One of those small schools in my area is Langhorne Creek. Funding of \$30 000 for 19 or 20 small schools has been cut. The threat of cuts to aquatics programs affects students throughout the state, and I hope that people have been writing to their local Labor member in the city

whose people enjoy the wonderful facilities at Murray Bridge.

I have mentioned in this place before and I have written to the minister about fire hydrant maintenance, which used to be conducted. It does not happen any more in the country. I know there are many thousands throughout the area but, in my experience in the last several years of fighting fires, trying to find a hydrant that is operable and cleaned out ready to go can be hard work at times. More tactical use of aircraft in fighting fires is something I have spoken about before. For some reason the government must have forced a decree on the CFS, which I support, being a member. The morning after a large scrub fire is the best time to put out small wisps of smoke, and I refer to the most recent fire earlier this year, which burnt thousands of acres of scrub. Perhaps it could have been pulled up first thing in the morning.

Another issue which could turn into a great blunder for the agricultural sector in this country, let alone this state, is the broomrape funding cut of more than \$3.25 million over four years. The government says it will take it up in efficiencies when we could eradicate more of this weed by using the cheaper options. Instead of methyl bromide, pine oil interceptor and Basamid can be used to fumigate more soil and get rid of this problem.

I hope the police station and court upgrade will happen fairly soon in Murray Bridge. Obviously the new prisons are coming, with the usual amount of consultation from the government—none. That seems to be a common theme, as with aquatics, instrumental music, prisons and the dreaded Wellington weir. The government seems to have a policy of making announcements, then it tries to put the fires out. I do not believe that is the best way to consult with people. Another issue is the Murray-Mallee Strategic Task Force which has recently lost funding. I will declare an interest here. My wife worked for the task force about 10 years ago, and she set up the Extreme Leadership program which PIRSA has now taken up to deliver across the state. It is a fantastic program giving instruction to youth in the Mallee. At a time when funding is needed to keep this task force going, and in a time of drought, it is just not happening.

I also comment on regional bus services, which have been under the hammer. The government has pulled some of its funding from these services. Regional bus services get 14 times less subsidy than people using city bus services, so we need some equity to get things on the right track. I would like to comment also on the federal takeover of the River Murray. I do not think it can happen soon enough. I even think the Minister for the River Murray is very keen for this to go ahead because, over the last 150 years, we have not managed it well. We need to reverse the over-allocation of water. I believe one way would be to compulsorily acquire 10 per cent of the water throughout the basin right up to Queensland. That would put approximately 1 500 gigalitres of water back into the system, as long as it was guaranteed to come down through South Australia and was not reallocated.

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

Mr PEDERICK: In finalising my comments, I think if everyone throughout the Murray-Darling Basin suffered a 10 per cent compulsorily acquired drop in their allocation, it would be better than what we have achieved at the moment with a 40 per cent reduction in South Australia on irrigation licences and, obviously, other licence restrictions in other states. I would like to comment on what the Minister for the

River Murray said about the weir proposal, which I very much hope does not go ahead, and that we would do something else if it went wrong and water was too saline or too full of blue-green algae to access for Adelaide water. Something else should be done now, and one option is to start building an off-take above Lock 1. We already have a lock. I think it is the most sensible option at this stage. We will get those pumps deeper at Murray Bridge and Mannum. I know that they already are going deeper, but they need to go deeper again, because I think the Treasurer would be aghast at the \$110 million that could be spent on the temporary weir, let alone whatever it would cost to take it out. One estimate is \$25 million. With those comments, I support the Supply Bill.

Ms BREUER: Madam Deputy Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the house.

A quorum having been formed:

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop): As convention has it, I support the Supply Bill but—

An honourable member: That is very decent of you.

Mr WILLIAMS: It is very decent of me, too. But in doing so, I do not necessarily concur with the direction that the current government is heading in. I do not necessarily concur with its budget strategy nor do I concur that South Australia is advancing under this government with the way the budget has been framed in recent years. I think the Treasurer himself has come to the conclusion that the past five years, whilst he has been Treasurer and the Labor Party has been in government in this state, have been years of wasted opportunity. I think in his heart of hearts even the Treasurer has realised that.

I say that because the Treasurer has become quite grumpy of late. I know that the Treasurer has always been quite combative—that seems to be his nature—but he has become grumpy, and I think he has come to the realisation that the golden period that he and the current government inherited in March 2002 may well run out. The largesse of the revenues that have been flowing into the coffers of the Treasury in the past five years may start to slow somewhat. The trend economic indicators are showing that, and I am sure the Treasurer is saying, ‘Wow, I have had these great times—five years as Treasurer—and what have I got to show for it?’

If members look around South Australia today, we realise how good the economy has been running in the past few years and how the revenues to the Treasury have increased, largely through the property boom, which has created huge windfalls in property taxes, conveyancing fees and stamp duty, and huge windfalls from the commonwealth GST—a tax that the Treasurer and the Premier fought tooth and nail not to have. When we look at where South Australia is today, taking into account the wonderful economic times that we have experienced over the past five years, in that context, we have to ask what we have achieved and what we have done to make the lot of South Australians better whilst we have had these good economic times. What have we done to make provision for the inevitable turnaround in economic conditions?

Some things are happening which will benefit South Australia into the future, and we all know that principally those things that will tide us over will happen in spite of this government, not because of it. Principally, I talk about the mining sector in South Australia. The Premier would have us believe that he and his government have been responsible for the surge in activity in the mining sector in South Australia and in what will hopefully be a very benevolent time in that

industry sector over the out years. Nothing could be further from the truth. This government has done very little, in a positive sense, to help the mining sector. When coming into power, I do not believe the Premier even knew that the mining sector was on the horizon. I do not think he even realised the potential of the mining sector in South Australia. That is why he and the now Minister for Health signed off on a document when coming into government saying that there would be no expansion of uranium mining in South Australia. Just back in December of 2001, the Premier and the now minister Hill signed off, as follows:

Labor continues to be opposed to the establishment of any new uranium mines and any expansion of the enrichment process.

That is what this Premier signed off on when coming into government. It is a bit rich for the Premier now to laud the potential expansion of Roxby Downs, which will be one of the great mines in the world. It is a bit rich for the Premier to say that he has been a great proponent of that mine. The reality is that, if he had been more effective in his earlier days in politics in South Australia, Roxby Downs would be—as the man who became Premier Bannon described it, and I am sure the now Premier probably penned the words—a mirage in the desert.

I do not believe that the Premier has actually changed his fundamental thoughts on the uranium industry and the uranium fuel cycle but, being a pragmatic sort of bloke, he has realised the importance of this activity to South Australia and he has turned a full 180 degrees. One of the problems that a populist government creates for business and industry in South Australia is that there is no surety. We do not know what to expect. If one is about to invest in South Australia, one does not know what the situation and circumstances might be in one, two or three years’ time under this government, because the government is out there watching the political wind—that is all it is watching—and it will move to follow the political wind. That is what the Premier has done with regard to the mining industry. It is very disappointing that he has not been more proactive.

Last week I was at the Paydirt Uranium Conference at the Hilton Hotel here in Adelaide. There is a huge amount of excitement within the mining and exploration sector in particular, and among uranium explorers. There are about 30 junior uranium explorers out in the field today looking for uranium in South Australia. But, until the ALP at the federal level changes its policy, there is not much they can do other than explore. If they were over the border, under a Labor government in Victoria, it would be illegal for them even to do that. It is illegal for them to even explore. I am not too sure whether the current Premier—if he had not come to realise latterly the importance of Roxby Downs and the Olympic Dam operation—would not be the sort of person to impose those sorts of regulations here in South Australia.

One thing that disappoints me greatly is that the Premier—and even today during question time he quoted exploration figures in South Australia—would have South Australians believe that the target of \$100 million of exploration expenditure by 2007 was a target established by himself. Those of us who have been following this industry for a significant period know full well that that target came out of the resources task force that was set up under the Olsen government in 1999. That was the target that was recommended by that task force and that was the target that was adopted by the Olsen Liberal government.

At the time, and since, the people involved always believed that that target was referring to greenfields exploration, exploration for new mineral ore bodies across South Australia. It was a realistic target and, with the right sort of support—the sort of support that the then Olsen Liberal government was giving to the mining exploration sector—that target was achievable. But today the Premier stood here and again referred to the official ABS exploration figures for South Australia being a bit over \$170 million, referring to 12 calendar months until 30 December last.

What the punters out there—and what, I would hazard, most of the members in here—do not realise is that, of that \$170 million, only \$33.3 million is actually attributable to greenfields exploration, and a whopping \$137.9 million is attributable to existing mineral deposits. The vast majority of that, as we all know—as would anybody who has been watching the industry—is happening at Roxby Downs as part of the feasibility study into the proposed expansion for the Olympic Dam mine site. So, whilst the Premier has been saying for some time now that we have hit the target—and we hit it early—of \$100 million, the reality is that he lowered the bar. He lowered the bar so much that we were always going to get over it. Without spending one dollar exploring for new mineral resources in South Australia, we will be well over the Premier's bar.

We are well under the bar that the former Liberal government set in 1999; we are under it to the tune of \$67 million vis-a-vis a target of \$100 million. That is a damning indictment on this government. I understand that the South Australian Chamber of Mines and Energy recently briefed the government—it certainly briefed the Treasurer—on the requirements for the infrastructure development to support the mining industry in South Australia. We are struggling to get anywhere near the target, although the Premier claims that we are there. Bear in mind that, once Roxby Downs comes into production, once the feasibility study is completed, a large proportion of that \$137.9 million that has been expended on existing deposits will disappear off the books. And when you pick up the ABS figures you will say, 'How come we've only got \$33 million worth of exploration in South Australia?' That is the question that the Premier would have to answer in a couple of years' time. But, without that, his target looks pretty silly.

Roxby Downs will be a great mine, and it will underpin, to some extent, the future of South Australia. But, do not let anybody be fooled by the government's rhetoric. When this government came to power, it started off saying, 'We don't like uranium; we don't want any new mines', had the publicity shots in front of the camera and signed the agreement—'no more uranium mining in South Australia'. It has come full circle, and now claims that all of that feasibility work at Roxby Downs is a result of its own work. Nothing could be further from the truth.

I will move to another area for which I am responsible in opposition, that is, industrial relations, and I will briefly talk first about WorkCover. WorkCover will prove to be the Achilles heel of this government, because it has been totally mismanaged for five years. I urge government members to go back and look at the sort of answers that the minister has been giving to questions from the opposition for almost the whole of those five years. His answers just twist and turn and change almost on a daily basis. The minister has WorkCover out of control, and all he does is try to cover his tracks, cover his back. He changes his story every five minutes and, in the meantime, the unfunded liability continues to rise, injured

workers continue to suffer, and now they are in grave fear. I get phone calls continuously from injured workers saying, 'What's going to happen? The rumour mill is working, and benefits are going to be slashed. How am I going to continue into the future?'

The Hon. J.D. Hill: And what is your position on this, Mitch?

Mr WILLIAMS: I will tell the minister what my position is. It is the same as the position that South Australia had prior to you coming to government. The WorkCover scheme is the same scheme; the benefits to the workers are the same, and between 1995 and 2001 we reduced the unfunded liability from almost \$300 million down to a low of \$22 million. At the time of change of government it had jumped up a little bit because the investment market was very poor in the first couple of years of that 2001-02 period, and instead of making about 13 per cent on the investments—and the investment portfolio of WorkCover was about \$700 million—for that little period we actually made a negative gain on those investments, and the unfunded liability did creep up a little.

I think the best figure at 30 June 2002, which is the closest figure to the time of the change of government, was \$67 million. Well, since then, for the information of the minister, the unfunded liability has blown out to \$694 million as of 30 June last, and that happened while the benefits to injured workers did not change. It was purely as a result of the way that his ministerial colleague has mismanaged the scheme. The Liberal Party in government brought the unfunded liability down without forcing upon the injured workers benefits less than those they are getting today, and we were able to bring the unfunded liability—

The Hon. J.D. Hill: What would you do now?

Mr WILLIAMS: Well, you should ask your colleague, because he is the one who has made the mess.

The Hon. J.D. Hill: Tell us your policy now.

Mr WILLIAMS: Well, he got rid of the board that had been doing a good job, he got rid of the CEO who had been doing a good job, and it was your minister who changed insurers. He changed the lawyers, and he changed the claim managers. It is your minister who has caused the problem, and there is no way you could blame anybody else, notwithstanding that your minister continues to try to lay blame on the previous government. It is just farcical. Mind you, this is the same minister who back in December said, 'Oh, well, things are going pretty bad, and we are going to have an election year federally this year. We've got to do something to help Kevin Rudd. We'll slip \$3 million across to our mates in the union movement and, of course, the reality is that a fair bit of that will come straight back into the ALP, and that will be very good for our campaign funds.'

He actually drew up a press release dated 16 December—ready to go—but, as I told the house previously, I do not believe that the press release ever left the minister's office. However, it came to light at one of the meetings of the SafeWork SA Advisory Committee where the minister had to fess up to what he had done. Here is this same minister who, we believe, has probably created close to a billion dollar deficit in WorkCover handing out millions of dollars to his union mates, and now this week he has come out and said, 'Now we're going to spend more taxpayers' money on the federal election: we're going to have an inquiry into the federal WorkChoices and see what sort of impact that has had on the working men and women of South Australia.' He then had the temerity to stand in the house in question time today and suggest that he already knew all the answers: it is an

absolute disgrace and it has cut the pay rates and conditions of working South Australians; yet he still wants to go out and spend taxpayers' money on an inquiry—an inquiry which, coincidentally, will report probably on the eve of the federal election. It is a disgrace.

