

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 2 May 2007

The **DEPUTY SPEAKER (Ms G. Thompson)** took the chair at 11 a.m. and read prayers.

## ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.  
(Continued from 1 May. Page 75.)

**Mrs REDMOND (Heysen):** I sought leave yesterday to conclude my remarks, and I had commenced on what is probably the major shadow portfolio I hold of Attorney-General and Justice. The primary remark that I wanted to make was that I was surprised at how little was said about the government's plans in relation to law and order. They indicated in the Lieutenant-Governor's address that they will introduce a package of reforms designed to enhance the rights of victims of crime, will reform the criminal law dealing with serious drug offences, and will reintroduce legislation relating to rape, sexual assault and child protection. However, that was about it so far as the law and order matters. What startled me about that was that it really highlighted what was missing inasmuch as there is no statement about any improvements to areas that needed funding, such as the Legal Services Commission or the Office of the DPP—and I acknowledge the government has actually added quite a considerable amount of funding to it in its last budget, but it is still nowhere near enough. If you keep changing the laws and creating tougher penalties, moving things into higher courts, the inevitable result is that you are going to have bigger and longer trials as people defend themselves, and the Legal Services Commission will need more funding.

There is also, of course, the issue of the funding available to the Aboriginal Legal Rights Movement. The Attorney-General's position, of course, is that that is a federal matter and only the federal government is responsible for funding it, but the reality of the situation is that most of the work done by the Aboriginal Legal Rights Movement is, indeed, state-law based and those lawyers are amongst the most dedicated that I know throughout the state. They work for what must be the lowest rate of pay, they have not had a pay increase for many years, they are paid at a very basic rate—certainly much less than many clerks with fairly sedentary, straightforward jobs in the Public Service receive—and these people—both male and female lawyers—do a tremendous amount of work. However, they have reached the point where they have had to withdraw services. If that situation continues and ALRM does, indeed, collapse—as it well could—then that will inevitably lead to an extra burden on the state-funded Legal Services Commission.

So my urging for the Attorney-General would be that he reconsider his position in relation to the funding that this state should help to provide to ALRM. In addition, there is no mention of improvements to the courts, and we know that the situation in the courts is inadequate. I am not talking about judges' rooms and so on, but waiting rooms for people who are usually extremely stressed about going to trials and pre-trial conferences and so on. The facilities available in a number of our courts are simply inadequate and badly need upgrading. Personally I would like to see some accommodation made available—even on a temporary basis—within the

new federal courts building to enable the state Supreme Court to be refurbished to an adequate 21st century standard. I cannot see why, given that we accommodated the High Court on its various visits to Adelaide for the first 100 years, it should not be prepared to let us have some of its space to assist in that regard.

Having made a grievance speech yesterday and commenced my remarks on the issue of law and order, I want to concentrate a lot of the remainder of my remarks on the issues of disability and also ageing, the other two areas in which I hold shadow portfolio responsibilities. Why I want to do that is because the government failed to make any mention of them in the Lieutenant-Governor's opening speech, and that was of considerable concern to me. The government has failed completely to address the needs of the sector, as well as to even mention any intention with respect to that sector with regard to its upcoming agenda. I think it is indicative of this government's attitude.

There are essentially three or four points I want to make about disability funding. First, and I think I have made this point on previous occasions, I have a conviction that we owe it to the families who care for their disabled loved one to provide them with all the help they need while they are providing that care; and, secondly, to take over the role of carer when they can no longer cope. I know I have said previously in this house that, until 50 years or so ago, people who gave birth to a disabled child (sometimes with even something that we would now consider as straightforward as Down's syndrome) were encouraged to leave that child in an institution and go away and get on with life and preferably have other children who did not have a disability. That sounds awful now, and I have no doubt that at the time it was well intentioned, but that was the way things were. Over the last 50 years or so, the pendulum has swung to the point where we are now probably at the opposite end and people who give birth to a child with even the most profound of disabilities are encouraged to take the baby home and care for it in their home.

That obviously has a lot of benefits, particularly for the child being raised in the circumstance of a loving home environment but, in my view, this government has consistently failed in its duty to those parents and their families. I think it needs to be recognised that every family who takes on the care of its disabled loved one does the government and, therefore, every taxpayer in this state a huge favour. They save us literally millions of dollars which would otherwise need to be spent on institutional care for those children. So it is my belief that it is surely up to us as a community, and the government on our behalf, to provide them with the help that they need in order to do that job, and to assure them that when the time comes that they simply cannot continue—whether it is due to ill health, frailty, age, death or simply because, just like the rest of us, they would like to retire one day—we have to be able to say to them, 'You can be assured that we will be taking care of your loved one.' I get quite emotional listening to and even trying to talk about some of the situations that I come across in this portfolio, and no doubt the minister does as well in his dealings with it.

I talk to mothers who are constantly deprived of sleep because they have a child who is now an adult who cannot even turn over in bed and who calls out to them 20 times a night and they have to get up and try to turn that child, who is often quite heavy, so it is physically arduous. We all know that sleep deprivation is a form of torture, yet these people are

in that situation, out of love, day in, day out, year after year. I cannot conceive what it would be like to have an adult child whose bottom I still had to wipe. I cannot conceive what it would be like to never have a day or a night off, or indeed any break at all.

Prior to the 2006 election this government made lots of noise about disability because Dignity for the Disabled had run a very strong, genuine and productive campaign, which I think raised community awareness generally about the plight of the sector, and it was largely, I think, because of the success of that campaign that disability became a major issue in the campaign leading up to the 2006 election. Indeed, Dignity for the Disabled indicated that it would run candidates and that its preferences would go to the side that offered the better deal. I still believe that the Liberal Party ultimately did offer the better deal, but Dignity for the Disabled—being a very new political force—came to realise that you cannot afford to antagonise and alienate the group that will be in government. It became apparent to that group—and it turned out to be true—that the Labor Party would be returned. Now that the government has a majority in the parliament, it is apparent from the very absence of reference to the disability sector in the Address in Reply that it does not need the disability sector and that it can safely ignore it.

I say 'safely' simply because generally the community has no idea how hard it was for Dignity for the Disabled to run its campaign. It is so difficult for any one of those families to attend a rally. It is not like the rest of us who might decide to take a half a day off work to do something. I remember years ago acting in a case for a chap who had become a quadriplegic and taking a detailed statement from his wife about what was involved in her life. Just to take him to a simple medical appointment required her to get up at 4 a.m. to shower him, clean him, brush his teeth, shave him, feed him, give him drinks and toilet him, etc.

She had to get herself ready at the same time and to arrange the Access Cab to get them to the appointment. She had done a day's work by the time she got to an appointment at 10 o'clock in the morning; and, even if the doctor was on time, they could not book an Access Cab to take them home until that appointment had finished. So, a good 14 hours was spent just going to a medical appointment. Until people understand that those are the sorts of things involved in even the most simple issue for many people with profound disabilities, it is hard for them to comprehend how much effort went into the Dignity for the Disabled campaign which, as I say, was extremely successful and did raise general awareness of the sector in the community. Unless one has lived it—and I have not lived it but, probably, I have been touched by it a little more closely than others simply because of the job that I used to do—one cannot comprehend how difficult it is. So, hundreds of families have now been left and, I think, will be left. It concerns me that the government appears to have lost interest in the sector.

The second point I want to make about disability is that I have a great deal of concern about the level of management (or mismanagement) of funding of finances for the sector. I have been receiving snippets of information from a number of sources (including from within the department), from boards of NGOs, parents, carers, and so on, and they are all giving me the same message. The government is undertaking a massive clawback of many millions of dollars pulling money back to the government. In some cases it is just a withdrawal of funding and sometimes it is a last minute minimal funding of three months, which is all that is provided

for some organisation to continue. Sometimes funding—and this is fairly frequently—is being continued but without even an increased level of CPI, which has the obvious effect that the services cannot even be continued at the rate they were provided, and that therefore takes no account at all of any increase in services.

As a result of this change that has been taking place in the sector over many years, there is this ever-burgeoning increase in services, and my suspicion is that, as we baby boomers age, it will continue to increase. The figures for that clawback are varied. They started at about \$4 million and then went to \$7 million and then \$11 million. I have heard figures of more than \$30 million in terms of what the government is trying to claw back. I have great concern about what is happening in the funding for this sector.

The third issue I want to cover in relation to disability is the fundamental philosophical difference the minister and I have about how to manage this sector generally. The minister knows that I like him. We used to work together, and I have great respect for him. I am sure that we are trying to achieve the same outcome, we just come from a different philosophical view as to how best to achieve that outcome. Indeed, I often say to people, 'We are probably the only minister and shadow minister in any parliament anywhere in the world who gave each other a peck on the cheek before coming into the parliament to be sworn in as members when we were first elected.'