Time expired.

Dr McFETRIDGE: On a point of order, I believe that the orange spots on the microphones opposite are displays and are out of order.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The minister might remove whatever it is that it is there.

Ms CHAPMAN: On a point of order, I think the minister is defying your ruling. You did direct that he remove the display and he simply has not done so.

Bill read a second time.

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

That the house note grievances.

Mrs PENFOLD (Flinders): The state Labor government's mental health record is going from worse to non-existent. That is the situation on the ground, despite what the Minister for Mental Health says. Along with the rest of her colleagues, the minister is putting her head in the sand and refusing to face facts. It is symptomatic of this Labor coalition government's record of missed opportunities and broken promises. I quote a letter from Dr Graham Fleming of Tumby Bay that was printed in the *Port Lincoln Times* last week, 22 March 2007, in response to the minister's pathetic reply when I raised concerns about the of mental health situation on Eyre Peninsula. The letter stated:

Minister Gago's reply cannot go unanswered. In spite of her reassurances that all is well, it does not reflect reality, particularly in rural areas. Acute medical emergencies are generally well managed unless it is mental health. However, with chronic medical problems, particularly rural and remote, the management may become inhumane and indefensible unless you have private health insurance. On the other hand, the acute mentally ill are not so fortunate. One of the most seriously mentally ill groups, 'the detained', have on occasion been processed at 25 patients per doctor per day. Poor patient management has been documented within the last few weeks and is far from isolated, to the extent that many doctors avoid the public system as ineffective and inappropriate for the fear they return worse than when sent. The doctors are tired of complaining to deaf ears.

The poor management of mental health patients is compounded by an accounting and management system that belongs to a century ago. Although more money urgently needs to be spent, twice as much could be achieved with half as much resources with proper management if efficient systems were in place. Child and adolescent mental health services are appalling in rural areas, no matter how good we are told they are. On lower Eyre services are going backwards, not forwards, with now only one visiting psychiatrist per month. This is hardly enough, which begs the question as to why psychiatrists have abandoned the public system. Promises of more inquiries, reports or pilot projects are insufficient as we need effective and efficient systems on the ground now. On the political front the government needs to be congratulated. All control and authority and absolutely no responsibility has to be the perfect political system.

Dr Fleming is particularly well qualified on the subject of rural mental health through the professional and community work that he has done over many years, particularly in the small community of Tumby Bay and environs. I quote excerpts from a speech I made in parliament on 28 November 1996 about his wonderful achievements from a project in the area of child mental health. I stated:

The suicide of a 15 year old student gave general practitioner Dr Graham Fleming and others the resolve to undertake the project. Specialist resource people included a psychiatrist, Dr Carol

Dorrington, and educational psychiatrist, Dr Gary Childs. Dr Fleming spent eight weeks in the psychiatry department at the Women's and Children's Hospital in Adelaide to confirm his understanding of the principles of child and adolescent psychiatry. . . He also attended the Smith Kline Beecham SOS program for prevention of suicide where he was asked to be a general practice moderator in future programs.

Five years later, the *Port Lincoln Times* of 24 May 2001 carried a report of the Brooker 'Women in Agriculture' meeting at which Dr Fleming spoke on suicide and the devastating effect suicide had had on the Tumby Bay community over the previous 15 years. I quote excerpts from that report as follows:

. . . he presented the tragedy of 12 deaths between 1986 and 1995 and the common factors associated with them. At this time, the death rate from suicide was three times the national average. The good news was that over the past six years there has been only one possible suicide.

He attributed this reduction to community support and the action committee—the one mentioned above—an educative approach to teach the community to understand mental health and mental illness, and to encourage early identification and intervention. Dr Fleming showed this approach had reduced suicide in the last five years to a third of the national average; a reduction of admissions from attempted suicides, although more people were now presenting to hospital for treatment of their mental illnesses before the crisis stage.

Dr Fleming's credibility, his hands-on experience and his success cannot be questioned. Under a Liberal state government, services and treatment for mental health improved, despite the financial bankruptcy of the state that was Labor's legacy and the consequent stringency of funding that was absolutely necessary for the Liberal government to get South Australia out of Labor's mess. Under Labor, the mental health situation has again steadily deteriorated, especially in rural and regional South Australia. The regions are suffering dreadfully under the Labor government's population-based funding policy that takes no account of costs of time and money, and the difficulty—particularly of transportation—for a population spread across millions of square kilometres.

A lot of people deny they have a problem and will not seek help, so they end up in the hands of police or in hospital, not in proper care. Many end up in the prison system where they should not be. The report recommendations that I have seen so far of the Social Inclusion Board's 'Stepping Up—A Social Inclusion Action Plan for Mental Health Reform 2007-12' does not address local issues in my electorate. I believe that it would be the same for all rural electorates. When I attempted to draw public attention to the appalling position in my electorate, the state Labor mental health minister was publicly dismissive of the need. The *Port Lincoln Times* on 6 March 2007 reported the minister as saying:

A specialist medical health team of nine trained professionals, including nurses, social workers and psychologists is currently based in Port Lincoln.

'Psychologists' translates to one psychologist visiting Port Lincoln on a monthly basis, and I ask the minister: what about the people living in the other 55 000 square kilometres of my electorate that is outside Port Lincoln?

The Hon. Ms Gago also apparently does not understand the geography of Eyre Peninsula or the negative effects that her government's cuts to health services have had on the community. She says the rural doctor workforce agency states that there are currently no vacancies for general practitioners in Port Lincoln—not mentioning the other nine hospitals on Eyre Peninsula. However, we are talking about mental health, which is a specialist area of expertise. The minister conveni-

ently ignores the other parts of Eyre Peninsula where people are more isolated and where health services are not so accessible—areas that struggle to get doctors and health professionals of any kind. The minister's comments are also contradictory to the media report which stated that Eyre Peninsula has the lowest number of doctors per thousand of population in South Australia.

In response to a letter acknowledging changes to the electoral roll, a constituent who describes herself as a Labor voter recently said:

It would be a great service if Wudinna had a permanent doctor and Ceduna didn't have such a high crime rate.

That does not support the minister's claim that general practitioners are plentiful. The minister's 30 intermediate care beds across South Australia is a drop in the ocean of need, albeit a welcome one. However, regions take in Whyalla, Port Augusta, Port Pirie, Mount Gambier, Mannum, Berri and other regional centres. When a person has to travel 300 kilometres or more, as happens in my electorate, the response to a medical condition is usually to ignore it until the breaking point comes—sometimes suicide, sometimes self-harm or harm to others. General practitioners are not always qualified to deal with mental ill health. I have had a number of constituents contact my office with harrowing stories of mental health in their families, in support of the comments that I made in the *Port Lincoln Times*, which the state Minister for Health derided.

One constituent asked what she could do to get the issues addressed. She has been desperately trying to get help for more than seven years, during which time she and her family have been living in fear, with death threats. Going through the police, courts and mental health has been useless in getting a permanent resolution to the problems. The police have been supportive but frustrated. Another recent letter describes a family's frustration and worry in dealing with a mentally-ill member of the family and in trying to get help from doctors and the team in Port Lincoln, yet the mental health minister believes it is sufficient. The team obviously cannot cope with the number of patients they are called to deal with. Fortunately, family support prevented a suicide. The writer concluded:

Liz, how many other people and their families are unsuccessfully seeking help on Eyre Peninsula?

There was a comment that anyone on their own without a supporting family would have no chance; that more than two years after the event, families and individuals on southern Eyre Peninsula are still battling mental health problems arising out of the Black Tuesday fire of 11 January 2005.

Time expired.

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett): I will keep referring to some of the issues I spoke about yesterday in my Supply Bill speech and this afternoon in question time in relation to Aboriginal affairs and reconciliation in this state. I want to focus on the Premier, Mike Rann, and his role in Aboriginal affairs in this state. It goes right back to when he was the minister for Aboriginal affairs in the early nineties. It is really interesting to see what the Rann government's response is to Aboriginal affairs nowadays and compare it to what was being said in 1991, because not much has changed, only the fact that it is 16 years later. In 1991 the then minister for aboriginal affairs, Mike Rann, said in response to the Royal Commission into Aboriginal Deaths in Custody:

It's a call to action—
haven't we heard that before—

directed at all sectors of our community.

Well, all we have seen is inaction. On 19 February 1992 then minister Rann said in this house:

I can certainly pledge to the house that South Australia will have the most effective response to the royal commission.

We know that an officer has been appointed once again to try to review the responses of all the government departments to the implementation of the royal commission. He has not reported yet, and we do not know when he will report; the matter is still out there in the ether. We are just seeing rhetoric and the Rann ranting. On 31 March 1992, then minister Rann, now Premier Rann—and, no excuses, he has been here five years now—said:

The report does not confine itself to important criminal justice and custodial issues, but addresses underlying issues such as racism, cultural breakdown, employment, education, training, housing, health, justice and media stereotyping.

And what are we seeing in this place? The gang of 49—lock them up! That was Rann's answer in the 1990s and that is his answer now. It is totally unacceptable. This Premier needs to stop the rhetoric and move on. He is an absolute disgrace when it comes to Aboriginal affairs.

Let me read what the then Labor federal minister for Aboriginal affairs (Robert Tickner) said in March 1992 when he described South Australia's response to the Royal Commission into Aboriginal Deaths in Custody. He described it as a 'sick joke'. In *The Advertiser* on 28 March 1992 the then Labor federal minister for Aboriginal affairs, Robert Tickner, said:

The South Australian government has claimed that \$76 million spent recently on upgrading gaols and police systems was sufficient. If that's the South Australian government's response to the royal commission, it's a pretty sick joke.

Lock them up then, lock them up now! What a stupid response that is. Nothing has changed. This government and this Premier needs to look at what they are doing, not just keep on with the rhetoric. The then federal minister for Aboriginal affairs, Mr Tickner, also said:

The South Australian government outlined its funding in a letter to the federal government claiming it spent \$36.5 million on major police and court complexes, \$30 million on corrective services institutions and \$10 million on prison redevelopment.

That does a lot for Aboriginal reconciliation, I am sure! It is an absolute disgrace. Let us see what then eventuated, and I refer to the 2004-05 annual report of the Aboriginal Lands Parliamentary Standing Committee. The then chief executive of the Department of Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation, Peter Buckskin, said in a letter to the Aboriginal Lands Parliamentary Standing Committee that there was going to be a complete check on what was happening with the response by the government in 2004-05 to the Royal Commission into Aboriginal Deaths in Custody. It has not reported. We have not seen very much at all.

Certainly, from the issues I raised in question time today, the response has been far less than one could have expected from a government which has been in office for five years and which has truck loads of money. In 1991 the then minister for Aboriginal affairs (now Premier Mike Rann) outlined the committees that were working in Aboriginal affairs at that stage, and, guess what? We found an inter-agency task group on Aboriginal youths. From March 1990 the functions of that task group were to provide a focus for government agencies in addressing the issue of Aboriginal youth involved in the inner city and media reactions to the problems.

It is the same as we are seeing now with the gang of 49. Let us keep the media stereotyping up. Let us not change our attitudes. Let us not get involved in any reconciliation whatsoever. Let us trot out a David Cappel and pretend that something is actually happening. Let us not talk to the real people—the families and communities—all over the state and see what is really happening. Put some money where your mouth is, Mike, for once in your life. My final point is the absolutely disgraceful funding for Aboriginal Legal Rights in this state.

The Chief Executive of the Aboriginal Legal Rights Movement, Neil Gillespie, has written to me on a number of occasions now pointing out the parlous state of funding for Aboriginal legal rights in this state and, in real terms, it has not increased since 1996. However, in 1991 Mike Rann said:

[He would] support additional funding to the Aboriginal Legal Rights Movement to ensure adequate legal representation for Aboriginal people.

What have we seen? We have seen an absolute disgrace. We have seen no significant increase in funding since 1996. Sure, a Liberal government was there and things could have been done better, but this government has been here five years and it has truck loads of money. It has not moved on or grasped the nettle with respect to Aboriginal affairs and reconciliation. Sure, 23 000 Aborigines reside in this state. They are not a big voting base; they are not going to change governments overnight, but they have serious issues and massive opportunities if they are handled correctly.

For anyone on the other side to say that I am not passionate about Aboriginal affairs is dead wrong. To say that I am not willing to enter into bipartisan discussions with this government is dead wrong. I was first involved 30 years ago in Aboriginal affairs at Port Augusta, and I saw some of the opportunities and issues then. They are still there now. I want to be involved in them. When I decide to retire from this parliament, I will feel sad if I have not made a significant improvement in the lot of Aborigines in South Australia because they deserve better than they are getting now. They deserve a lot better than Mike Rann's rhetoric from the early 1990s to the present.

Ms CHAPMAN (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): On 26 February this year, Vasilios Misopapas, a 31 year old Unley man, died arising out of injuries he sustained when he skidded on his bicycle on the Waterfall Gully Road. Quite early this morning I visited the site at which he sustained those injuries, and a small memorial has been erected. The tragedy is that this is an event which had been predicted and about which warning had been given both publicly and in this parliament arising out of the disgraceful state of the Waterfall Gully Road and the danger it presented to cyclists, walkers, runners, hikers and motor vehicle operators who used that road every day.

On this day, 319 South Australian residents petitioned this parliament both to you, Madam Deputy Speaker, and to members of this house that the issue be raised as to their concern about the state of disrepair of the Waterfall Gully Road, Waterfall Gully. The petition states:

... pray that your honourable house will do its utmost to convince the state government to proceed immediately with the remediation of the road which was damaged by flooding in November 2005 so as to prevent any further fatalities or injuries to persons using that road.

I have raised this issue with ministers, I have raised this issue with the Premier, I have raised this issue with the parliament,

and now these people have come forward to ask this parliament to take this matter seriously in light of the tragic death of Mr Misopapas last month. To compound the danger, let me indicate that, only yesterday morning, a person known as Kevin was rescued by one of the local residents on Waterfall Gully Road, Mr Alan Greig, and I commend him—

An honourable member: I know Alan. I used to teach with him.

Ms CHAPMAN: Indeed, and I commend him for his courageous and, I think, very civil-minded act in rescuing a cyclist just outside his home on Waterfall Gully Road whom he conveyed, with several cuts and abrasions and apparently a fractured wrist, to the emergency department of the Wakefield Street Hospital. The cyclist's injuries occurred when he hit his head on the bitumen after hitting a rough dirt patch on Waterfall Gully Road.

Let me give one more story from Mr Bruce Munro, also a resident of Waterfall Gully Road. He writes to say:

Dear Vickie,

Thank you for your letter of 19 March and initiative in following through the issue of the third world state of repair of Waterfall Gully Road.

It was gut-wrenching to hear of the death of the 31 year old cyclist just 30-40 metres from our home. I saw the pool of blood an hour after the accident—it looked like someone had spilt a large milk container worth of blood on the road there was so much of it. In speaking to the police investigators they mentioned that the cyclist was travelling very fast when he lost control.

I have no doubt the road surface was a factor in his death and, as a road cyclist myself, this was brought into sharp focus when I nearly came off my bike on Waterfall Gully Road last Sunday. I was approaching the 'first bridge' near number 37 when my bike tyre&wheel got stuck in a narrow trench/channel in the too-many-times-patched, and I found myself slowly tipping over. With a tug at the handlebars I was able to jump the wheel out of the trench and maintain control. I was travelling at around 35 km/h, which I suggest is a common average speed down Waterfall Gully Road for road cyclists. It was truly a close call and, if I'd not pulled the wheel out within a second, I would have been sliding across the road into the path of ongoing traffic turning into that blind corner.

Just this morning, I met a woman whom I will simply describe as Chris. She has been a runner along Waterfall Gully Road for 35 years. She was walking this morning because on 4 September last year she was running, hit a pothole, broke her ankle and is now no longer even able to enjoy that pleasure in her life which she had enjoyed for many years.

It is shameful, as described by Mr Munro, that we have to have third world conditions along Waterfall Gully Road. And why? Let me pose that question. In September 2005 there was what we call a one in 1 000 year flood. Members of the house will remember this, because areas such as Virginia a few days later sustained significant flood damage to occupiers of land and residents of the town. But here is the difference. The Premier and the Minister for Transport came out to Waterfall Gully Road and made such damning statements as, 'The Burnside Council has a lot to answer for in relation to the damage sustained'—and extraordinary property damage had been sustained.

They did not have the last laugh on this issue because ultimately it was determined, and they had to admit, that it was rock from their parks—16 000 tonnes of it—which had come plummeting over Waterfall Gully and caused major damage and havoc for the residents and danger to property and person. It is still sustaining damage to these people and, indeed, the death most recently of at least one cyclist. There are daily occurrences where people are at risk of injury or death. They had to admit that, in fact, Waterfall Gully Road

is their road and that they are responsible for it, that they are obliged to maintain, patch and repair it. Well, that is all they have done, Madam Acting Speaker. After a lot of work and submission, they have finally removed the rock. They have refused to reimburse the Burnside Council; they have given nothing to the local residents; and they leave them with this death trap without it being dealt with.

To add salt to the wound, I wrote to SA Water recently commending it on the reference in its annual report to the assistance it had given to people during the Virginia floods. I thought that was commendable. It was acknowledged in the annual report and I thought it was appropriate that it be recognised. I inquired of the chief executive as to what contribution they might have made to Waterfall Gully residents. I was surprised to receive the response which indicated, 'We rendered no assistance to the people of Waterfall Gully Road because we were not asked to. The government only asked us to deal with the people in Virginia.'

That is a disgrace: it is discrimination, it is unacceptable. There are people there who have suffered personal and property damage and continue to be exposed to this risk, with no assistance and support from this government or even an indication that it will remedy the situation. How many people have to die on Waterfall Gully Road, even if they do not live there? Hundreds of people every day travel up and down that road to enjoy aspects of the Waterfall Gully area and the parks that adjoin the road. They also face that risk and danger. The man who died a month ago on Waterfall Gully Road was not even a resident of Waterfall Gully; he was a resident of Unley.

I hope the government understands that this road is a danger to the public at large. It can be dismissive and suggest it is the Burnside Council's problem, which it clearly is not, and it can ignore pleas for financial support and at least some recognition of the residents of Waterfall Gully Road, but it should understand this: this hazard is causing the death and injury of people at large, not only the people of my electorate. It is time the government understood the danger that exists. The road is an uneven mess. It is just a matter of time before, once again, another tragic death occurs. It remains a state government road. It is a death trap. It poses a continued risk to cyclists and pedestrians who use it. I ask that the petition not go unheard and that the government recognise this.

I accept that, at present, the road maintenance backlog for state government roads alone is estimated to be more than \$200 million, but this government continues to spend money on useless projects such as the tram extension, opening bridges at Port Adelaide, \$33 million towards the current program for the redevelopment of Victoria Park and \$17.5 million to buy back a contract at Modbury Hospital, yet it cannot spend basic funds on safety and avoid the death of South Australians. That is a disgrace. I think that the government should hang its head in shame. I ask the government not to wait for the Coroner's report on the death of a 31 year old cyclist before it does something with Waterfall Gully Road. It is unacceptable that this situation continues to prevail.

Mr PISONI (Unley): It was the former Liberal government which ensured the AAA credit rating was in reach and about which this government boasts today. It did that through some very tough decisions. There was a reduction in government services to reduce government debt. There was the controversial selling of ETSA in South Australia. All those

deals were controversial and they were tough to do, but they had to be done because we had an \$11.6 billion debt, a legacy of 12 years of a Labor government. Of course, the people of South Australia were tired of the weight around their shoulders. They could not survive any longer and they felt that they needed to get someone in to fix that problem.

Traditionally, the Liberal Party has had a reputation for being very good economic managers and, consequently, in 1993, we saw the Labor Party thrown out of office by a very large majority. As the member for West Torrens said, it was the largest election victory in history. The AAA credit rating which the government boasts about obviously is as a result of the work of the previous Liberal state government. What also needs to be remembered is the difference between Australian states and other federations such as Canada and India; that is, state government borrowings are guaranteed by the federal government—and under the Howard government, Australia has been very effectively run for over a decade. Because of this, the world understands that we can pay our bills. We can pay our bills in South Australia and, if we cannot, then we have a very responsible federal government which has reduced the \$96 billion debt left by the Hawke and Keating years and also put money in the bank by establishing the Future Fund.

We have seen surplus budget after surplus budget. I remember Kerry O'Brien interviewing Peter Costello when he brought down his first surplus budget. I remember Kerry O'Brien saying to Peter Costello, 'You have a surplus, Mr Costello, what are you going to do with it?' The Treasurer answered, 'Now isn't that a problem you would love to have? We have choice. We have a surplus. What will we do with that surplus?' Responsible government is about having a choice with what you can do with taxpayers' money. When you are running a deficit, you do not have a choice. There are essential services that you need to cover, but there are no choices about whether you reduce taxation or provide additional services. Those choices are taken away when you are running a deficit.

It is important that we learn to run budget surpluses and that we continue to run budget surpluses. The temptation when you are running a surplus is that government can grow. Time and time again we see that happening with Labor governments. For instance, in the past five years of the Rann Labor government we have seen increases in the public sector which have not been covered in the budget—increases not in service delivery but in bureaucrats and middle management. I have not come across a single person in my electorate who has said that they believe they are getting an extra \$500 million worth of services out of the state government. As a matter of fact, people have been complaining to me about delays in services.

I am glad that the health minister is present, because when I visited the Queen Elizabeth Hospital I was told that it is having an enormous amount of trouble reaching the minister to discuss its problems with service delivery, equipment replacement and the difficulties in running that hospital. Managers of departments have to go through six levels of bureaucracy before the minister gets to hear about the problems at ground level. What happens is that it gets to the first level, then the second level. Instead of that information going in an unfiltered manner to the minister, the further it goes up the chain, the more people have amended the problem, pasted over the problem, hidden the problem or blamed someone else. By the time the minister gets to hear

about the problem, it has become a very sanitised minor problem and it is not the problem which was raised initially.

In the infrastructure area we are seeing a number of very large cost blow-outs and wrong priorities. Wrong priorities have cost my electorate the redevelopment of Unley Road. The redevelopment of Unley Road is long overdue. We have seen budget blow-outs in the cost of opening bridges at the Port River—an extra \$100 million on the life of the project; the tram extension, \$31 million; Public Service blow-outs—an extra 7 750 over and above what is budgeted for, which equates to around about \$500 million (half a billion dollars) a year, which is more than \$2 billion over four years.

For ministerial staff, increased costs and numbers amount to more than \$16 million over four years. We now have two additional ministers to accommodate the Independents. In South Australia we used to have 10 ministers, then it was 13 ministers and now, with the expanded income and surpluses that the government is receiving, we have 15 ministers. As to the development of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, the cost blow-out is \$60 million, taking the cost to \$317 million. The cost blow-out on the Northern Expressway has gone from \$300 million to \$550 million, and we are still not sure where it will go. It will be interesting to see whether the government will be honest and transparent with its valuations and purchase prices, unlike the situation on the South Road project, where valuers are denied comparison pricing because the government has hidden the price of properties that are being purchased. The Land Titles Office does not have that information for it to be made public. For any other sale that information is public so real estate agents can do their job and give fair valuations.

Getting back to Unley Road, the traffic is increasing virtually daily. On a busy morning I leave my home, which is only 2.5 kilometres from Parliament House, and it can take me up to 40 minutes if I travel via Unley Road, and it does not make much difference if I travel down King William Road or Fullarton Road. It is even a difficult job travelling the other way. When I drop the children off to school, it can take a substantial amount of time—much longer than it should—simply because of the amount of traffic and the lack of work that has been done on the road. I refer to the planning work that was not done to give us dedicated right-hand turning lanes, two lanes city-bound in the mornings, one lane out and the reverse in the evenings. Most importantly, to save our strip shopping, we do not have safe crossing points. We need more of them and we need them to be safer and more visible.

Mr VENNING (Schubert): Once again, I rise to ask the current Labor government to give high priority in the coming state budget to building the new Barossa health facility (or the Barossa Hospital, as it used to be known). As I have said previously, this is a critical issue for the Barossa community. Members have heard it from me ad nauseam. I have been quiet about it for a little while but it is time to raise it again as we do the bilaterals for the upcoming state budget. I am hopeful that the government will give it some consideration. I was encouraged by reading *The Advertiser* yesterday where the government has almost admitted that it needs to spend more money on infrastructure because it is causing some concern and it is impeding the development of our state. I could not agree more.

This is an incidence where a powerhouse of the state's economy, the Barossa Valley, is being handicapped because a lot of visitors go there and they cannot believe that the

physical hospital facilities we have are so far below par. Sir, when you served on the Public Works Committee with me in the previous parliament, several times the bureaucrats from the Department of Health came in and we saw that the priority for the Barossa hospital was on top of the list, but it never seemed to get the funding. So, the political games go on.

Mr Williams interjecting:

Mr VENNING: It is probably not on top of the list now, as the member for MacKillop tells me—

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Koutsantonis): Order, the member for MacKillop! The member will be heard in silence.

Mr VENNING: I believe that the Barossa population is one of the fastest growing in the state and the government needs to address the situation. The government has lots of options and I offer this advice on a true, apolitical, bipartisan basis, particularly when we live in an era of public-private partnerships and Build Own Operate Transfer projects. There are so many different things. The way I look at it is that the cost of maintaining the two outdated hospitals in the Barossa at the moment—two very aged facilities—would not be much more than the cost of upgrading a single new unit. The interest on the money would not be much more than what it is costing to run these aged facilities. I hope the government will consider this. The Barossa population is now one of the fastest growing in the state, and it is a key contributor to the economic strength of the state through the wine industry, the food industry, tourism and, of course, most importantly, our people. The Barossa is internationally renowned. Yet, here we have health facilities that are clearly past their use by date.

Only yesterday I hosted a high level delegation from Chile here. They were very pleased to be here and visit our regions, and they cannot stop marvelling at what wonderful facilities we have. They are looking to continue the relationship between the Colchagua Valley in Chile and the Barossa Valley. I am fostering that, and I have had several delegations now visiting to do that. I note that next week the Premier is travelling to Chile and I am very pleased about that because I visited Chile last year and paved the way for a lot of these functions. Now six members of parliament are planning to go to Chile. I am quite optimistic and over the moon about how this has caught on and what a lovely country Chile is. It is such a similar country to ours with the wine industry, its agriculture and the beautiful countryside, too. It is a country of high achievement.