**Mr Pengilly:** That was a dangerous move!

**Mrs REDMOND:** An absolutely dangerous move, but I have a high regard for the minister. As I said, we have a fundamental philosophical difference, because the minister is very much a socialist; he is on the very left of the Labor Party. He thinks the idea is to build a giant bureaucracy, bring everyone in and create this huge thing called Disability SA, whereas I say that the money is more effectively spent and you get more bang for your buck if you stick it out into the NGOs that have specialist understanding. The minister has dismantled the boards of the Julia Farr Centre, the Independent Living Centre, the Intellectual Disability Services Council and a range of other boards on the basis that we will have this great big department which will service everyone, and we will have a single waiting list. A single waiting list has never made sense. I do not mind if there is a single waiting list for, say, equipment or a particular thing, but you cannot have a single waiting list for the entire disability sector. How can you have a single waiting list where one person needs a wheelchair, another person is blind, another person is deaf and another person has an intellectual disability? It seems to me that it will not solve the problem.

One of the good ideas with which I agree with the minister is having a case manager. Every time we became aware of a person with a disability a case manager would be appointed. I have no objection to that case manager being someone in the Public Service, whose job and special knowledge enables that person to say, 'You need a wheelchair and you have an intellectual disability so you need to be on that list; and you need to be on a list somewhere else; and you need to access various bits of help.' I think that it is probably a good idea. It would be great if we developed a group of passionate people within the Public Service who, after talking with each family about what they need, know where to get what they need. But the information I am getting from people in the community who are carers of family members is that this is not the way things are working out; they are not being listened to. In fact, what is happening is that massive amounts

of money are paying highly paid bureaucrats. I remember reading somewhere recently—and I stand to be corrected—an indicator which stated there was an increase from 42 to 67 in the number of people in the disability area who are now paid more than \$100 000 a year.

I believe that the government has a set against NGOs. I think NGOs give more bang for the buck in dealing with disability issues. I acknowledge that often a lot of them arise out of a self-help group or support group formed by parents who have a common interest because they have children with a particular disability. Admittedly, they may grow from that, but the result of that growth ultimately is that they become highly knowledgeable about the particular disability and how to deal with it. They are passionate about what they do. They often become members of boards and they donate a lot of their time and skills (that come from a range of areas) to those boards, and for many of those reasons that is why we get more bang for the buck. I would have some commonality with the minister about the need to develop more certain career paths for people wishing to serve in the disability sector, but I have this fundamental philosophical difference with him about whether it is best to sweep it all into a giant Public Service bureaucracy or have it in the community with smaller organisations that provide a more specialised service; and then within the Public Service have a case manager for each person so that each of those separate services can be provided at the appropriate time.

Finally, I express my profound disappointment in the minister and, indeed, contempt for the Labor Party over their failure to take up the offer made by the commonwealth at the meeting in April to renegotiate the commonwealth-state-territory disability agreement. The commonwealth made an offer, which I believe the government should have grabbed with both hands. The commonwealth said that if the state provides the data to substantiate the level of unmet need in the area of disability housing the commonwealth would match it dollar for dollar to eliminate that unmet need.

Disability housing is by no means the only issue in the disability sector, but it is right up there. I can guarantee that every parent who brings home a disabled child from hospital, from the day they bring that child home, is thinking: what is going to happen to my child when I cannot care for it any more? Once that child becomes an adult, just like me with my children in their 20s at home, the parents want their kids to leave home. If they can acquire the level of independence needed, they want that for their children, just like the rest of us. With young people with a disability it often means they need support, and we need to address that issue.

This area of unmet accommodation need is right up at the top of the list and ranks with transport as one of the key issues in the disability sector, but what do state Labor ministers do? They stormed out in disgust and would not even look at this offer. I am appalled that we had an opportunity to do that and, even if we could not have met all of it out of the state budget, we could have made some arrangement. But to have an offer on the table from the commonwealth saying, 'If you identify the unmet need in this sector, we will match you dollar for dollar up to the maximum so you can eliminate the need' is extraordinarily generous, and it is an offer we should have taken up.

In the last couple of minutes I will talk about the other portfolio I cover, namely, ageing, which is not mentioned in the Lieutenant-Governor's address. I have mentioned before these extraordinary figures. At the moment we have in Australia in the order of 2 340 people over the age of 100

years, which in state terms means that a little over 300 people over that age currently live in this state. As we baby boomers age, that will burgeon out, so by 2055, when I hope to be here and over the age of 100 years, there will be 78 000 of us in Australia—over 10 000 on our current state numbers will be in South Australia. If that many are over the age of 100, their kids will be over 75 years for the most part, and they are the 'olds' under our current definitions.

This is a topic that the government seems to ignore. It is a crucial issue that we need to think about because there is a whole range of issues that we will need to contemplate, and there is an attitude that the commonwealth licences nursing homes and provides the money for them. However, 90 per cent of us do not live in nursing homes, never will, and never want to—no way José. As baby boomers age, I suspect that fewer people will want to go into a nursing home. We need to think about this issue.

To touch on one brief topic, we will need to work for longer. We cannot maintain a retirement age of 58 years, which seems to be the age where it has bottomed out at currently, and live for another 30 years without allowing people to work. Our WorkCover legislation does not allow that to happen. WorkCover says that it does not cover you once you reach the normal retirement age. We need to address the issue so that people can continue to work once they get past retirement age. Most of us probably will not want to work full-time, but we want to slow down in our retirement. In the US, McDonald's has a policy of employing retirees, and on certain days when you go into a McDonald's store, instead of young kids, it is all the 'olds' doing a bit of work that day to earn their pocket money. We need to make adjustments, which involves commonwealth input also, but the first thing the government needs to look at is adjusting the WorkCover legislation to say that the retirement age can be beyond 65 years.

**Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Leader of the Opposition):**

I rise as Leader of the Opposition to set out on a three-year journey to argue the case for change to the people of South Australia, because they are being under-served by this government. I emphasise that it will be a three-year journey: results are not achieved overnight in this business. We know the history of the last 10 years, and we know the legacies of former governments. We can go back in time to the Playford government and think back on that period as one of great achievement, when South Australia was repositioned after World War II. Manufacturing was attracted to the state and new suburbs were set up, such as Elizabeth. It was a period of great achievements. DSTO (the defence, science and research establishment) was attracted here, and that formed a core upon which other growth could occur. And, of course, the Playford period saw enormous migration to this state. The legacy of the Playford government is clear.

Governments such as the Dunstan government also had a very clear legacy of social change and social reform. Some disagreed with that legacy; some agreed with it. However, I think Dunstan left his mark on the state. The Bannon government also left its mark on the state, and its great legacy and the thing for which it will be remembered is the \$11.5 billion worth of debt and the \$300 million current account deficit that it left us. When premier Brown and treasurer Baker took over, they had to wrestle with a \$300 million per annum black hole, quite apart from the debt they inherited. As I mentioned yesterday in this place, one of the chief architects of that catastrophe was the current

Premier. The current Treasurer also was part of the headquarters, if you like, that delivered that result to South Australians. There was talk of it taking 30 years or more for the state to get back on its feet.

The legacy of the Bannon period was a tragic one for South Australia. However, it was sorted out by the Brown and Olsen governments over a period of eight years, when they managed to turn that catastrophic situation around. They did so through a range of savings measures and economies. The Public Service had to be made more efficient, and a range of projects needed to be axed. Other projects were still managed, despite the fact that we were bankrupt—and I speak in particular of the Southern Expressway. The Bannon government had done nothing for the people of the south during its period in office. The Brown government built that expressway. We could only afford \$170 million to do it one way, but we bought the land for its duplication later, when the money was available. So, even though we were bankrupt, we still did things. We built the South Eastern Freeway. We did the work that resulted in the Adelaide to Darwin railway. We did the work to get the Adelaide Airport reconstructed and the airport runway extended.

**Mr Pengilly:** We put in a desalination plant.

**Mr HAMILTON-SMITH:** We put in a desalination plant at Kangaroo Island. We carried out a lot of major roadworks and major infrastructure works over the eight years, even though the state was bankrupt. However, the greatest achievement of the Liberal Brown and Olsen governments was that we got rid of Labor's debt and financial mismanagement. That is the legacy of the eight years of the Liberals. When we handed over the books to the current government, the debt was virtually eliminated. The books were balanced. One can argue about accounting measures—and this government has gone to a much more dodgy accounting measure than the one we used, which was much more stringent. However, the legacy of the Liberals under Brown and Olsen was that they sorted out Labor's mess and gave back this state its dignity and self-respect and a balanced set of accounts.

What this Labor government inherited in 2002 was a state in great shape. Not only had the books been balanced but we had also lived through the recession that Paul Keating gave us (which we had to have), we had lived through the lag that we had inherited from federal Labor governments and the previous state Labor government, and the state was again beginning to blossom. Thanks to the good work of the Howard government, the national economy was also at a turning point.