As I said, the Barossa is internationally renowned and everybody wants to know about it. So, when they visit, you hope like heck that they do not need the hospital because they get quite a shock if they go up and see the facilities. Admittedly, they get the most fantastic care in that hospital; the people working there are absolutely marvellous. The quality of the care is exceptional, but they work in the most archaic and antiquated conditions. It is not in keeping with what we would expect from such an iconic district as the Barossa Valley.

The hospital at Angaston was built in the mid-1920s. It was a house in the first instance. The Tanunda facility was built as a hospital in the 1950s and is certainly the better of the two. It would have a future in something else, such as aged care. The Angaston facility is past any redemption at all. Both hospitals are now totally inadequate for the delivery of modern day health care. The staff at these two outdated hospitals provide the best service they possibly can under difficult conditions, and they are to be commended. Both

hospitals continue to be accredited, which is absolutely amazing.

Amongst the various times that I have raised this issue in this house over the years, back in February 2003 I indicated that representatives from the Department of Health had provided evidence to the Public Works Committee (which I just referred to you, sir), of which I was a member at the time. The evidence from the Department of Health included a graph in relation to the age of hospitals in South Australia and how directly proportionate the standard of health care was in relation to the age of those hospitals. At that time, I noted that the worst column on the graph was in respect of hospitals that were 50 years old. There was no column for hospitals older than 50 years, so where does that leave the Barossa's current health facilities—with Angaston hospital over 80 years old and Tanunda now being over 50 years old?

With continued economic growth in the area, more skilled workers will be required. These workers will more than likely be attracted to areas with good health facilities and schools. One case that comes to mind today is Fosters, which has increased its workforce in the Barossa many times. It encourages people from overseas to come to Australia, in fact, even to South Australia. They even encourage them to live in the Barossa. The first thing they do is go into the Barossa, look around, look at our health facilities and, if we are able to convince them to come here and become professional people in our industry, they usually choose to live in Adelaide. Why? Because of the facilities—the transport and hospital facilities. So it is now starting to cause other things to happen. Our old hospital buildings leave a great deal to be desired and would not serve as a drawcard for skilled workers.

It is important, particularly for people who are over 50. A lot of people, as I said, are now choosing to live in Adelaide and commute, and that causes an extra problem with our roads. The biggest growth industry in the Barossa, apart from wine, food and people, is retirement villages and aged care facilities. As Peter Goers said, it is God's waiting room, second only to Victor Harbor. People go there to retire. There are marvellous facilities. Of course, in that age group medical requirements are much higher, yet another reason we need to address this problem.

As a background to this issue, in 1996 the former Tanunda and Angaston hospitals merged to form a single entity, the Barossa Area Health Services—which is quite amazing in itself. At that time, there was a clear expectation that facility issues would be addressed. Various studies or consultancies were undertaken: a Joint Review of the Future of Health Services in the Barossa (by KPMG in 1995); a feasibility study on the Nuriootpa site (by Thompson Rossi in 1996); a Strategic Financial Review (by Thompson Rossi in 1997); an Asset Strategic Planning Study (by TC Tomlinson Pty Ltd in 2001); an Environmental Health Risk Assessment (by Barossa Council in 2001); and a Health Planning Projection Study (by Hames Sharley in 2001). All these things happened but still no progress. These studies all clearly demonstrate the poor condition and inadequacy of the building assets at Angaston and Tanunda, and the need to build new health facilities on a new site.

In November 1999, the then Liberal government announced that a new facility would be built at Reusch Park in Nuriootpa. That decision was overturned when the Labor government came to power in March 2002. I have continued to highlight the issue in this house and the media, and I will not cease to do so until this matter is resolved. I have reason

to be hopeful that, at long last, it will be addressed in the coming budget, as I said, because of the media and also because the current minister, the Hon. John Hill, I believe, is an honourable person. He visited the health service in February 2006 and expressed interest in a new facility to be collocated with the Health and Recreation Centre at Magnolia Road, Tanunda, which is a change. I am quite happy to support that change—anything to deliver the new facility.

I am aware that in 2005 the Wakefield Regional Health Service determined that the Barossa health facilities were its top capital works priority. I understand that Barossa Health is of the view that the current facilities are inadequate for the delivery of contemporary health care; redevelopment of the existing facilities is not feasible and neither of the two existing sites is suitable for consolidation of the facility; and construction of a new facility on a new greenfield site is the only feasible option. Furthermore, I understand that the Barossa Health Board of Directors all support a new development on Magnolia Road, on the outskirts of Tanunda.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Leader of the Opposition): I want to make a contribution in this 10 minute griever as the local member for Davenport and raise some issues that are important to my electorate. The main issue in Davenport is the lack of traffic planning. I am glad that the Minister for Transport is here because it is the traffic matter that the electors of Davenport are very concerned about. Blackwood Park has put another 600 homes into the Blackwood catchment area, and another 600 homes are to be built in the next four years. That is a 20 per cent increase in Blackwood's population over that period, and no money has been spent on improving the road infrastructure.

The problem in Davenport is that the roads into the city are essentially down Old Belair Road or new Belair Road, but primarily Old Belair Road. The traffic from Flagstaff Hill, Coromandel Valley and all the catchment in the Mitcham hills files down two roads, and it is a logjam. Much of the traffic has to go over the Adelaide-Melbourne railway line twice—at the Blackwood crossing and the Glenalta crossing, which are only about 1½ to two kilometres apart. Then there is the Blackwood roundabout, which is a five-road roundabout, not dissimilar to Britannia, but smaller, and it handles a huge volume of traffic.

The problem is that the increase in traffic is so great that the morning traffic is backed up nearly to the roundabout, which would be a distance of some five to seven kilometres. If the train goes through at the wrong time at Glenalta crossing, the traffic banks up virtually back to the roundabout. On the journey home the problem is that the Blackwood railway crossing is about only 200 metres from the roundabout. So, when the train goes through—and we are talking about goods trains that are about 1.5 kilometres long—the traffic backs up to the roundabout and it then stays on the main road. It cannot progress through the roundabout, and the whole thing becomes jammed. That is before the extra 600 houses are built over the next four years.

The government has done a management plan for the traffic from essentially the top of Belair to the roundabout. It has not done a management plan for the road from Belair, down Old Belair Road, down the new Belair Road, along Unley Road and, indeed, along Fullarton Road. Even the management plan that it has done for the main street has no money attached to it, according to the department's press release. There are major traffic issues within the Mitcham hills. I have raised this consistently and I will continue to do

so. Not only am I concerned about traffic congestion, which is a major issue that is becoming unworkable and will become unworkable, I also fear the capacity of the district to evacuate in time of fire.

The district has excellent CFS services. It has not seen a major bushfire on the scale of an Ash Wednesday for over 50 or 60 years, and a whole generation of people who live in that area have not had to face that sort of threat because of the excellent service that we have. But, if they do get the fire on the wrong day, the capacity of the district to evacuate, if the road structure is not increased, is something that is raised with me by local residents consistently, because they are concerned about it.

Another issue is public transport. Cuts have been made to public transport in the Davenport electorate, which has not been well received. We will be taking that up with the minister in due course. We have also been lobbying the minister now for over a year for improvements to train infrastructure both at Eden Hills and more recently at the Glenalta Railway Station, because one way to offset the traffic is to improve the public transport facilities of both trains and buses.

I hope that in the coming budget the Flagstaff Hill Primary School gets a guernsey for its upgrade. I remember going to the school and doing a tour with the school principal and a senior departmental official. Just standing on the ground, you could poke your finger through the gutter, the roof leaked, and there was a whole range of issues. That school is definitely in need of a major upgrade. I know that the school is putting in the appropriate applications, and I will keep working with the school in relation to its upgrade. The other one that I hope might be able to get a guernsey of some description is the Hawthorndene Primary School which is seeking to build a sports hall. An excellent fundraising committee operates at the school and, hopefully, that school might get a guernsey at some stage or other from the government for a grant towards that facility.

The other issue is that of train noise. In the Mitcham hills train noise is a significant environmental issue. People in this house might find it difficult to believe the level and intensity of the squeal that a 1.5 kilometre freight train at 3 o'clock in the morning can actually make. The noise is incredible. We have been working with the EPA for about six years now trying to resolve the matter. The company concerned, ARTC, a federal government corporation, has spent, I think from memory, around \$2 million to try to fix that problem. However, residents are continually raising that issue as not necessarily improving, so we may have to go back to the EPA to seek other solutions to that matter.

They are just some of the issues that we hope might be addressed in the forthcoming budget that will help the electorate of Davenport. Another area would be traffic lights or a roundabout treatment of the Laffers Road/Main Road intersection, particularly with the increased traffic out of Blackwood Park. The reality is that people will not be able to access Main Road from Laffers Road to come to Adelaide to work very easily unless there is some improvement. They are already having a lot of trouble, so there should be a roundabout or traffic lights at that particular intersection. Blackwood High School has been lobbying for many years to get traffic lights at the corner of Seymour Road and Shepherds Hill Road. We will continue to work with the Mitcham Council and the state government in the hope of funds.

The other area that needs treatment is the James Road/Old Belair Road intersection, which is where I really started this speech and which is part of that problem that exists with early morning traffic jams, because all the traffic out of what is known as the bottom road, Upper Sturt Road, into James Road, runs into the traffic down Old Belair Road, and is an absolute logjam. We must have the most courteous drivers in Adelaide, I think, because the drivers out of the main road virtually stop and let the traffic out of James Road even though it is an illegal manoeuvre. They do that because they realise that it is the only way people out of James Road are ever going to access the traffic stream. Hopefully, some of those issues might be dealt with in the forthcoming budget.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite): I rise as the lead speaker for this particular debate to draw a conclusion to some of the comments that have been made by various members of the house. We have heard some points made that seem to be repeated by member after member, and they paint a picture. It is a picture of a government that has enjoyed buoyant revenues for the last five years. It is a picture of a state that came from the chaos of the State Bank collapse in 1993 with \$11.6 billion worth of the debt inherited from Labor and from Premier Mike Rann and Treasurer Foley, who were linked to that government in various roles, and a \$300 million per year current account deficit.

In effect, we were in the red. It took eight years to sort out the mess: eight years of tough Liberal government when efficiencies had to be made and debt had to be reduced with some tough decisions like asset sales. This Labor government collapsed into government, really, in 2002, and I say 'collapsed into government' because I do not think it actually won back government, to be perfectly fair. I think we on this side handed it over, to a large degree. That has clearly resulted in some reflection on our part. However, I do not think the government really earned it back. It certainly did not deserve it back, but it fell into its lap.

Of course, by then the tough decisions had been made, and the house has heard, as the contributions have been made to this supply debate, about the buoyant revenues: the \$2 835 million worth of windfall gains from 2001-02 to 2005-06 above and beyond what was originally intended and the buoyant revenues from property taxes from the GST. The house has heard that Labor opposed all those measures that are now contributing to these financial windfalls: the GST, from which the government now benefits, and the sale of ETSA, which Standard and Poor's and others have clearly confirmed as a principal reason why the state's finances have been turned around. The house has heard that, in essence, these have been perhaps the five easiest years that any government could have hoped to enjoy.

There could not have been five easier years in which to be Treasurer or in which to present a Supply Bill such as we have before us, because of these buoyant revenues. The house has heard that balancing the budget these last five years could have been done by Blind Freddie with one arm tied behind his back. The reason is simple: the revenues have simply been collapsing across the counter of the government year after year. The house has also heard from the contribution of members that, as the money has been swallowed, so too has the belt been let out. As the size of government has grown—and other members have given the figures on that—so money has been wasted on various designs, large cabinets of 15, silly infrastructure projects that do not form part of an overall design, like trams down King William Street and opening

bridges across the Port River, and an array of other wasteful measures, cost blowouts on major projects etc.

Most important, of course, as the house has heard, are the swollen ranks of the Public Service. The house has also heard that, if this government had simply said to itself, 'We will be lean, we will be mean, we will contain our costs and use these buoyant extra revenues to build for the future,' much could have been achieved. The house has heard that all is not well in our competitive position relative to the other states with which we compete and that, although these have been buoyant times, our share of the national economy has continued to decline and our performance in such areas as employment, gross state product, state final demand, state merchandise exports, retail trade, new motor vehicle sales, etc. has been very close to the bottom of the pack for each of the last five years. Although we have gone forward, we have gone nowhere near as far forward as the other states.

The house has also heard from members' contributions that our performance in areas like consumer price index increases, capital investment construction work done, engineering construction activity and other indicators has been very much below the national average. It is therefore little wonder that we ask ourselves what really has been achieved in the past five years. I am really searching for the major signals of the government's achievements over five years, and I am talking about achievements that might not have come automatically, given the buoyant economic times we and the nation are experiencing, thanks by and large to the good effort of the Howard federal Liberal government, which has created the environment in which we prosper.

To be fair, I give the government credit for some initiatives. The idea of having a State Strategic Plan was a good idea. I must say that I argued strongly, when we were in government, for a similar proposition. I think the idea was a good one. Unfortunately, to an extent it was an opportunity missed, because clearly the Economic Development Board (which, after all, constructed the State Strategic Plan after its State of the State report) was clearly warned off any of the key controversies. For example, industrial relations hardly appeared in the State Strategic Plan. There was little there that involved, in meaningful terms, the expenditure of money. There was little in there of substance on significant tax reforms. A lot of the key things that you might have looked for in terms of restructuring the state economy were not in the State Strategic Plan.

However, there were some good things in it. Regrettably, though, I think it has lost its way and become a list of targets, if you like, that have been intentionally set low, knowing that by and large they will be achieved and there can be some sort of mutual hugging process at the end saying, 'Haven't we done well.' I do not get a sense that South Australia has been transformed in the past five years, that the economy has been transformed. Again to give the government some credit, I think there have been some positive signals. I concur in the Premier's comment that mining exploration has been buoyant.

Of course, in an economy where resource prices are through the roof at record highs, and where there is extraordinary demand for minerals, of course you will get increased mineral exploration. I think that the government, to an extent, has gone out of its way not to get in the road of that, and that is commendable. I am intrigued and pleasantly amused that the Premier, who once wrote a booklet defying the need for the Roxby Downs development and proclaiming that anything to do with uranium should never be considered and,

in effect, that the Roxby Downs development should never occur, now is a born-again convert to the need for Roxby Downs, and is out there advocating its cause and its future. Of course, it is that expansion of Roxby Downs which is predominantly responsible for the positive signals we are seeing in terms of mineral performance.

There is a lot of other mineral exploration going on, but the government still holds to its Labor Party constraints on uranium mining, for example, which I hope will be binned at the next national conference and dispensed with. There have been some positive developments in mining and, by and large, I do not think they are due very much at all to the efforts of the state government. I think they are largely, as I said, a consequence of global market factors and national policies. However, to its credit, I think the government has tried not to get in the way. I think it could have done a lot more to help.

I think another good thing that the government has done, to be fair, is not to get in the way of further defence investment in this state. I think that the idea of continuing with the former Liberal government's ideas of a defence unit within the Department of Industry and Trade as we had it structured, but under the new arrangements as they have it structured, was a good one. Not throwing out that idea of developing the defence industry when they took over government was, I think, a positive. They could have walked away from what we started, but they did not. I think Admiral Scarce and his group were able to help in the case to get the AWD project to South Australia although, of course, it was a federal government decision, not a Rann government decision, and it was really a victory for the ASC, not for the state Labor government, even though I note the premier was quick to try to take all the credit for it. But to be fair, as I have said, I think the government did not get in the way and did what it could to help. I think those things are a positive and have been helpful.

But, of course, there are so many other things that have not been done; there are so many other opportunities that I think have been missed. For example, I do not see this government making a meaningful effort to transform the state economy. Sure, mining has grown and mining exploration has grown; sure, we have won the AWD contract; but whilst those positive things are occurring, we are seeing Mitsubishi and Holden, and other key players in the manufacturing sector, slowly withering on the vine. That is a cause for real concern, and it is widespread across the manufacturing sector. The government did a lot of things like scrapping certain business units the former government had created, such as the Centre for Innovation, Business and Manufacturing (CIBM), only to re-create similar devices four years later when they realised their mistake. I think their cuts to the Department of Industry and Trade were far too savage at first, and that the economy has suffered as a consequence.

Manufacturing has not had a helping hand reached out to it by this government, and it is suffering. I simply ask: when the minerals boom—a global minerals boom—subsides, what will be left? We know that it will subside, and we must then ask: if Mitsubishi is gone and if Holden has declined, and if other manufacturing centres have collapsed or closed—and there has been a string of them—what will be left? I think that the government has missed an opportunity to carry manufacturing forward and come up with a new paradigm. I think that paradigm should have been linked to innovation, and to linking our universities and our centres of excellence more closely with manufacturing. I know that there has been

rhetoric about that, as well as symbolic gestures and glossy brochures from the government. I am thinking of their strategy ST10, I am thinking of projects like SABRENet and certain other projects which are small gestures, but a much more significant investment would have been needed—and it was needed five years ago—if we were really to transform manufacturing.

Frankly, you need now to be innovating your way to success in economies like ours, not producing 'me too' types of manufactures and hoping to keep up with China, Thailand, Malaysia, Korea and other players who have cost factors of production far more competitive than ours. So I think that is a missed opportunity. I also think that the rural sector—and this is particularly evident in primary exports—has declined under this government. Although we have been experiencing an extraordinarily tough drought in the last 12 months to two years, that has not been the case for the whole of the five years of this government, and I think that the government could have moved much more swiftly in regard to maintaining rural exports. I will come to infrastructure later.

In my view, the government has really missed the opportunity to address questions of state competitiveness, and key stakeholders have pointed them in the right direction. The principles the government could have applied to what it is doing would be to ensure that the underlying cost structure of the state's economy is recognised as a critical factor in achieving competitiveness. That means that micro-economic reform in the area of taxes and charges related to the cost of doing business should have been a priority much sooner. Instead, taxation and revenue have gone up by around 42 per cent in the life of the government and, of course, that does not promote competitiveness.

Market reforms should have been pursued more earnestly in areas like deregulation, the diligent application of competition policy, and the implementation of principles such as competitive neutrality. Instead, the government has hitched its horse to opposing the federal government's workplace reforms and, frankly, that is a step backwards in terms of labour market flexibility and competitiveness.

There should have been a greater focus on attracting appropriate investment to maximise labour and capital productivity, and business infrastructure should have been provided or facilitated more earnestly through a partnership between government and the private sector. Infrastructure includes appropriate regulation, traditional hard infrastructure (including transport and communication services) and soft infrastructure, but it includes access to human and financial resources and what I would call intellectual infrastructure, which I think has been neglected by this government.

Business infrastructure in the state needs to be cost effective and efficient and, frankly, the current government has not invested its resources wisely in transforming the economy in these ways. The government could have set better targets for reduction in the government's consumption expenditure, perhaps as a ratio of GSP. Instead, we have seen government swell. The government could have benchmarked the state budget allocation for investment in capital expenditure and infrastructure development, but it has not. It could have reduced payroll tax to levels that place South Australia at a competitive advantage over other states and territories. Instead, we are one of the least competitive states.

Clearly, the Treasurer has won every round in cabinet. You cannot have Treasury running your government. You can get away with it in buoyant economic times, as we have experienced for the last five years, but it does not work as a

long-term strategy. Governments are about people, businesses and families: they are not just about bean counting. I am disappointed to see that the government has not genuinely developed an index of the state's competitive position relative to other states that is reported annually at state budget time. Instead, we have seen gloss in an effort to promote raw increases without looking at our relative increase compared to other states which, of course, looks worse.

Necessary services have not been provided by government for business, particularly in the area of planning and development assessment. I note that the government has made some changes. Some of them, I think, have been improvements, but some of them have been a step backwards. Government should always aim to provide efficiency, and government should continue the development and implementation of micro-economic reforms aimed at encouraging competitive markets. Instead, the state government, as I mentioned, has linked itself to going backwards on workplace reforms, and there are still bountiful quantities of red tape before businesses as an obstacle to their success. Really, the government has not meaningfully helped business and the wider community to translate our broader competitive advantages as a state into business opportunities. I think there have been pockets where the government has performed better, and I have mentioned the AWD project and mining exploration where I think it has made an effort to help.

However, so many other areas of our economy have been left to their own devices, and the government has been proud of it. The government says, 'We're not in the business of helping. We're not in the business of intervening. Let business survive on its own merit.' All that is true, all that is very doctrinaire, but be aware that if you are not prepared to work cooperatively with business to grow their opportunities and to help them succeed, they will relocate. The markets are in the eastern states: they are not here. Many of the competitive advantages are naturally in the eastern states and in other places—for some businesses it is China or other destinations in our region where they are increasingly moving manufacturing.

If you leave it, it will move. You need to find a way to keep it here. As I said, that does not mean you must subsidise it. That is the wrong strategy. That is a strategy for crisis times. Some of that was necessary in the period 1993 to about 2000 when the state was in a financial crisis and a basket case. Yes, extraordinary measures were needed. Head offices were leaving in droves after the State Bank's collapse. Those were strategies appropriate to their time. Better strategies now in the current, buoyant economic times, as I mentioned, would be to link our centres of excellence with businesses so as to give them competitive advantages which put them ahead of other states and nations in our region and which require a big investment from state government.

The government could have identified and implemented priority infrastructure development projects according to a schedule and a budget by producing something more than a glossy infrastructure discussion paper dressed up as an infrastructure plan, and I will come back to that point later. The principles of industry development that I would have liked to see applied by this government would have been a total recognition that economic growth and development is driven by the private sector, not by government. Instead, the government has gone out of its way to bring back into government certain outsourced functions whilst curiously being quite happy to support certain things it railed against in opposition. For example, it seems more than happy to

continue with the three bus contracts for the operation of our public transport bus system. It is delighted; it suddenly realised that it was a great thing to do but, of course, it was viciously opposed to it in opposition. It is quite happy to thumb its nose at the unions now and continue with the project.

I have not seen the government rushing to back out of the United Water contract for the ongoing maintenance and management of our water infrastructure assets, which the government and the people of South Australia own. It seems quite happy with the arrangement. I think it has about four years of a 15-year contract to run. Let us see whether the government renews it. I have not seen the government rushing to buy back any component part of our electricity infrastructure assets. Huge slices of it have been on the block for sale in the last five years and could have easily been purchased back. The government railed against the privatisation of ETSA but now argues that it cannot unscramble the egg. Well, it is easy, really. Just go back to the bank, borrow all the money again and buy it back.

These questions expose the government's shallowness and hypocrisy, and that is all it is—blatant hypocrisy. A better balance should have been struck between achieving economic growth for the state through the development of local companies and the attraction of significant new companies to South Australia. Government's resources need to be directed towards the attraction of new companies to the state as well. A clear demonstration of local benefits should be included and a set criteria used to assess any proposal coming forward. Few head offices have relocated to South Australia in the life of this government. The development of appropriate, specific infrastructure, as I mentioned, should have been a better priority.

Business incubators, business networks and industry clusters should have been encouraged more earnestly as important structural arrangements for economic business growth and development. Innovation, including research and development, should have been better encouraged, and money should have been spent in that area. It has not been. Business and the government need to collaborate to facilitate trade promotion and investment attraction. There simply has not been enough of that.

South Australia needs to strive to be an innovation state, not just in words but also in reality. That is going to require the creation of some new structures. I recommend to members the model presented by the California Institute of Technology in Los Angeles which has expertise in the space industry but which has developed around it a cluster of innovative space technology companies that have now become world leading and world class. We need to find the things we are good at and ensure that our universities and centres of excellence are so good at them that they are world leading and build industries around them.

The government went out of its way to try to abandon the Centre for Plant Functional Genomics at Waite. There were huge efforts undertaken, as we understand it, to scupper that project in cabinet when the Labor Party first came to government. The contracts had been signed, and I know that because when I was a minister I had them signed and it was too late to cancel. A year later the Premier was up there opening it as a prime example of how the Rann government was going forward with innovation and science, the very project it tried to scupper. In fact, the Centre for Plant Functional Genomics is a good example of a competitive edge we have that needs to be nurtured. There are many more

examples, and the government needs to find them and make sure they are fixed. But it is really infrastructure that, as the house has heard during the course of this supply debate, is in a lamentable state, and that is simply because the government has ignored it.

Of course, the government is delighted to be able to say in its infrastructure plan that energy infrastructure now is the responsibility of the private sector. As I told the house previously, imagine if energy infrastructure was still the responsibility of the Minister for Energy. He cannot build a Northern Expressway; he cannot build two underpasses along South Road without getting it hundreds of millions of dollars wrong; he cannot run the trains on time; and he cannot build a Bakewell Bridge replacement without its budget blowing out by about 30 per cent. He can't knit—he can't stitch two threads together! Imagine if he was building power stations and running the power supply system: I would be down at the supermarket buying candles. God knows what sort of a state we would be in. If you read the infrastructure plan, when it comes to energy infrastructure the Minister for Infrastructure just says 'private sector, private sector'. He hates privatisation, but isn't he delighted now that someone else is pulling out their cheque book and having to build the infrastructure for the future! Nevertheless, more needs to be done there. As it turns out, the minister and the government love privatisation and love the new arrangements, and have shown no sign whatsoever of reversing the situation.

There are a number of principles the government could have better understood in regard to the way infrastructure works but I simply say that it needs to ensure, despite climate change and the challenges we face with possible coal taxes or carbon trading, that we are provided with adequate supplies of affordable energy. It has to deliver on the promises it made. But I will not dwell on that. I will move to water, because that is an area of infrastructure that has been terribly neglected.

We are now facing the prospect of having to build a stupid weir at Wellington as a crisis measure because, for five years, a government awash with cash has not been prepared to build desalination plants or stormwater catchment plants on what available open space there is. It will not even consider using Cheltenham as a prospect. They say they have done all the research and it does not add up. I have asked the minister to provide the research to the Public Works Committee, and I hope he will, so that someone else can look at that and satisfy themselves that it is ruled out. We still have water pipes leaking, and our reservoirs need work. The government has not done the work and now we are having to look at a stupid weir at Wellington that will do enormous damage, not only to the people of Hammond but also to the entire state, because the government fell asleep at the wheel. It needs to get on with building that infrastructure.

I move to the topic of roads, about which much has been said during the course of this debate. They cannot plan a weekend barbecue, let alone a road, and their plans are extraordinarily underwhelming. I hear this government and the minister talking about this being the greatest expenditure of money the world has ever seen on infrastructure, but it is just palpably untrue. If you take the Northern Expressway as an example, I think the budget is \$550 million on a 20-80 funding basis with the commonwealth, so it is something like \$120 million of state government money. The project will take five years to build. That is something like \$20 million a year out of the state government coffers that the minister is going to stump up out of a budget of over \$12 billion, and he

reckons it is the greatest expenditure on roads the world has ever seen.