Let me start by defining the legacies of those former governments. I think that, in some respects, they are proud legacies. We could talk about the circumstances of this government's arrival into office. Some might argue that it did not really win office of its own accord. Some would argue that it was handed to this government on a silver platter, because we on this side of the house double-faulted through a few issues with which we were wrestling at the time. I say to the house that I was not there for most of that. I came to the parliament in 1997. We did a marvellous job. As with any government, there are always things you could have done better, but we did an absolutely marvellous job, which leads me to the legacy of this government.

I touched on this point yesterday; that is, the house should ask: what will be the legacy of this government, given its predecessors? What has it achieved; what will it achieve? When one looks back over the past five years, one can see no direction, no purpose, no set of clear directives and no clear

agenda for change or for action. Rather, it would seem that this government has ridden the wave of buoyant economic times at a national level and simply managed things from year to year. Remember that they came to office in 2002 by the favour of the former member for Hammond, Peter Lewis. They did not even win the 2002 election of their own accord, despite bountiful opportunities, I must say.

As I mentioned yesterday, when in opposition, the current Premier's polling was something like a 14 per cent approval rating. I think he was the most unpopular leader of the opposition in the nation. Their stocks were abysmal. I would argue that they did not actually win office in 2002: it was delivered to them on a silver platter by the member for Hammond. They certainly did not earn it—and to give full credit to the member for Frome, I think he jolly nearly pulled it off—and good for him. Anyway, that is all history. What did they set out to do in their first four years? Not a great deal. They consciously sat down and said to themselves, 'The national economy is in good shape. The Liberals have sorted out the State Bank mess. We have a good set of accounts. What we will do is absolutely nothing for four years and we will probably be re-elected.' In fact that occurred—they were re-elected.

I think that the buoyant national economic times had a large part to play in that. I think they took the view that, if we do not make any mistakes over the next four years by not doing anything, then we will be fine. Perhaps some would argue that is a strategy that worked. When we were in government, we found that we had to do things. We had to make some tough decisions—\$11.5 billion worth of debt and a \$300 million current account deficit focuses your attention. We had to make some cuts. We had to sell some assets to pay off their debt. We had to build some things to give the state back its pride. When you build things, sometimes they go wrong. The government is finding that now that it is finally having to build things such as the Northern Expressway, the South Road underpass and the Bakewell Bridge.

Low and behold, they finally had to do something, and they are finding that, when you do things, you have to take some risks and maybe sometimes things go wrong. Nevertheless, one is still searching for the legacy that this government might plan to leave South Australians, and there is none. Frankly, there is none after five years and, as I argued yesterday, if there is no direction and no legacy emerging after five years, I doubt whether there will be any in the three years' time. I really think that it is time to go. I always subscribe to the theory that, if you are leading the show and you do not know what to do, get out of the way and let someone who does have a go—and, frankly, that is where we are.

As I said, I am not sure how this government will be remembered. It may be remembered for what it has done since 2002: for example, its increases in taxes. It may be remembered for having promised people—such as the hotel industry—that it would not lift taxes and then doing so immediately on being elected. It may be remembered for taxing and spending. It may be remembered for swelling the size of government and for spending millions on advertising and spin. It may be remembered for claiming bragging rights on law and order while delivering little. It may be remembered for attaching itself like a suckerfish to the good work of others by claiming things such as the air warfare destroyer contract and the mining boom as its own.

One would think that this government has given birth to the mining exploration boom. I can tell members what has

given birth to the mining exploration boom—high commodity prices. When the price of uranium triples, when the price of copper increases fourfold and when global equity markets are awash with cash, I can tell members what you get—a mining exploration boom. However, you have the Premier and the Labor Party suckering on, saying, ‘Look, this is ours. Gee, this is all because we invested 10 bob in encouraging mining exploration.’

We have the Premier coming back from the national conference of the Labor Party claiming the credit for getting rid of the three mines policy. I point out to the house that the Liberal Party got rid of the three mines policy 25 years ago; the rest of Australia moved on 25 years ago. The Labor Party has been hanging on to this sort of hippy-esque, 1960s idea that we should have a three mines policy and they have suddenly decided to get with the 21st century—and they are heroes, and the hero-in-chief is the Premier. Well, whoopy-do! What getting rid of the three mines policy shows is that the Labor Party has realised something finally, and that is that it is good for business if the Labor Party gets itself out of their way. What we are not hearing about is the fact that the three mines policy was one of the great Labor dinosaurs that needed to be got out of the way. It looks like we have shot that one—wonderful!

There are three other dinosaurs that Labor has left, though, one of which is their stupid attitude to industrial relations and their desire to completely bin Australian workplace agreements, which the mining industry unanimously decree is one of the best things that have ever happened to them. I asked the Premier: what is he going to do about that dinosaur? Now that he has got rid of the three mines policy, what will he be doing about that dinosaur? There is another dinosaur, and that is the Premier’s and the state Labor Party’s attitude to taxation: payroll tax and royalties which, according to the last budget review, have just gone up extraordinarily. What does he have in mind to slay the tax reform dinosaur that has seen profligate tax takes by this government in its past five years? Nothing from the Premier on that dinosaur!

The fourth dinosaur that is yet to be slayed by the government is infrastructure: the \$20 billion ask from the mining industry for infrastructure so that it can grow and blossom. So, before the Premier comes in here and heralds the good work he claims to have been doing getting rid of the three mines policy, slaying one dinosaur, remember the other three; they are still before the mining industry and industry. The great revelation of the week has been that the Labor Party has finally recognised that it is the problem not the solution; it has been in the way of business for the last 25 years, not helping it. Labor has finally realised that it needs to extract itself from the roadway so that the bus of the economy and economic growth can travel down the road. So, I will be very interested to hear from the Premier how he plans to slay the remaining three dinosaurs that he and his Labor colleagues have put before industry.

The government is more likely to be remembered when it goes—and I sincerely hope and plan that it should go in March 2010—for what it has not done; for its failure to deliver on infrastructure, or to have a 20-year vision on anything at all; for its failure to plan and therefore its plan to fail; for its abandonment of the most frail and the most vulnerable in society, like the mentally ill and the disabled, who have been demonstrating on the steps of Parliament House and who have been complaining about the lack of funding and support for years past. The government may be remembered for the fact that in real and meaningful terms

little improvement or progress has been made in health or education services. Some of our kids are graduating from school still unable to count and read. Waiting lists are still insufferably long.

I ask South Australians regularly, when I am doorknocking and speaking to them, ‘Have you noticed a remarkable improvement in the quality of health care in the past five years since this government has been in office?’ and their response is, ‘No, nothing has changed’. Parents of kids in school are saying the same thing. The government may be remembered for its failure to make real headway on drugs and family breakdown as the causes of crime, while claiming bragging rights on how tough they are; and they may be remembered for their complete inability to foresee the worst drought in 100 years. No, the government has had its opportunities and it has failed to take them.

We are where we are, on this side of the house. We got a very clear message from the electorate at the last election that we need to do better, and we plan to do better. We can read and understand polls, and we know that we need to do better. I notice that there is even one out today—and guess what? It says the same thing as the one that was out five or six weeks ago—that is, that we need to do better. We hear the message and we understand that our challenge is to convince the people of South Australia that we are a better alternative government, and we are determined to do so.

I suggest that members on that side of the house not worry too much about polls. I still remember the 14 per cent poll that the Premier got when he was Leader of the Opposition; at least 40 per cent of people know who I am. They did not seem to know who the Premier was when he was leader of the opposition so, after 17 or 18 days, I am already doing better than he ever did when he was in opposition—and I take some comfort from that. However, we all read these things with great mirth and interest—they are good fun—but we know exactly where we are, and we will build and argue the case for change.

The problem the government has (and it has quite a few) is that the electorate can move very quickly. As I said yesterday, the Premier thinks he is Mr Popularity but I remind him that it is a very short walk down the rocky path from Mr Popularity to Mr On-the-Nose, and he should watch his footing. South Australians are not stupid, and you overplay the Mr Celebrity bit at your peril. We are a cynical and savvy lot in this great state, and we do not like ‘big-time Charlies’, whether they are individuals or governments. When we are told that a government or a premier will get results, then we expect to get results—for us, not for themselves—and I made that point yesterday.

I notice some members on the government side getting very glass-jawed, saying how terrible I was to have a crack at them yesterday. I may have gotten a little bit excited and said some things that were a little colourful, but I remind the house of the behaviour of the members for Port Adelaide and Elder when they were in opposition. Those of us who were here have not forgotten where the bar was set when the Labor Party was in opposition; we remember the character assassination that went on from the Labor Party side of the house that focused on John Olsen, Graham Ingerson, Joan Hall and Dean Brown. We remember very well that those on the other side had a simple rule: to stop at nothing and do whatever they felt needed to be done without any scruples, principles or consideration of whom they hurt or damaged or what fibs they had to tell on the way to get there. They showed no

principles or scruples whatsoever and so should not be surprised if we muscle up. Two can play that game.