It is a disappointing Supply Bill, and it has been a disappointing budget. There is much work that remains undone. In five years, far from being transformed, we have stood still. Our competitiveness with other states and our share of the national economy has remained relatively static in five years. I simply ask: what will be the legacy of this government when we get rid of it in 2010? They will look back and say, 'What did we achieve?' The Nemer case!

Mrs Geraghty: Many things. Many wonderful things.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: Let us just wait and see, member for Torrens. There is no such thing as an election that cannot be lost and no such thing as an election that cannot be won. So I would ask: what is this government's legacy so far, and what will it be in three years' time? There is no legacy.

Time expired.

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond): I wish to make some remarks regarding supply in relation to my electorate of Hammond. As everyone is aware, we were caught off guard in Hammond when we found that we were to get the new men's and women's prisons, and I wonder what other infrastructure is being planned by the government, because obviously we will need hundreds of homes for the people who work in the prison system. Now that Murray Bridge knows it will get the new prisons, the local council and I are willing to work with the government to get the best outcome for Murray Bridge.

We know that there can be some negatives in having prisons in your community, but we will be working to achieve positive outcomes. Combined with that, I believe that we need to fast-track (and I did mention this in my second reading contribution) the new police station and court complex because, at present, prosecutions have been transferred to Mount Barker. It is not a thing to which we like to lay claim, but Murray Bridge has a higher crime rate than Mount Barker and our prosecution work has had to be transferred because of inadequate courtroom facilities. I believe that it will return to Murray Bridge, but the whole process of upgrading the police station and court complex needs to be fast-tracked to keep up with future demands which will be exacerbated by having the new prison infrastructure in the community.

One thing on which I will commend the government—and I worked with the Minister for Infrastructure—is getting the railway land freed up in Murray Bridge above the river. So long as we have a river, it will be a great thing to see a five-star accommodation development on the cliff. However, what I would like to see is the money put back into Murray Bridge because, with the construction of new prisons and manufacturing development not just in Murray Bridge but at Monarto and to meet the needs of people in the community, more development is needed as far as shopping centres and so on in the town. I go back to the Mallee task force funding. This was something which was addressing the social needs of people in the Mallee. It is a little ironic that the funding was cut not long after the 2006 election campaign when the government ran political offices—the Office of the North, then the Office of the Murray in Murray Bridge. It threw hundreds of thousands, if not millions, around during the election campaign, yet it cannot support social welfare work in the Mallee.

Another matter on which I will commend the government is its work with exceptional circumstances. It had to be dragged in by communities who did all the local work early on, but PIRSA came on board. I congratulate the staff at PIRSA who spent weekends finalising the submissions to get exceptional circumstances reports completed for the community. It was pleasing to see that the Murray-Mallee area and the Upper South-East received exceptional circumstances funding. The River Murray corridor (which is for irrigators from the mouth of the river through to the Riverland and through to the Victorian border) is under review by NRAC and the federal minister, Minister McGauran. They have been given interim funding support. That is a great move for exceptional circumstances, but it will be a while yet, possibly a month or so, before we see whether the irrigators will receive exceptional circumstances funding.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

Mr PEDERICK: Yes, the member for Bragg said, 'Great work by the local member.' This whole drought situation which caused the area to apply for exceptional circumstances involved a drought impact reference group of which I was a member. One of the references included the social, environmental and economical effects of the current drought on the area. One thing that could not be included in that reference was the word 'weir', because the government is allergic to it. The point is that it raised this matter in November without consultation and said that it would build a \$20 million weir. If it looked back at the studies, as the engineers did when they undertook the studies for this weir in the 1930s, it would have realised that it was not appropriate to build a weir on a narrow section of the river, so the \$20 million option was never on.

As part of the social reference the consultant, Jonathon Sobels, went out with his brief and was told not to mention the weir, but it was the first thing people mentioned. They said their fear was having their water cut off not only for this year but for next year, the year after and maybe for the next 10 or 12 years. As far as I am concerned, there is nothing temporary about 700 000 to one million tonnes of rock going into that river, the greatest river system in this country. Now it has made the list as one of the most endangered river systems in the whole world, which is just disgraceful, as I mentioned in my previous contribution, due to over allocation and other matters. What would the Rann government be remembered for? This is something with which the press was trying to come to terms. There were not any big answers.

All right, it has created a strategic plan for South Australia—and it is a great thing, we need to plan—but what are the targets? As far as infrastructure, it says, 'We will increase spending.' What does that mean? It will put another white post on the side of a road. It means nothing. The one thing I want to happen under the Rann government is for it to continue its non-spending in regional areas as far as this weir is concerned. I would hold up that as a monument to success in Hammond if this damn weir never goes ahead, because it is not necessary. The pumps at their lower stage will be in water until next March. Under water restrictions, Adelaide will survive for another 12 months. So, Adelaide will have water two years from now. We need other infrastructure planning than using an 18th century so-called solution for fixing a lack of infrastructure planning over the past five years.

We need to look at lowering pumps further, building new pump stations upstream of the locks and running the water into Adelaide and country towns and just getting on with the job. I firmly believe that this weir will destroy the quality of

Adelaide's water and then where does the government go from there? It will truly learn the folly of its ways—and that will be the one thing, if nothing else, that will bring this government down.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Koutsantonis): I call the member for MacKillop.

Members interjecting:

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop): I am more than happy to defer to any of the members of the government because during the supply debate and the opportunity to grieve, I have noted a distinct lack of contributions by government members. I can understand that because I am aware of the embarrassment it would cause any member of this government to have to stand up and justify the way that they have run the Treasury over the past five years. I can understand, also, why government members are reticent to enter this grievance debate, knowing there is nothing that they can actually say which would be gratifying to either themselves or their constituents regarding the way the state has been run over the past five years.

I want to canvass a number of important issues in the 10 minutes I have available to me. I want to pick up on the topic my colleague the member for Hammond was talking about at the end of his contribution, namely, the proposal to build a weir at Pomanda Point, where the Murray River enters Lake Alexandrina, which is very close to my electorate. Of course, it would have a devastating effect on a number of my constituents, particularly those on the Narrung Peninsula at Meningie who are largely dairy farmers and who will be severely handicapped by the construction of that weir. I agree with what the member for Hammond said, and I will take it further. One thing that the government has failed to do is take seriously Adelaide's water supply. The one thing it should be doing is building a desal plant. I note that the government sent a team to look at the desal plant that has recently been constructed, and pretty well fully commissioned, south of Perth at Kwinana. I am delighted that even at the eleventh hour the government sent a team of people over there to have a look at that.

I hope that they got the same report that I received with some of my colleagues when I visited that site back in November when the myth about the cost of building a desal plant, which had virtually doubled in the past three years, was exploded. We were told that that doubling was not the case: rather, that the cost might have escalated slightly, but only slightly. We were told that if South Australia was keen to get on board and make a decision to build a desal plant, the cost would not be significantly different to what it was in Western Australia. The Minister for Water Security told the house recently that it would cost twice as much; that is totally wrong. I think, now that the minister has sent a team over there to talk to people on-site about the joint venture between Degremont and Multiplex, she would have received the same information that we had, and it is time the minister came back into the house to apologise for misinforming the house at that earlier time.

I spoke earlier in the supply debate about WorkCover and the severe problems it is facing as a result of its total mismanagement under the current minister and government over the past five years. It was brought to my attention from the coalface during the last week that WorkCover has become incredibly miserable with the people it works with, and I am talking about the employers who are obliged to pay to WorkCover their levy by the seventh day of each month. One

of my constituents (a farmer) tells me that for a long period he has used the BPAY system. He does not necessarily have an obligation to make a payment every month, although I think this particular farmer does have a levy obligation most months.

BPAY is an organisation which carries out electronic payment of accounts. They have a contract with WorkCover, as I understand it, and this particular constituent uses that service to pay his WorkCover levy every month, and he has been doing that for a long time. Recently, he received a notice that his payment was late because it came in after the seventh day of the month, and I think for about a \$150 levy payment he received a fine of about \$100. Apparently, he has arranged for BPAY to take the money out of his business account on the seventh day of the month and, as far as he is concerned, it was transferred straight into WorkCover and everything worked properly; that is the way it has been working for years. Apparently, when he received the fine notice, it came to his attention that BPAY does not necessarily transfer the money to the final recipient on the same day that it takes it out of the account. Apparently, there is often a lag of three or four days, and that is how he got caught. As far as he was concerned, he had made the arrangement and did the right thing for the money to be transferred from his business account on the seventh day of the month to WorkCover but, unfortunately, it is not turning up at WorkCover for some days after the seventh.

Now WorkCover, because it has about \$1 billion unfunded liability and huge debts mounting, has become very miserable, and I assume this is not an isolated case. They have sent him a late payment fine of about \$100 for about a \$150 levy payment. How miserable can you get! The problem is that it is WorkCover's problem. WorkCover has the arrangement with BPAY and it should be sorted out at that end. However, if it cannot do that, I suggest that WorkCover, if it has arrangements whereby the money transfer will take three to four days, should shift the due date back beyond the seventh day of the month. It should be at least the tenth day or some date after the tenth because, for a business operator to calculate their liability—and bear in mind that the first couple of days of the month may be a weekend—and make the arrangements to pay through the BPAY service, if there is then a four-day delay on that, it could be argued that it is almost impossible for the normal operator of a business, particularly a small business, to have done that and have the payments made by the seventh. I call on the minister to have a serious look at that and either sort out the arrangement that WorkCover has with the BPAY organisation, or shift the due date back a couple of days in the month so that small business operators can in fact comply with their obligations.

Another issue that I want to briefly talk about is country health. My colleague the member for Schubert earlier talked about the requirement for a new hospital at Angaston, in his electorate. I commend him for bringing that matter yet again to the attention of the house, but I take him to task a little on that matter. He maintains that the highest priority in country health is a new hospital at Angaston, but I believe that the highest priority in country health is a new hospital in Naracoorte. It is my understanding that Naracoorte has been at the top of the priority list within country health for probably six or seven years at least, if not a little longer.

The hospital at Naracoorte is very old, and I have been through it a number of times. It is a series of buildings which have been added to and added to and added to. To be quite honest, in this day and age, with the sort of service that we

are delivering out of our hospitals, that building is just not up to it. It has plenty of bricks and mortar, but that is about all. The sort of services that go with running a modern hospital and delivering a modern health service are just beyond it. We need a huge upgrade to the Naracoorte Hospital. I am delighted that the Minister for Health has come in because he has visited the Naracoorte Hospital at least several times, if my memory serves me well, and is fully aware of the state of the infrastructure there. I would urge the minister to ensure that, for once, in the budgetary process which is occurring at the moment through the bilaterals, money is made available to start upgrading some of our country hospitals.

When we were in government we upgraded a number of country hospitals and made up for the backlog that had been created by the previous Bannon/Arnold Labor governments. We started to get to the point where we had almost caught up but, unfortunately, over the last five years the backlog has started to grow again, and the good people of Naracoorte have had enough.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Treasurer): I would like to thank members for their contribution. I have listened very closely to the contribution of all members and I have learned quite a bit. I am not one of these treasurers who think they know everything, and I have never been like that. I am more than happy to consider alternative views and opinions of my learned colleagues from this side and, indeed, even from the opposition.

I have discovered that one thing is a given in this business: that parliaments, governments and oppositions are full of people who know how to spend money and know where they should spend money, or at least offer views on how to spend money. Very few people ever actually stand up in this place and say how we should not spend money. I do not offer that as a criticism; it is just a statement of fact. I always listen to members opposite talk about how we are not spending on this particular function, how we are not spending on that function, and why we are a horrible government because we have not done X or we are not doing Y.

The reality is that this government is an extremely prudent manager of the state's finances. That is demonstrated by achieving balanced budgets in each of our budgets since we have come to office. It is demonstrated by the fact that we brought down budgets that delivered to the state a AAA credit rating. We are a government that spends money prudently, but we cannot spend what we do not have. One thing that always amuses me, particularly from members like the deputy leader or the would-be leader, the member for Waite, is that they are almost reborn socialists in that they think everything can be fixed by simply printing money.

Mr Hamilton-Smith: I have lots of cuts to recommend.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: The member for Waite says he has lots of cuts to recommend. I did not hear any in his speech.

Mr Hamilton-Smith: Well, you didn't listen to it.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Didn't I? What were they?

Members interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: \$200 million? Well, the deputy leader said she gave us \$200 million; is that per year or—

Ms Chapman: The tram, Victoria Park, Modbury Hospital—add them up.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I am amused that the deputy leader has now stated that her position is that she is opposed to Victoria Park.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: How else do you build something—with no money?

Ms Chapman: Think about it.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Think about it! She is not bad, is she! The deputy leader opposes the grandstand, the former leader and shadow minister supports it, the member for Waite supports it, the member for Morphett opposes it.

Mr Williams interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: She opposes it. Yes, one person; but she will vote in support of it. But I tell you what, Robert Gerard supports it. A lot of Liberals support it, but of course we know the deputy leader has to be there in support of her mate and colleague the member for Unley, who is also opposed to it. Ivan Venning supports it. We have a divided Liberal Party—a very divided Liberal Party. As I have said, quite frankly I have enough to do without worrying about building a grandstand, if that is what it comes to. Or do you want to talk about divided cabinets? I could tell you a few stories about your lot. Anyway, I am not here to prolong debate. I thank members for their contribution.

Motion carried.

Bill taken through its remaining stages.

The Hon. P. CAICA (Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education): I move:

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

Motion carried.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (STORMWATER MANAGEMENT) AMENDMENT BILL

Consideration in committee of the Legislative Council's amendments.

The Hon. P. CAICA: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendments be agreed to.

I am advised that the government is accepting all the amendments 1 to 8 from the other place.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: I will speak to the minister's motion. I am pleased to hear that the government can count, and that it realises that, on this issue, it does not have the numbers. The bill has now passed the Legislative Council with eight amendments. The government indicated to me that it would not agree with any of the amendments, but I see that it has had a change of heart. The amendments moved in the upper house on behalf of the opposition included amendments to page 8, after line 31, dealing with the requirement to set out appropriate public consultation processes to be followed. They also included amendments to page 13, after line 34, dealing with agreement by the landowner in accordance with the Land Acquisition Act for access. But, most importantly, in page 16, lines 12 to 21, we wanted to delete the proposed clause 27, which was a reference to the Public Works Committee.

Of the three amendments outlined above, all of which are important, the Public Works Committee requirement is the one that is absolutely essential. I want to clarify an issue with the minister. He is indicating that the government will agree to deleting proposed clause 27, which was an exemption from any public works involving the Public Works Committee. Can I take that as an absolute ironclad assurance from the government that all infrastructure projects above \$4 million will come to the Public Works Committee? I will seek that assurance shortly.

The other four amendments were successfully moved in the other place by the Democrats with the support of the opposition. They deal with the process and issues linked to public consultation, environmental protection and planning arrangements. I am pleased to see that the government will support those measures also. The public works issue is the core issue for the parliament and for the opposition for a range of reasons. The parliament has previously made its views clear on this when it opposed a measure by the government to increase the limit involving projects that needed to come before the Public Works Committee—I think it was to \$10 million. The parliament clearly decided that it did not want to change the limit from \$4 million.

So the parliament is keen to ensure that there is proper probity and review of public investments, and I am not surprised that, in their wisdom, members of the upper house have remained consistent on this issue and that they have amended the bill to that effect so that stormwater works involving more than \$4 million are brought before the Public Works Committee. I think that that is important for several reasons. Not only does it ensure that members of parliament, through their parliamentary committee, get to look at proposals: it also gives an opportunity to members of the public to come and give evidence, to make submissions to the committee, and to attend public hearings to inform themselves about the nature of said public works and the impact it may have on their lives. We are talking about tens of millions of dollars and, over time, hundreds of millions of dollars worth of investments.

Clearly, the members of the other place did not accept the view that because the authority was a vehicle that included local government these were, if you like, local government works and therefore should not come under the scrutiny of the Public Works Committee. I think that they did not accept that view for very good reasons, in particular because of the fact that the Treasurer is underwriting the entire scheme. Frankly, if a large infrastructure investment is undertaken and something goes drastically wrong with it and it goes belly up and gets out of control, it will fall back to the Treasurer at the end of the day. I think that it is clearly the intent of the parliament to ensure that the Public Works Committee works as a last line of defence, if you like, to ensure that there has been some level of scrutiny before these projects are undertaken. I will just run over it again, Pat.

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: No, don't, because they are your amendments, not mine. I don't have an answer for you. They are your amendments.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: I will put the question and, if the minister has no answer, he can say so.

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: They are your amendments.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: Yes, they are our amendments.

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: You give the answer.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: If you would like to listen, I will explain the issue. Would you like to listen?

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: No.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: You would not like to listen?

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: There has never been any point listening to you.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: Thank you for that.

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: But please do go on, as you will anyway.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: I will just continue, if you do not mind. If you can just contain yourself, we will have a go. The other place has decided to delete proposed clause 27

references to the Public Works Committee. As members know, that clause sought an exemption for works above \$4 million so that they did not have to come to the Public Works Committee before proceeding. What I now seek from the government is its advice on the following. It is agreeing to that amendment, that is, the deletion of clause 27—

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: Your amendment.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: Yes, our amendment. You are agreeing to that. Can I take it, then, that the spirit of your decision to agree with that amendment is that all projects over \$4 million will come to the Public Works Committee? Is that the commitment that you are making by agreeing to that provision?

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: They are your amendments.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: Yes, they are. I will explain why. Do you want further explanation?

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: No, I don't.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: I will explain the point to you, then, because during the briefing from your officers they made the point that they were not 100 per cent sure whether matters would have to come before the Public Works Committee but, to ensure that there was no doubt, they put into the bill clause 27, which provided that matters did not need to come before the Public Works Committee.

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: You want me to explain our clause to you? I can't explain your amendment.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: The amendment simply deletes clause 27. I am asking you to explain, with clause 27 deleted, as the bill now stands with these amendments agreed to—

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: You will have to explain your amendment to me. I can't explain it to you.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: I thought I had. I will explain it again.

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: Good. But I won't explain it to you, Marty. Do you understand that? I am not going to explain your amendment to you.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: I am not asking you to explain my amendment.

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: Good. Thank you.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: You haven't listened, obviously. I am not asking you to explain that. I am asking you to explain your bill as it will now stand with that amendment agreed to.

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: With your amendment.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: No, with that amendment agreed to. That amendment deletes clause 27. What I am asking you is: with that clause deleted, which you have now agreed to, does the bill now require absolutely any public work above \$4 million to come to the Public Works Committee?

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: You want me to explain the bill as you have amended it.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: You have agreed to the amendment.

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: No, mate. It's your amendment. You think it's a good idea. You explain why it's a good idea.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: Do you want to stand up? Are you on the record now? Is this an interjection or are you on the record?

Members interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: He wants me to explain the effect of the bill as he amends it!

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: You have obviously considered the amendments. You have agreed to the amend-

ments. The bill will now stand with the amendments. As the bill comes out of this consideration with those amendments agreed to—

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: I think your amendments are stupid, but I think it is important that the bill go ahead. But I think your amendments are stupid.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: Can you guarantee—

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: That your amendments aren't stupid? No.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: Had a couple of drinks, have we, over lunch?

An honourable member: Steady.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: Do you want to make sense or not?

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: I see. The last resort of the foolish.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: No, it is not the last resort. There are many more. There are many more than the last resort.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIR: Order!

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: Will you just answer the question, please, minister?

The CHAIR: Member for Waite, have you finished talking? If you sit down, then I can invite the minister to stand.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I cannot begin to explain why the opposition wants this amendment. What I can explain is that this is a very important piece of legislation for the people of South Australia, to prevent flooding. It will do a lot of works. I think the amendment of the opposition is stupid. I do not think it should ever have been moved, but I do not think we are going to be able to get this bill unless we accept the amendment. That is my logic. I think that, if the member for Waite is confused about what his amendment will do, then he should perhaps move a different amendment or do something else. But it is not my job, having brought a bill to this house that actually does something that has never before been done for the people of South Australia, that does something to address the absence of infrastructure to prevent flooding.

Having done all that, it is not my duty to explain the member for Waite's amendment. My view is that it is utterly unnecessary. It will add about \$25 000 to \$30 000 to the cost of any works should they be brought before the Public Works Committee—every work that is done. It is utterly unnecessary. We are actually doing a piece of work that is worth about \$16.5 million in the Little Para or North Para reservoir. We are doing that now and we are doing that without the necessity for it to go to Public Works. If the member for Waite wants me to explain the effect of the amendment of the Liberal Party, he will have to do a little better himself.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: I take it from the minister's reply that he is now of the view that, as this bill has now been amended and agreed to, any work over \$4 million will be required to come before the Public Works Committee.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I repeat: if the member for Waite wants to know the effect of his amendment to the bill, he should ask himself. It is not my amendment. Had I a choice, and were there any sense in this parliament and in the opposition, we would not have this amendment. If he wants to know what it means, then perhaps he should ask the people who drafted it, and that is not me. I do not believe it is necessary. Let me put on the record that I believe it is an utterly stupid amendment which, if it achieves anything, can

only waste money. If he wants to know what his amendment means, I think he should ask himself.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: Let me just make it very clear that what I am trying to do is make sure that the minister understands the amendment. We on this side understand the amendment. The minister has had advice from his staff and has considered this matter. What I am seeking an assurance about on the record is that the government understands that the effect of this amendment is to require all works above \$4 million to go before the Public Works Committee, because during the briefing his officers expressed some concern about that. They expressed some concern that this clause that has now been removed might not have been necessary. I am wondering whether his officers have said to him, 'Don't worry about it, minister. The fact that this clause is being deleted won't require you still to have matters come before the Public Works Committee. We just thought we would put it in there to be sure; it doesn't matter that it's being knocked out. You won't have to bring matters before the Public Works Committee anyway.' I am wondering whether the minister has received that advice, or does he now understand that the effect of the amendment is that all works above \$4 million will now be required to go before the Public Works Committee? If he simply says yes, we can move on and deal with the bill.

The CHAIR: Minister, do you wish to comment or shall I put the amendment?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I cannot explain to the member for Waite what his amendment means if he does not understand it himself. If the member for Waite does not understand what his amendment means, that simply reveals to this chamber the utter irresponsibility of members opposite when they bring amendments to this place. I have stood here for, I think, five or six minutes having the member opposite ask me what his amendment means. I place on the record that I think the opposition's amendment is stupid and unnecessary, but if it wants to know what it means—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Well, again, I will place on the record exactly the attitude of the government. This bill is enormously important to the people of South Australia. It is an historic agreement with local government to go ahead and create an organisation—

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: We have the resident genius from the opposition in here. What's her name? The member for Bragg. We have here a piece of legislation to create a corporation that is the result of an historic agreement with local government to accelerate works that are extremely necessary. We have a number of amendments, including from the Democrats, who I would describe as the political version of phantom limb syndrome: when your leg has been cut off you keep scratching at it as if it were still there. We also have Liberal Party amendments which are utterly stupid and unnecessary, but what they do not do is erode the essential importance of this legislation.

What I cannot do for the member for Waite is explain to him what his amendment means. I can explain to him that it is stupid and unnecessary and an illustration of why the opposition was so massively slaughtered at the last election: because it is stupid, irrelevant and unnecessary. Will I explain to him what he is trying to do? No, because what I cannot do is discern any reason for what he is attempting to do. He will have to do that for himself.

Motion carried.

BARLEY EXPORTING BILL

Consideration in committee of the Legislative Council's amendment.

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

That the Legislative Council's amendment be agreed to.

Mr VENNING: I remind the committee of my interest in this matter not only as a barley grower but also as a shareholder of ABB, as I have indicated in previous contributions. I always acknowledge that. I support the amendments even though I am most disappointed that this is the end of a 68-year tradition in South Australia. With respect to the amendments, I am pleased that there will be a review of the act within two years. I am very happy about that. Also, the minister is required to table it after six sitting days, which is a good move. The act will also expire after three years.

Most importantly, section 3 of the act will be cancelled so that the statutory text will be restored just as if the bill was never passed in the first place. I think that is very basic. I have put it in basic language so that anyone reading this can understand. I think that the amendments—even though we are now about to shut down 68 years of history—provide some safeguards; and, certainly, I am very supportive of that.

I am most disappointed with the position of the SAFF Grains Council because that council, under Chairman Roberts, caused all the others to wilt and cave in on our single desk. I was pleased that the Legislative Council, which put forward these amendments, gave us the opportunity to discuss this at a public meeting of the SAFF Grains Council. That meeting was held last Friday. I must say how disappointed I am. The Legislative Council gave the farmers an opportunity, a last chance, but only 70 people attended this meeting and, would you believe, the vote was 35 to 33 not to support deregulation of barley, but of wheat. How far out of step was that? They never even discussed the barley, which I thought was absolutely amazing.

I blame the Chairman, Brett Roberts, because he had control of the agenda of the meeting. The barley motion was at the end of the meeting. Of course, they never got to it and it was never discussed. I apologise to upper house members. I thank them for sticking out their necks and holding up the bill to give the farmers an opportunity which they did not take. That is now history. We can all contemplate what could have happened. To show how far out of step it really is on this matter, SAFF became the first grower organisation in Australia to come out with a policy to deregulate or support the abolition of the single desk for wheat.

That flies in the face of all the other recently convened meetings by the federal government across Australia. I attended one meeting of 250 growers at Balaklava and at least 90 per cent of those present were fully supportive of retaining single desk for wheat. So, here we are, flying in the face of reality. I did not raise this matter before, but I think one of the most important reasons to retain the single desk today (which is now not relevant) is to protect the mistakes we made in the past. I remind members of the contribution of the member for Enfield on this issue. It was a brilliant speech. He said it all.

I am most concerned that we should have retained the single desk to protect the mistakes that we made in the past, and I was part of that mistake. In hindsight, it was a terrible mistake to corporatise the ABB and, worse than that, to put our marketer, the ABB, together with our store and handler, the South Australian CBH (latterly called AusBulk). To put

them all together was a great idea at the time but, in hindsight, it was a very serious mistake. Now that the single desk is gone, I feel that the ABB's A class share structure—the means by which farmers control their company—will go. The company is then fully exposed to the stock market and ripe for takeover.

We know that our assets are way under-valued. Any of half a dozen giant international traders would make a bonus offer to the shareholder farmers and they would own it. They would own not only our marketer but also our storage and handling, and guess what else is in those silos? Wheat, and that is the real prize. How unworkable is it for the Australian Wheat Board then to have its wheat in a competitor's silo?

I am most disappointed to realise how all this push to deregulate started. So much misinformation has been peddled. It all started in December 2003 when the headline was peddled that the Western Australian farmers would get \$35 more a tonne for their barley than the South Australian farmers. In fact, comparing apples with apples, and at the end of the pool period, the South Australian growers actually did better than the Western Australian farmers, but we never saw that in the newspaper. As I said, the whole debate was based on this false premise.