We have a pack of schoolyard bullies over there led by a Premier who is probably bully-in-chief trying to be Mr Nice Guy now that he is Premier. But we know how you behave, we know about the abuse that goes on within your own party directed at some of your own members. We have had the unsavoury publicly released incidents about people squaring up to the Hon. Nick Xenophon in the Members' Bar. We have heard about the bullying behaviour in the corridors here. We have heard all the stories from Cora Barclay, and we know about people coming in here after a few sherbets in the evening and throwing their weight around.

We know how those opposites behave but, suddenly, when they cop a little bit of it back, they are all precious about it: 'Oh my golly, my gosh. How dare you say nasty things about us.' Well, I tell them, 'Get used to it', because the days of Mr Nice Guy are over and they can expect a little bit of head-to-head over the next three years. We enjoy the argy-bargy of politics; we are happy to engage in it and we will do so without fear or favour. So do not get all glass-jawed on me, do not get all glass-jawed on us; we will take it up to you over the next three years with great pleasure and look forward to it coming back.

Speaking of which, it came back beautifully yesterday. I quite enjoyed yesterday, I had a lot of fun; it was nice going head-to-head with the Premier. He said he knew all about it, but I noticed him scratching out his notes on the paper there and then he got up extraordinarily well-prepared—he had all this data—and spoke for seven or eight minutes I think. Then, of course, the Treasurer was awfully well-prepared—he had all these instructions—and I think he spoke for five minutes. It was a striking bit of parliamentary debate. I am so impressed that I will go away and listen to the recording as a cure for insomnia when I go home late at night.

I was happy to come in here and set the scene by starting off the first day of parliament with a little bit of entertainment. One thing I do not want to happen is for members opposite to fall asleep. I know what it is like on the backbench. I know how difficult it can be, particularly for talented members such as the members for Enfield and Napier. I draw to the attention of the house a simple truth. Yesterday I think I described the cabinet as a gypsy wagon, with acrobats, spruikers and flame swallows being pulled along by a show pony. I know it to be true because, when you look at some of the people in the government's shadow cabinet, you can only chuckle when you look at the backbench and see that people of the calibre of the members for Enfield and Napier are left out. Frankly, we have some people on the wagon who we would probably be better off posting to China. It is a reflection of the Labor Party's own factional difficulties and its own internal problems that two of its more talented people are stuck on the backbench and some very mediocre talent are on the frontbench—and that is just in this house. If you go over to the other chamber, you will have a real chuckle: there are a couple of real balloons there. I do chuckle when I hear the government crow on about members on this side of the house when I look at its own line-up.

Indeed, the government has enjoyed very, very buoyant times indeed. Labor's tactics since coming to government are very clear: 'Hey; we've got good economic times nationally (thank you, John Howard). We've got tax revenues flooding in and cash falling over the counter at us. All we have to do is hold on and we'll be okay.' Well, guess what? As fast as the government has swallowed the cash, it has spent it, and

I will come back to that point in a minute. Of course, the Premier's tactic is very clear: 'Now that I'm the Premier, I'll be Mr Nice Guy.' I have to say that we have probably played along with that game for too long. We probably have not attacked the Premier enough over the last five years, and I intend to change that. I say to the Premier that by and large I will be focusing my questions on him, and he can start answering to the people of South Australia. I will certainly be aiming to hold him more accountable. Of course, it would be nice to get some answers to questions. Let us see how he goes in question time and see whether he answers questions or just flicks them off to his ministers.

I am sure that today and tomorrow the government will have some carefully prepared Dorothy Dixers that, no doubt, will back up the truck on me. I am sure they will have a list of little quips from which they will be throwing a little witty comment; it is all about theatre for the government. I am sure the next two days of parliament will be very entertaining. I look forward to the barrage. The more they tip on me, the stronger I will get. It is a three-year journey we are on. We will make the case for change, and we will enter into the battle of ideas. We will put out some better alternatives for the people of South Australia to consider as the three years unfold.

The Premier and the government frequently want to talk about the past. We have had all this stuff about when we were in government and how everything was our fault when we were in government. Of course, then they go back to all these furrphies about the Brown and Olsen period and all these issues. They like to play up all these issues about the Liberal side of politics. They seem terribly fascinated by that, and I must say that some in the media are equally fascinated. They always like to talk about the Liberal Party. We love to be the centre of attention, but it would be awfully nice if people just focused for a moment on the Labor Party. If they want to talk about the past, I am more than happy to oblige. We could start by talking about how Terry Cameron and Terry Crothers in the other place crossed the floor from the Labor Party over the debate on how we would get rid of the Labor Party's debt and how they were then abandoned by the Labor Party for breaking ranks. We could talk about their own divisions.

We could talk about why the member for Mitchell, a former member of the Labor Party under this Premier's leadership, gave up on the Labor Party and became first a leader and then an Independent. We could talk about Linda Kirk. We could talk about the way they treated Ralph Clarke when he was dispatched from the Labor Party and we could talk about the vitriol between him and the member for Elder. We could talk about the barbecues that the member for Port Adelaide was organising back in 1996, when he planned to do a hatchet job on Mike Rann before the 1997 election.

I have heard all this gobbledegook that the Labor Party spreads around about how Mike Rann was promised two terms. What a load of nonsense that was. He was the only man left standing in 1993 after the Labor Party was massacred at the election. He inherited the job by default because he was the only bloke standing. Kevin Foley was out to get him. Everybody was out to hatchet him. He was the most unpopular leader of the opposition in the country. The only reason he survived—due to quite a bit of help from our side of the house—was that he did quite well in the 1997 election. There is one truth about leadership, and I understand this: you have to get results. It takes time but, to be fair, he got a result in 1997 and that saved his leadership.

I would argue that he did not get that result himself. I think we delivered it to him in 1997. That is what saved him in 1997. It should be remembered that he was going around on election night in 2002 saying to people, 'Well, I'm cactus. This is me, I'm gone' until Peter Lewis marched in from the seat of Hammond and saved his bacon. What a load of garbage. He was disliked on his own side. He was supported in 1997 only because the election outcome was favourable to Labor, because we made some mistakes we should not have made. He would not be here otherwise.

I make this prediction: if the polls start level-pegging at some time over the next three years, and Mr Popularity suddenly becomes Mr On-the-Nose, you watch the knives come out over there. You watch it. It is a fundamental truth of political life that while you are popular everything is sweet. The minute that popularity starts to sag, watch the knives come out. It happened to Maggie Thatcher. It happens to everybody. One thing I will say—and the Premier will understand this—is that all leaders come through the same door and we all go out through the same door. So, I say to the Premier: let us just see what happens. It will certainly be my goal to make sure that Mr Popularity has a chink or two taken out of his shoulder over the next three years, but I emphasise the point that that will take time.

The government has had a lot of fun in the past couple of weeks building up the expectation for this week: here comes the new Leader of the Opposition. He is going to charge in here like a white knight in shining armour and, wow, it will be fantastic! Of course, it can then turn around—as it did yesterday—and say, 'Oh, wasn't that a big disappointment?' That will happen again today and it will happen again tomorrow. I know that; that is the way things are. We are all big boys and girls, so we all understand that. I thoroughly expect to have a jolly good bucketing this week; that is the way things go. I look forward to the repartee. Bring it on. I really look forward to question time this afternoon. I will have some good questions.

Let me tell the house how it will unfold. I will ask some good questions, but I will get no answers. Instead, I will get a carefully prepared bucketing back at me on everything from the colour of a gorilla's toenail to what my third aunty's fourth cousin twice removed said about me once in 1897. It will all be on for young and old. We will have the member for Elder all red in the face, jumping up and down, gesticulating and going, 'Wah, wah, wah.' We will have the member for Port Adelaide, the Treasurer—he will be up and down like a jack-in-the-box. The Premier will be there—Mr Witty, Mr Snarly. It will be on for young and old. Bring it on. I look forward to it, and I look forward to many more question times—we have three years. This is a rotisserie not a barbecue. I am happy to have the government on a rotisserie. If the government wants to schedule more sitting weeks, bring it on. We are quite happy to sit every week from now until Christmas, so bring it on. The more question times and the more sitting weeks, the happier we will be on this side of the house, because we love question time and we love coming in here.

We will use the standing orders and we will use them to full effect. The lazy members opposite on the government side are used to coming in here, sitting down for question time for one hour, from 2.10 until 3.10, and then there are three little grieves on each side. For some members of the media who are used to that routine—and when they do not get it every day they get all upset—I just say that there are other devices in the standing orders that we can use to cause

mayhem. There are lots of devices in the standing orders. We used one yesterday: a matter of urgency. Gee, we might do things like motions of no confidence—wow! We might even move censure motions. We might play around with the standing orders a bit. The member for Stuart has expressed to me that he is a bit upset, and I share his concern about the changes to standing orders in regard to sitting times. Heaven knows what the member for Stuart might get up to over the next two weeks—anything could happen. I do not care if we drag ministers out of their offices. I do not care if we call quorums. I do not care if a bit of chaos ensues in the house. I do not care one little bit. The more inconvenient it makes the life of ministers, the better. If they want to try to foist new standing orders down our throat and act like arrogant—

**Mr Venning:** Boffins.

**Mr HAMILTON-SMITH:** Thank you, member for Schubert—boffins, we will give them a little bit back. To those members opposite, and anyone in the media who thinks that, for the next three years, all we will get are standard little question times, I say: we will use the standing orders. Our aim is to hold the government to account, and we will do whatever it takes—and we will.