Also, the threats made to the SAFF grain section when it still supported single desk need to be made public. Apparently 30 farmers threatened to sue the SAFF Grains Council and involved themselves in some pretty severe provocation. There was mediation, but all this needs to be the subject of public scrutiny. We need to have this discussed in a public place and work out who said what, what action was taken and why it was taken. It needs to be aired in public because it has all happened behind closed doors and has serious repercussions.

Of course, as I have said in previous debates, we had the Round report and the Neil Andrew Barley Committee which were both subject to 'ministerial guidance'. Finally, it is most ironic that the reason the minister has always said that we had to make these changes was to protect our competitive payments in relation to the national competition policy. Well, how ironic is it? The federal government has now changed the onus. Now we do not have to show or prove that we are not competitive. The National Competition Council now has to prove that what we are doing is anti-competitive. This was announced only three or four weeks ago. So, the whole basis for change has gone but, alas, so has the single desk for barley.

It is indeed a sad day, and I apologise to growers. I was unable to win the day. Also, I apologise to members of the government, because I believe that many of them feel the same as I do, and that we did not mean to get to this position, and I think it is a sad day. As the member for Enfield said, and he can have the last hurrah, I think people are going to read this debate in ten years' time and think, 'Well, why the hell did we do this?' We could have held it up. We could have covered the mistakes of the past and held the line. We have not, and the single desk is gone, and I worry for the sake of the industry. I thank all members, particularly the other four who supported me in the debate: I thank them very much. We fought and lost, and we accept the decision of the parliament.

The Hon. J.D. HILL: I thank the member for his contribution. It was passionate, determined and accepting of the resolution. I do not think I have anything further to say other than to thank members for their participation in this debate.

Motion carried.

PHARMACY PRACTICE BILL

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill with the amendment indicated by the following schedule, to which amendment the Legislative Council desires the concurrence of the House of Assembly:

Clause 6, page 11, lines 21 to 23—

Delete paragraphs (b) and (c) and substitute:

- (b) 3 must be persons nominated by the Minister of whom—
- (i) 1 will be a registered member of a health profession other than that of pharmacy; and
 - (ii) 1 will be a legal practitioner; and
 - (iii) 1 will be a person who is not eligible for appointment under a preceding provision of this subsection.

Consideration in committee.

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

That the Legislative Council's amendment be agreed to.

I indicate to the committee that the government moved an amendment in the other place to include in the board a person who had a background as a health professional. This is consistent with a number of the other boards and goes some way to accommodating the interests of the medical profession, which would like to have a say in the practice of pharmacy. I can indicate that I asked my department to talk to the Pharmacy Board and it was happy with this measure, so it is by way of a compromise between the two professions.

Ms CHAPMAN: The opposition supports the amendment on the indication of the minister that the Pharmacy Board has considered this in a positive manner, and, accordingly, we support the same.

Motion carried.

TOBACCO PRODUCTS REGULATION (SMOKING IN CARS) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 14 March. Page 2068.)

Ms CHAPMAN (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): I indicate that the opposition supports this bill. The concerns raised in another place in the debate on this matter include the penalty of \$200 (being the maximum penalty) and no provision for more severe penalties on repeat offenders. They remain issues of concern. I note the contribution of the Hon. Rob Lucas, who highlighted that the council has advised that there are in fact 3 000 people a year more dying from smoking tobacco than 27 years ago. That is, it has moved from 16 000 deaths in 1980 to 19 000 deaths per year at present.

The reason I highlight that is that, when the minister in another place responded on this issue, she suggested that the measures to reduce the number of people smoking would need time to have some effect and that it would take 20 years or more. I found that a very puzzling answer because, as you would know, Madam Deputy Speaker, we have had periods in our history, particularly in the mid-1940s (and we are talking 60 years ago), when tobacco chewing was popular. In fact, free cigarettes were distributed during the war. One would have expected, if the minister was right in her reflections and her response, that after 27 years of positive advocacy and education, as we have had, for example, in helping people to change their habits in motor vehicle use and thus reduce the number of road accidents, we would have seen a similar result in relation to smoking.

The effect of this legislation is to protect children on the basis that they are vulnerable, considering the level of development of their lungs and the like, and accordingly they are at greater risk of asthma, bronchitis and other conditions arising out of passive smoking. We as an opposition can only hope that a bill of this nature will ensure that adult drivers do not smoke whilst driving a motor vehicle which can cause some detriment to the passengers. In this case, the emphasis is on protecting the passengers. With those few words, I indicate our support for the bill.

Mr PISONI (Unley): I am pleased to support this bill. I am not someone who likes to see more and more legislation pushed on society. As a matter of fact, I would like to see smaller governments and people educated and responsible enough that legislation such as this was not needed. However, when I drive around the suburbs of Adelaide with my family in the car, I know that time and again I will see a mother, a father, or an adult with children in the car, and the adult is smoking with the windows up. I cannot understand how they do not realise the damage that they are doing to their children. Obviously they are comfortable with the damage that they are doing to themselves. They are adults and I do not have a problem with their making that choice, but they have no right whatsoever to impose that choice on their children, who are not of an age to make that decision for themselves, nor are they in a position to control the situation in which they are placed.

I know that, if we are serious about community health and stopping the uptake of cigarette smoking by our young, we need to use every measure that we can to ensure that parents understand the damage that they are doing to their children through passive smoking, which inevitably leads to an addiction to nicotine and their children taking up smoking as young adults. We know that is the way that cigarette companies operate. They tell us that competition in the marketing of cigarettes is all about changing brands, but we know that they are looking for new recruits all the time. Anything that can be done to demonise cigarette smoking and to make people understand that cigarette smoking affects their health is worth while. Many people are innocent victims of cigarette smokers when they are forced to breathe in second-hand smoke and passively smoke cigarettes. I endorse what some may describe as draconian legislation, but it is necessary if we are serious about protecting our children from the effects of passive smoking.

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Minister for Health): I thank members for their support for the bill. I indicate to the member for Torrens that the government is also contemplating smoking regulations for people who smoke in cars in which there are dogs.

Mrs Geraghty: Not guilty.

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

TOBACCO PRODUCTS REGULATION (MISCELLANEOUS OFFENCES) AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Minister for Health): I move:
That this bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

The *Tobacco Products Regulation Act 1997* regulates all aspects of tobacco control in South Australia, from the licensing and supply of tobacco products, to restrictions on where smoking can take place. These laws are aimed at reducing the harm caused by tobacco smoking to the South Australian population.

I am pleased to tell the House that recent research has revealed that smoking rates amongst school students is continuing to decline. Less than five per cent of twelve to fifteen year old students reported that they were current smokers in 2005, a huge improvement from 1984 when just over twenty per cent of twelve to fifteen year olds smoked. Enforcement and compliance with all tobacco control measures needs to continue in order to reduce smoking rates even further across all age groups.

To support improved compliance with the *Tobacco Products Regulation Act 1997*, it is proposed that expiation fees be applied to more offences. Currently only ten offences can be expiated (that is, dealt with by way of issuing an on-the-spot-fine) whilst the remaining offences can only be prosecuted through the court system.

The process of prosecution is both time consuming and resource intensive and may be considered inappropriate for pursuing anything other than very serious or ongoing offences. In contrast to prosecution, the process of issuing an expiation notice is an efficient and effective way to deal with non-compliance issues in appropriate cases.

The Bill, as a result of amendment in the other House, enables prescribed persons—that is, police officers, authorised officers, authorised persons under the *Local Government Act 1999*, or a teacher at a child's school—to confiscate tobacco products found in the possession of a child. An exemption is made for children who possess tobacco products in the course of their employment or are otherwise involved in the lawful sale of the products.

This Bill will encourage increased compliance with tobacco control laws and contribute to the reduction in harm caused by smoking in South Australia.

I commend the Bill to Members.

EXPLANATION OF CLAUSES

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Commencement

3—Amendment provisions

These clauses are formal.

Part 2—Amendment of *Tobacco Products Regulation Act 1997*

4—Amendment of sections 6 to 45

These clauses amend the specified sections of the principal Act to provide expiation fees (and hence the ability to issue expiation notices) for the offences set out in those sections.

5—Insertion of section 70A

This clause enables prescribed persons to confiscate tobacco products found in the possession of a child. An exemption is made for children who possess tobacco products in the course of their employment or are otherwise involved in the lawful sale of the products.

Ms CHAPMAN (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): I indicate that the opposition will be supporting this bill and we are happy for the matter to be dealt with immediately. I am quickly perusing that which has been presented by the minister, which is largely the government's explanation in another place where this legislation has been debated. The bill comes to us after debate in another place and after the inclusion of a very significant amendment from its original form.

Essentially, this bill was introduced to increase penalties for offences which broadly relate to the retail licensing and sale of tobacco products; so, whilst there is quite a lot of detail in the length of the bill, it substantially increases the penalties. It is designed to ensure that there are appropriate penalties for non-compliance and largely, it places the responsibility on those who sell, display, deal with or hold in their possession products of this nature. The debate in another

place had also recognised, as the minister has in our house, the importance of protecting minors and ensuring that they do not have access to or are exposed to the risks of smoking, let alone the introduction to it as a habit-forming practice. However, the provision for young people themselves to also have some responsibility in this protection was raised in another place, and it is presented to us in this bill, that is, to have a procedure in the proposed clause 15 to enable the power of confiscation of tobacco products from children.

The intent of this is to ensure that a prescribed person who becomes aware that tobacco products are in the possession of a child has the power to confiscate them—not to say that they must do it or shall do it or be obliged to do it, but that they may do it. The prescribed person, as proposed, is to be a member of the police force or any other authorised officer under part 5 or an authorised person under chapter 12 of the *Local Government Act* or a teacher at a school attended by the child. I have foreshadowed an amendment which relates to the deletion of paragraph (c) to ensure that those who are employed under the *Local Government Act*—perhaps an officer who is employed as a parks and wildlife officer—and who are the type of persons who do not want to have that responsibility will not be included. No-one is intending that they do have this responsibility and, accordingly, that would be the amendment that we will be moving.

However, I have seen the amendment proposed by the government which proposes not only to delete that paragraph (c) of the proposed clause 70A(4) but also to deal with the definition of teachers, so that it is not as expanded as it will be in the bill that is to come. That is to say that, when it comes to a teacher, it is to be a person performing the duties of a teacher at a school attended by the child, whether or not such duties are performed on the grounds of the school. The opposition has considered the limitations in relation to the amendment, and I indicate that the opposition will support the government's amendment as tabled. That will comfortably deal with the provisions there. The intent is clear. I thank the Hon. Michelle Lensink for introducing an important provision to assist in the management of, and restriction of, children's access to tobacco products. If, for whatever reason, they are able to obtain this product, as has been seen from the previous debates, often not by themselves from lawful outlets but by other parties who obtain them for their benefit, the product they can be removed from their possession. It is hoped that would be a helpful adjunct to ensuring that children are not exposed to the risk of either smoking or developing a habit and taste for the same.

I noted in the debate in another place the observation of the Hon. Mark Parnell, who raised the question of parliamentary superannuation. He noted in the annual report of Funds SA at the top of the list of the shareholdings—that is the investment of funds of public servants, not members of this parliament—that they had been directly invested (and they remain so) in the tobacco industry. He observed that one such company was Altria, whose parent company is the tobacco giant, Philip Morris. I do not propose to cast any reflection on this company but I do say that, although the minister in another place was quite dismissive of this issue, to suggest that it was not relevant to her bill I think is a matter which clearly needs to be considered by the government if it is going to be so clear about its view on the protection of children involving tobacco products, and that is an anomaly which clearly needs to find some answers or at least some consideration for future investment.

In any event, at present, it is a legal product for people over the age of 18 years to use, and the primary purpose of this legislation is to ensure that the product is kept away from children. On that basis, with this important amendment, the opposition will support the bill.

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Minister for Health): I thank the opposition for its support and I also thank it for expediting the process this evening, despite the fact it did not have the second reading explanation in this chamber until this evening. The amendments that I am moving, as the member said, change in some degree the amendment moved by the Hon. Michelle Lensink in another place in that local government and such officers will not have the power that originally was suggested by the member. That removal follows negotiation or discussion with the LGA, which felt that it would be inappropriate for that power to be placed in the hands of those officers, given their lack of training and expertise in that area.

The other matter which the member has dealt with is the restriction of power in relation to teachers to confiscate cigarettes. They can do it when they are carrying out their role as a teacher in relation to that particular child, rather than have a general power to be able to confiscate cigarettes from children at their schools or anywhere at any time. I thank the opposition for its support of that. I think the amendments that

were suggested add some value to the legislation, and the government is happy to accept them in the form that is proposed.

Bill read a second time.

In committee.

Clauses 1 to 14 passed.

Clause 15.

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

Page 4, lines 33 to 35—

Delete paragraphs (c) and (d) and insert:

(c) a person performing the duties of a teacher at a school attended by the child (whether or not such duties are being performed on the grounds of the school).

I thank the opposition for allowing me move this amendment instead of the amendment which they have moved.

Ms CHAPMAN: I confirm that the amendment is consented to by the opposition, and I indicate that I will not be proceeding with my amendment.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Title passed.

Bill reported with amendment.

Bill read a third time and passed.

ADJOURNMENT

At 10.40 p.m. the house adjourned until Thursday 29 March at 10.30 a.m.