The government has issued a response to yesterday's urgency motion, and it is worth a read. I gather that this is the legacy of this government over its life to date: a few photocopied pages. Reading through it, it refers to 'growing prosperity' and lists some things in relation to the economy. I went through them, and most are our work. It includes things such as the Adelaide to Darwin railway and the Adelaide Airport. I seem to remember John Olsen having a few words to say about that. It mentions all sorts of things, including the air warfare destroyer. I wonder whether Alex Downer, Robert Hill, Amanda Vanstone and Nick Minchin would have a point of view on that. I wonder whether four South Australian Liberal federal cabinet ministers had more to do with our getting that than the state Labor government, but there they go, 'Claim ownership of it, claim it as yours and it will become yours; say it over and over again.' We are in the hands of people who have learned everything they know from being journalists and walking the shadowy corridors of these hallowed precincts and not from being out in the real world, so you have to grab onto these things, massage them and make them yours.

This document also talks about 'record spending on productivity enhancing infrastructure'. Record spending! I think that the government has hardly spent a thing so far. If I remember correctly, the Northern Expressway has blown out to \$550 million. Hardly anything has been spent on infrastructure in the last five years. The document has a whole section on transport and infrastructure. Gee, I could entertain the house for probably another two hours on transport and infrastructure. Nothing of consequence has been done, and what has been done has been an absolute shambles. It also mentions 'health and wellbeing' and 'attaining sustainability' and 'climate change'. This is the most paltry list of achievements I think any government has ever had the discourtesy to throw on the table after five years of being in office with the amount of cash windfalls this government has had to spend. I turn to that point now.

This is indeed a government awash with cash. I remember sitting in cabinet in the closing days of our government and hearing that our budget was likely to be \$8.5 billion for that year (2000-01). I note that the budget now is to the tune of \$11.404 billion. What an extraordinary increase in revenue! It took us from 1857 until 2001-02 to get to \$8.5 billion, but

it has taken only five years for that to grow to \$1½ billion. It is an extraordinary increase in budget. Of course, budget figures also show the Rann government to have been the highest taxing government in the state's history. Taxes, combined with GST payments from the federal government, make this the wealthiest government South Australia has ever had. I ask: what do we have to show for it?

Government general revenue and expenses are absolutely extraordinary because they show that they have risen to match expenditure: \$11.4 billion in 2006-07 in revenue and \$11.39 billion to match in expenditure. As they have swallowed the cash, they have let out their belt. It is classic tax and spend, which is what we always get from Labor. The problem they have is that, when the economy turns down, interest rates go up and the revenue stops. It is like any other business: you have ratcheted up your fixed costs (the number of public servants and other expenses), but how do you then cut costs to match? If you had held your costs down and used the money on infrastructure and for other visionary projects, you could have built a future for this state; instead, you have spent it on recurrent expenses.

Any businessman knows that this is a recipe for disaster. The moment of truth for this government will come when the economy turns down. The great truth in Australian politics is that you will become on the nose, as you always do; people will realise you have messed up the economy, and there will be calls for us to again sort out the mess that you have created. Let us see if my predictions come true.

Labor's first budget broke key election promises, but it particularly introduced new taxes and charges and increased existing taxes and charges, including the introduction of gaming machine super taxes, River Murray levies and increases in stamp duty on conveyances. The latest 2006-07 budget shows that the Premier and the Treasurer will collect just short of \$3 billion more revenue than the former Liberal government collected in its last year—an extraordinary sum. What do we have to show for it? Not a great deal. Over the five years of this government, the Treasurer has enjoyed a cumulative \$9.8 billion of additional revenue over and above what the last Liberal government had to spend. An extra \$9.8 billion has come in. What do we have to show for it? Is South Australia \$9.8 billion better off than it was?

The budget numbers, too, simply cannot be believed. In the Treasurer's four previous budgets, he underestimated revenue by extraordinary amounts. In 2002-03 it was \$528 million; in 2003-04 it was \$794 million; in 2004-05 it was \$595 million; and in 2005-06 it was \$521 million. That is a total of \$2438 million—an average of \$610 million per annum simply underestimated, and that is not a bad buffer. As I mentioned, the Rann government is the highest taxing government that we have ever had. Taxes are up 43 per cent, or \$949 million, compared to the last year of the former Liberal government.

Of course, tax revenue collections continue to rise, but no financial relief for long-suffering families or businesses of consequence has been granted. There is no stamp duty relief for struggling first home owners, no extra concessions or financial assistance for older South Australians, no payroll tax relief of substance, and South Australia's payroll tax threshold of \$504 000 is the lowest of all states and territories in Australia. In fact, payroll tax collections in 2006-07 will be 40 per cent higher than in the last year of the former Liberal government. Payroll tax concessions are predicted to increase by a further \$200 million per year in 2009-10.

We had the Treasurer in here yesterday saying that they have cut taxes. I am trying to work out how we have cut taxes. This again leads me to the great challenge that we face on this side; that is, focusing the attention of the people and media of South Australia on the substance of the issues we are raising rather than on presentation and style. The Treasurer was in here yesterday waffling away, and the media is saying today, 'Oh, he did a good job.' Let us look at what he had to say. Let us not look at the gesticulations. The government claims in the budget that over the next five years a further \$296 million of taxes will be cut, taking the total amount of tax relief to over \$1.5 billion by 2010-11. This claim is a complete furphy. The \$296 million is a revised number on the tax relief package that was announced in the last budget.

The 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 kicks in from 2009 to 2010. Property taxes, of course, I have already mentioned. This is the first government in South Australia's history to collect more than \$1 billion in property taxes. Conveyancing and stamp duty in 2005-06 collected \$116 million—24 per cent more than was budgeted for; another broken Rann promise. Land tax relief packages announced in early 2005 have been ineffective. For all these reasons, the government is awash with cash.

We have talked about the wrong priorities and blow-outs: Port River bridges; \$31 million tramline extensions; thinkers in residence programs; public servant blow-outs of around 8 000—somewhere between 7 700 and 8 800, depending on which figures you look at. Yet, have the resources gone to service delivery? Not according to the Public Service Association, which this week slammed the government for its lack of reforms and its lack of sound management. Ministerial staff: we were promised there would not be 15 ministers, and now there are—

**Mr Pengilly:** Sixteen with Don Farrell.

**Mr HAMILTON-SMITH:**—more bureaucrats all talking to each other—yes, 16 with Don Farrell; more committees; more intergovernmental, interdepartmental management processes. We have talked about the blow-out of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, the Northern Expressway and South Road projects. This government is stellar when it comes to wasting money. When it comes to wasting money, it is first class.

Of course, the Premier's and the Deputy Premier's hypocrisy on the issue of Public Service job cuts is also stunning, given the promises they made during the last election campaign. I think it was the Premier who announced the sacking of 1 571 public servants in the last budget, on top of the 222 public servants who accepted separation packages in June. But he was happy to slam us during the election campaign for proposing similar economies. This means that almost 2 000 public servants will lose their jobs, contrary to the promises made by both the Premier and the Deputy Premier to the South Australian people during the election campaign.

I suppose, on the other side of the balance sheet, one might ask why it has taken them almost five years to start action on these blow-outs on which they now seem to be focused. The fact is that the Premier promised no cuts to the public sector and, in particular, key areas such as health, education and police would be quarantined from any efficiency dividend. I doubt that will be so. Then, of course,



there is the issue raised by us of unfunded liabilities. We know that WorkCover's unfunded liability alone is heading towards \$723 million, with the possibility that it could blow out to as much as \$1 billion. But, then, we also hear extraordinary news on unfunded superannuation liabilities which, just last year, involved \$7.2 billion. These unfunded liabilities will one day have to be paid for by South Australian taxpayers. Where will the money come from?

**Mr Griffiths:** It was \$3.2 billion when we left office, so it has more than doubled.

**Mr HAMILTON-SMITH:** In the case of the superannuation blow-out, as my friend the member for Goyder mentions, the figure was down towards \$3.2 billion, but it has now more than doubled. They have lost control of WorkCover. They have lost control of unfunded superannuation liabilities. Compare that to the federal government, which is actually provisioning its surpluses to provide for a future fund. Where is the vision in this government? Where is the provision of surpluses and this windfall tax gain for the future, given our ageing population and the fiscal challenges we face? The answer is there is no provision because the money is being spent on recurrent costs. Instead of providing any business set for bankruptcy, instead of providing for the future, they have simply spent it as the moneys come in during good times and locked it into fixed costs. When things turn down the moment of truth will come.

There are other issues the house needs to be cognisant of. I have talked about revenue windfalls, and I am now referring to comments made by Dr Mike Nahan, a senior fellow at the Institute of Public Affairs. He points out the extraordinary revenue windfall of 15 per cent in the life of this government, and the increase in state taxes, property taxes and grants. But he also points out that South Australia's future is on the line with a decline in core sectors of the economy and with a loss of people, particularly young people, and a loss of competitiveness relative to other states. I have made this point previously to the house.

When you look at our share of wealth compared to other states, we are not getting our fair slice of the cake. Our tax effort compared to other states is extraordinarily high. Dr Nahan rates it at the highest of all other states, when you consider all taxes. He makes some very concerning points about our above average tax effort in a range of areas, particularly in payroll tax, conveyancing and gambling. Indeed, our tax effort has increased extraordinarily in the life of this government, and it is a cause for considerable distress.

Recently, Mr Saul Eslake, Chief Economist for ANZ, came to South Australia for a business briefing. I was interested in his comments. He made the point that Australia's productivity miracle appeared to be evaporating. He talked a great deal about labour productivity levels. He made some interesting points about the gap between South Australia and the national economy; in particular, he said that the gap between us and the rest of the country is opening up. In state final demand we are falling well behind the rest of Australia. In employment we are seeing some of the worst results in the country. In the export of goods, as he pointed out, we have fallen well behind and, in the unemployment rate, we are also well behind.

South Australia has been attracting more overseas migrants but we are still losing people to other states, and he makes the point that our population growth is well behind the other states. Migration to South Australia is also well behind. Our population is ageing, and that rate of ageing is a bigger challenge for South Australia than any other state except

Tasmania. Saul Eslake provided some very interesting statistics on the expectation of ageing of those over 65 years and 85 years, which show that as a state we will be impacted upon more severely than any other state.

Alarming, South Australia's other real structural problem is low productivity, particularly low productivity growth. The level of labour productivity here, measured in GSP per hour worked, shows us performing very poorly and well below the national average, with our labour productivity growth also very poor compared to almost every other state. When productivity is taken into account, Saul Eslake argues that South Australia does not have a labour cost advantage, and this is a most important point. Labour cost per hour worked puts us at the bottom of the pack, and labour cost per unit of output in 2005-06, again, puts us toward the bottom of the pack and well below the national average.

South Australia has a below average share of unqualified people in its work force, indicating that skills development and training is a major challenge that we face. Of 15 to 64 year olds with post-school qualifications, South Australia performs very poorly; in fact, we are at the bottom of the pack save for Tasmania and well below the national average, and the bracket of 15 to 64 year-olds who have not completed a year 12 qualification—again, apart from Tasmania—puts us in the highest rate of all. Not surprisingly, South Australia has a below average proportion of high-skilled jobs. The statistics speak for themselves.

Saul Eslake argues that South Australia's policy of high-quality state services funded by high taxes may detract from economic growth. I am not sure I agree with him on that point, but it is an indictment of the Labor government's swollen Public Service of nearly 9 000 extra people that it has not delivered, as a consequence of that growth, better high-quality services to match that tax take. The results are simply not there.

Public sector reform: in crisis. Six reviews: the Fahey report in 2002, the Economic Development Board's report in 2002, the Menadue report in 2003, the Speakman Payze report in 2004, the Smith report in 2006, and the Goss Commission to overhaul and modernise the public sector in 2006. And what has it delivered? As far as the Public Service Association is concerned, very, very little. They describe the impending mass exodus of baby boomers in the public service as 'a ticking time bomb' that must be diffused by the government. The public sector reform has simply not occurred. As I have mentioned earlier, nor do we have the 20-year vision on infrastructure. We have what the government has described as an infrastructure plan, and a regional infrastructure plan, but the opposition has made the point again and again that these are just glossy brochures, with little substance, that do not tell people what is to be done, when it is to be done, how it is to be done, how much it will cost to do it or who will do it. They are not plans at all. Other state governments have managed to get it right. This government has not. Even the State Strategic Plan—and I have said before that I commend the government for at least going ahead with the concept of having one—falls well short on detail and falls well short on being what it purports to be, and that is an actual plan.

Across the board the government is failing. That is no more evident than in the area of water. We now have our irrigators in the Riverland being told to expect zero allocations in July. These are for the growers of citrus crops and vines and other crops that will simply die and cannot be replanted next year should zero allocations come into force.

The government could have built alternative water infrastructure, but it has failed to do so. It could have eased our reliance on the River Murray by doing what the Western Australian and Queensland governments have done, and that is start work on a desalination plant a long time ago. I have called for the government to make some announcements on this in the June budget. This can no longer be left on the shelf as something we are thinking about; it must become something we are doing, and doing quickly.

The time for talk is over. The time for action is now. We must have a desalination plant and, if the government needs any reminding, pick up today's *Advertiser* and read page 1 and understand what the view of the people of South Australia is. We keep hearing that Labor listens. They are not listening to the people of South Australia on infrastructure. That is also true of stormwater retention, reuse and recycling of water. We had the glossy brochures once again with Waterproofing Adelaide. We have a cabinet full of glossy brochures, but there has not been delivery; there has not been the investment. Instead, the government has ripped \$1.1 billion out of SA Water over the last five years in dividends, in capital returns and in other takes, and swallowed it into general revenue. It is money that could have been spent, and should have been spent, on building water infrastructure.

These arguments have been put out there for South Australians to consider, and they will consider them more and more earnestly over the coming three years. The government simply does not know what the future holds—nor do any of us. But I would say to them we have experienced now the longest boom in our history. This is the longest period on record we have had without a recession, and I caution the government that it needs to start thinking about preparing for a possible downturn. History tells us that booms do not go on forever, and this government is poorly prepared to cope should such a recession or downturn take place. They have failed to act with vision, they have failed to prepare and, as a consequence, the state taxpayers are exposed to the risks of their failure.

I just go back to the remarks I made at the opening of this address. What will be the government's legacy? How will this government be remembered? If we look back at the last five years it is difficult to see what its legacy will be. We look forward over the next three years and struggle to see in what direction we are heading. The government needs to set a clear course. It needs to be a visionary course. It needs to be prepared to back up that course with investment and resolve.

We cannot go on doing what has been done these past five years, which is simply to surf the wave of buoyant economic times in the hope that all will be right at the end of the day. The bottom line is the fundamentals of how safely South Australia is working, the dynamics of our economy and the dynamics of how things going on here have not changed in the past five years. Australia has gone forward and we have gone forward, but our share of everything has remained in decline, or has shrunk. That is the fundamental truth that this government has to face up to. The things it claims are steps forward, by and large, are not its own work. It needs to create the opportunities for itself and for South Australians; it cannot simply rely on them happening as a matter of course so that credit can be claimed where credit is not due.

I look forward to the next three years. I am sure it will be most interesting. I say to the government that we are prepared to play the game in the argy-bargy of politics as least as earnestly as it is. We are the underdogs; we know that. The

government has tens of thousands of public servants, billions and billions of dollars, and brigades of media minders and staff to help it get its message together and to get it out. We have a handful of members of parliament who are very keen and determined to argue the case for change, with only a handful of resources to help us argue that case.

There is no question that we are the underdogs here. All the cards are in the government's hands. We remember what members opposite were like when they were in opposition, and that is not very good. It is easy to look good when you are in government, backed up with all that support to write the ministerial statements, to prepare the media releases, to check all the fine detail, to have briefings, and to make sure that when you come in here you are forewarned and forearmed. We know how government works; we have been there. It is much harder for us with the very scant resources that we have.

I say to the people of South Australia and the media: give us a fair go. We are turning the ship around. We do not want to talk about the past. If the government wants to keep going there, we are happy to match it one on one, because its record is abysmal. If you want to go there and have no vision for the future, the more you talk about the past the stronger the message is to the people of South Australia that you have nothing to talk about in the future. The more you reflect on the past, the more we will start talking about the State Bank and your own failures, both internal and external. So, if the government wants to spend the next three years talking about the past, bring it on, but I really think what South Australians want to hear is the government's vision for the future, and that is certainly where we will be going.

I have said that, at the beginning of this three year journey, we will define you, and we are doing that this week and we will continue to do it. At a point after the next budget, we will come out with an alternative vision going forward of our own. We understand that the case for change needs to be argued and it needs to be argued early, but we will do that at a time of our choosing, and in a way of our choosing, and, when we do, we will do it well, and we will build the details around that alternative vision going forward during the context of an election campaign and the period immediately preceding it. It will be a good alternative and a better alternative to that of the government.

I suspect that the legacy this government will give to South Australia in 2010 (when, hopefully, we will see the end of it) will be one that in good times it did very little and then it went, leaving South Australia no better off than it was when it took office, and I think that will be a shame. I think that will be a great shame. I commend the Lieutenant-Governor for his address, and I look forward to the next three years.

Time expired.

**Mr Venning:** Hear, hear! And John Rau shouldn't be on the back bench!

**Mr RAU (Enfield):** I thank all my supporters on the other side of the chamber. It is heartening; and I hope they enjoy what I have to say today as much as I will enjoy saying it. Obviously, I rise to congratulate the Lieutenant-Governor on the speech that was delivered the other day in the upper house. I would like to talk about a few issues which, I think, will be of interest to people in my electorate and, in particular, to me over the rest of the year. Those issues fall into three basic categories, I suppose. The first is the issue of local government, the second is the issue of education and the third is the issue of public housing.

Before I turn to those issues, I would like to say a couple of things, having listened carefully to the Leader of the Opposition's speech. First, I congratulate the Leader of the Opposition on his elevation to that role. Secondly, I for one welcome his statement today that, in due course, we will get to see the full variety and excitement of opportunity presented by the standing orders. He has mentioned urgency motions, no confidence motions and such things, and, from my point of view sitting back here, anything which is sufficiently motivating coming from the other side of the house to warrant putting down my book is something which I welcome.

I look forward with great anticipation to this imaginative and creative use of the standing orders that we will see. I would like to say, however, that, in his contribution today and in his contributions in this place in the last few days, the Leader of the Opposition has done something either deliberately (and I must assume that it is) or (hopefully not) accidentally in that he has raised the bar of expectation considerably about what he and this opposition will achieve. I come from the old school which suggests that you are better off achieving something before you brag about it.

I think that to set up a goal, which is a higher goal than you have managed to achieve in the past, and publicly trumpet about it does raise you to the point where the question must be asked, 'Okay, you've raised the bar, but can you clear it?' That is the issue that I think will be played out in this chamber over the months to come. Members opposite might be interested to note—and I ask them to ponder this—that, after the pump-priming the Leader of the Opposition gave to his performance yesterday, the galleries were full of media.

Half a dozen people were in the media boxes there next to Hansard—in fact, three or four more than normally would be the case. The TV cameras were arrayed up over our time clock in a way which indicated an expectation, and I wonder whether that expectation was met. The Leader of the Opposition can only continue to raise the bar and lure the media in here and get them to follow him so many times before he risks becoming like the boy who cried wolf. They will get sick of it. I do not think they have a long attention span, actually.

If the trumpeted performances turn out to be nothing like what they are expected to be, I think he will find their interest will drop off and, more disturbingly from the point of view of the opposition, their level of criticism of the opposition's performance will intensify because that criticism will be measured against the bar that the opposition has set for itself; and that bar, as I have said (courtesy of the Leader of the Opposition), is now very high. The Leader of the Opposition talked about putting the government on the rotisserie. I think that his actions in raising the bar may actually be putting him on the rotisserie, and he may be slowly rotating like a chicken. Members opposite need to remember that, having done it once in this parliament, it will get easier to change leaders again. So, he had better be able to meet the expectations that he is raising, but we will see.

So far, having listened to the Leader of the Opposition's remarks, I have to say that they are essentially all form and no substance. Form is never a substitute for substance. It is almost as if the Leader of the Opposition says in his speeches, 'Look, all you chaps sitting here with me let us close our eyes and let us believe together'—and they all are going through this sort of collective self-hypnosis. Unfortunately, even if that works for members opposite—and I hope it does because it will make them feel better—it will not extend beyond the

happy little zone represented by the opposition benches. They have to do more than that. Closing your eyes and dreaming together is a lovely thing. Lots of groups out there in the community go off and do that on weekends—and good luck to them because they have a lovely time. The problem for members opposite is that for them to change anything they have to do more than hold hands, form a circle and sit there believing together. They actually have to achieve something. So far there is a lot of rhetoric but no impact or substance. In terms of politics, not many people have succeeded just on rhetoric anyway—very few in fact—and those who have succeeded have had some substance to it.

I really say to members opposite that the challenge that has been thrown up to them by their leader is to meet the substantial challenge that he has thrown out to them by raising the bar to the level that he has. They now have to come up with the substance to follow through with that. Again, I am not making a call on that one. It may be that they have all sorts of ammunition waiting to fire off and they will do a tremendous job. I will not criticise them now, because I will give them an opportunity—and I think they deserve an opportunity—to come good on their threats. Fair enough, they deserve that opportunity, but for my part back here reading my book in quiet solitude I will be looking up only if they look like getting there. So far members opposite are not disturbing most of my random reading at all. Anyway, we will see how far they go with that. So they are a few of my thoughts about the Leader of the Opposition's contribution.

I want to say a few words about local government. Local government is a very important part of the system of government in South Australia. Many people are under the mistaken impression that local government is in fact a tier of government in the sense that it has some sort of constitutional credibility. It does not; it does not even exist as a constitutional element. Local government is entirely the creation of a state parliament. If one looks around the country, one sees different solutions that different state governments have applied. For example, in Queensland the Brisbane City Council is an enormous local government entity with an enormous budget, covering far in excess of anything like the number of people or services offered by South Australian local government. Each state has different solutions for the local government issue. The fundamental reason for local government is to offer citizens some active role for participating in decision making at a local level; otherwise it is difficult to see what the rationale for local government is. After all, why would you duplicate administrations across a city such as Adelaide in order to have rubbish bins collected, streets swept, trees pruned or verges mowed? Why would you multiply that over and over through administrations unless there was a good reason?

The good reason is that people in the community get the chance every four years to elect their local community representatives to participate in decision making at the local level, and that is very important. That important role is an effective role only if those individuals who are elected to local government positions are informed in their duties and given the opportunity by the administration in local government to go about their business in an informed way. If those individuals are shielded from the truth or shepherded into particular directions by various administrative mechanisms, such that they make uninformed decisions which are, in effect, rubber stamping administration opinions, then they are not properly discharging their function.

That is a matter for concern. It has come to my attention that there are some problems in some councils where this important local government role, that is, giving the local community a voice in their decision making processes at a local level, is being frustrated by administrations which see it as being their role to not only execute the decisions of council, which is their statutory function under the Local Government Act, but also to make the decisions as well and to use the councillors as basically some sort of decoration required every now and again to put a stamp on a decision. One of the things that makes that very difficult for these administrations is the prospect of them being overseen from without. It is very easy for them to deal with a complaint from within. If a member of the public is not happy with local government and goes to the CEO of a council and says, 'Look, we have a problem with what is going on here,' they are appealing to the person in charge of the organisation that is oppressing them. You do not have to be a genius to work out that the chances are that, unless it is something that does not really bother the administration, they are in a perfect position to kill the complaint and do nothing about it. That applies whether the complaint is administrative, fiscal or of any other nature.

The parliament would be aware that the former Auditor-General in his report to parliament last year made certain recommendations about the scope of audit in local government. I will not quote the Auditor-General extensively because it is all there for anyone to read, but he indicated that there is a difference between the scope of audit at a state government level and at a local government level and this remains the case, according to the Auditor-General, in spite of the very positive amendments the government has made to the audit provisions, which I understand will come into effect in June or July this year. The Auditor-General says that even those steps could be improved. The Acting Auditor-General recently went to print endorsing those views as well, and makes clear that in other states around the country there is a role for the Auditor-General to be able to come in and supervise at least the audit process at local government level. It is an appropriate consideration for us to look at and say that, if Auditors-General around Australia are doing this, and the Acting Auditor-General says it would be an improvement from the viewpoint of financial accountability of local government, then it is at least a case worth considering. I hope that over the course of this year those proposals receive some active consideration.

The scope of audit is very important as well as the fact of audit. Local government audit, according to the Auditor-General, is largely a tick and flick process—an expression they use. In other words: has the money come in—yes; has the money gone out—yes; do the cheques balance—yes; tick. The audit process engaged in by the Auditor-General at a state level is a more sophisticated audit process requiring greater accountability. The Auditor-General's remarks go to two points: first, the scope of the audit should be broader; and, secondly, it should not be the case that the Auditor-General does not of his own motion have a role in supervising those local government audits. At the moment those local government audits are done by private auditors, which of itself is not a problem as far as I am concerned, but the Auditor-General cannot of his own motion wander up to one of these local government private auditors and say, 'Show me what you are doing—give me a copy of that, we would like to take over this part of the audit or direct you to do this or that.' That is what happens elsewhere and, as I said, it is

something to which I think we need to give serious consideration.

The other matter to which I previously referred about the genuine democratic participation of councils is a more difficult matter, because we are talking here about the culture of particular local government organisations. Everyone realises that cultural change is very difficult to achieve, and it probably requires a lot of hard work and goodwill from the people involved. However, ultimately, some individuals are absolutely resistant to this sort of culture change in local government and, until those individuals are identified and put under the spotlight, I fear that this cultural change will be slow in coming.

That raises the question, I think, of whether (leaving audit aside) there is the need for some other form of independent oversight of local government. Of course, the Ombudsman has a role there; he comments about this in his annual reports, and that is all very well. I was watching the *Four Corners* program (I think it was) on television the other night, and there was a reference to a problem with local government in the Busselton area in Western Australia. It was interesting to note that the local individuals there said, 'Look, we tried going through the local government authority, and we couldn't get anywhere.'

I make it clear that I am not standing up here advocating some sort of CJC or CCC, or whatever they call them over there. I think that is a different debate and one that is not relevant to this remark. However, I make the point that there needs to be the opportunity for some sort of independent oversight. We have the Auditor-General and, of course, we have the capacity for ministerial intervention. However, again, ministerial intervention, in many of these local government cases, would be the equivalent of using a sledgehammer to crack a walnut. There needs to be some form of modulated response below that sort of extreme measure.

The other issue that I think is also very important with respect to local government is the fact that the information flow between the administration in local government and some councillors in some councils is appalling. I know of one instance where explicit council resolutions requiring the production of documents by the administration have been disobeyed by council administration and, subsequently, I have put in a freedom of information application in respect of that same matter and received 2½ inches of documents. I ask the question of the parliament: why is it that I, as an applicant under a freedom of information provision, should be entitled to more in respect of that matter than elected members were after not only asking for these things but also passing a resolution? That is completely wrong. It is absolutely clear that there should be appropriate provision of information to individual councillors at least commensurate with what they would be entitled to receive under the Freedom of Information Act.

I have spoken to elected members in a number of councils who have told me that, when they have asked for documents, the response they have received from the unelected administration has been, 'If you want that material, put it in an FOI application.' These people are private individuals. They do not have the opportunity that we have as members of parliament of being able to obtain some form of financial assistance to get an FOI application up and running. They are being frustrated in conducting their elected public duty by a refusal to provide them with appropriate information. Again, that is completely unsatisfactory. The sort of process which

I am talking about does not necessarily require ministerial intervention. However, it should be capable of being complained of to someone who can expose the officers and the administrations involved and get some action on these things so that the democratic processes that are supposed to be operating at that level can, in fact, operate.

Another area of concern in local government is delegations. Members of parliament may be aware that many of the powers vested in local government are vested in the body itself—the council. The council itself will not sit down as a body and decide whether or not your garage will be approved, so it delegates. It delegates a large number of its powers to the staff—and that is a perfectly sensible administrative arrangement, about which I have no complaint. However, there are circumstances in which these delegations are presented to councillors in phone book sized policy documents, and they are invited to tick them off with virtually no opportunity for them to comprehend what is contained in them. It is particularly important when it comes to the delegation relating to obtaining legal advice, because there are cases involving disputes between the elected membership and the administration of council about what legal advice should be sought, from whom it should be sought and to what end.

Those delegations are routinely being made in circumstances in which I do not believe most elected members understand what is happening. Unfortunately, most of them do not understand that, by resolution, they could also revoke that delegation. I would encourage members who are being frustrated in that way to consider doing that. In any event, this is something at which we need to look calmly. I am not suggesting any particular solutions to these problems, other than the fact that they are there and we should give measured consideration to how these problems can be addressed so that the important democratic function that local government is supposed to discharge is enhanced and not frustrated.

The second thing about which I would like to talk briefly is public housing. In relation to public housing, members probably realise that my electorate has more than most members would have by way of public housing stock. I am very happy about that; I do not have a problem with that. Public housing is a very important part of the social fabric of South Australia and it is a very important government function. However, there is this perennial problem of disruptive tenants, and all members at some stage must have encountered this problem as members of parliament—some more than others. I commend minister Weatherill for the steps he has taken in relation to starting to deal with this question of disruptive tenants. He is moving in the right direction and I congratulate him for that.

However, we still have to keep moving on it, because there are some people—and I emphasise this again: a very small number of people—who are absolutely and irretrievably disruptive tenants. They are people who will not listen to requests that they treat their neighbours with respect. They are completely impervious to any form of assistance, advice or anything else. Frankly, I do not know what would be satisfactory for these people, but the fact is that they are being placed next to other people who are trying to live their lives in a reasonable way. These people are moving around from one spot to another. They get booted out of one spot; they move to another spot. They get booted out of that spot; they move to another spot. I realise that this is not easy, because some of these people have children and those children have to be housed, but something needs to be done to keep the

pressure on these disruptive elements—and I emphasise to the house that they are few in number.

In fact, in my electorate, if I had a magic wand that I could wave over only five houses at any one time, I could improve the happiness in my electorate from about 50 per cent to 80 per cent. It would be that easy.

**Ms Fox:** A wizard!

**Mr RAU:** I would be a wizard; exactly. All I would need is that wand—five houses. Give me five houses at any time. Again, from the experience I have in my electorate, there is no getting away from the fact that the houses which have previously been held for Aboriginal housing have caused a disproportionate amount of complaint from their neighbours. I for one do not believe that this is all a product of racism. I think that is nonsense. I have been to some of these places; I have seen what goes on, and some of these people are conducting themselves, for whatever reason, in a way that is not conducive to their neighbours' peaceful enjoyment of their property.

A number of things can be done about this, including intervention programs to give them some assistance with what they are doing. What I would put as a suggestion is this: now that the Aboriginal Housing Authority, as such, is no longer a separate unit, at least the houses which were previously designated as Aboriginal housing properties should no longer be explicitly designated as those properties, and there should be an opportunity for the residents who live next to these properties to have some respite.

So, from time to time, sure, there may be a difficult tenant in those properties and the appropriate agencies go out there and try to help them through, but it should not be the case that the same neighbours get those same tenants time in and time out, and they have no respite. I would urge the minister to give some consideration to actually creating, in effect, a floating pool for that important purpose. I appreciate there are good reasons why those people need to be housed, but they should not always be housed in the same properties because I think that is unreasonably disruptive for the neighbours.

The final thing I say, very briefly, is on the subject of education. There has been a great deal in the media about education over the past couple of years, and recently it has been getting more intense. Not being by any means an education expert, I do not really understand all of the arguments, other than that there appears to be something of a convergence of thought, at least at a national level, about what needs to happen, and there appears to be some convergence of thought about there being a national curriculum and all this sort of thing. It seems to me that, while that is superficially logical, if that curriculum is hopeless, well, that is not a good thing. But that is not where I want to go.

I just make some brief remarks as a parent who is trying to comprehend the assessment processes that go on in schools these days. I understand that there is this idea called outcome-based learning, which is the flavour of the month in education circles. I am reading about it in an attempt to understand it better. My present view, which is not a fully informed view, is that it looks like something that has a lot of questions marks about it, if I can put it that way. I will leave it at that because I have not finished my research.

What I will say is this: as a parent, I have had to sit down and read report cards sent home about my children. I am able to read—in fact, before I came here I basically read for a living—and I do not understand what those report cards say. They make no sense to me at all—zip. Basically they say that my children are alive and they have been at school. I have

tackled the teachers about this, in a nice way, and said, 'Can you please translate this into English for me because I don't understand it? It doesn't make sense. I don't know what it means. Does it mean I should be helping my son a bit more with mathematics of a night time, or does it mean I should be giving him some sort of encouragement to play the violin? What does it mean?' Unfortunately, I have to tell members that the teachers say, 'Sorry, but this is how we do it.'

The only thing I can say to members is that I do not know why this is the case, and perhaps that is a failing in me. If it is I confess it; however, I do not understand it. I find it frustrating, and if other parents are experiencing the same thing I would hope that, in the course of whatever is being tumbled around at the state and national level at the moment regarding education, something can be done to make the actual report cards comprehensible to simple folk like me, so that when I am actually at home with my kids I have some idea where I should be focusing my attention and what I should be doing. I do not want to buy into the bigger debate because I do not know enough about it, but I do know that that is a frustration for me as a parent.

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

*[Sitting suspended from 12.56 to 2 p.m.]*

#### DAYLIGHT SAVING

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

Leave granted.

**The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT:** I rise to inform the house that the government will be consulting with the South Australian community over a proposal to extend daylight saving. It has been announced that New South Wales, Victoria, Tasmania and the ACT are extending the period of daylight saving time so that it commences on the first Sunday in October and ends on the first Sunday in April. The Premier has already made it clear that it will not be the eastern states that determine when South Australia starts and finishes its period of daylight saving, but the Premier did agree to consult with the people of this state to see what they think. Whatever decision we come to in the future, it will only ever be what is in the best interests of South Australia and not what is in the best interests of the eastern states or anyone else.

The process we are embarking on today is about determining how all sections of the community feel about a change. We will consult widely, because such a change is not just about how it will impact on the business community; it is about the impact it will have on families as well. I have requested SafeWork SA to carry out a community consultation process about a possible extension to daylight saving in line with these dates. Advertisements in metropolitan and regional newspapers will ask people to register their view in writing or electronically on a purpose-built web site. Members of the South Australian Strategic Plan contact group will be surveyed directly by email, and a direct invitation to consult will be provided to key stakeholders and relevant community organisations. The consultation period will be for four weeks, commencing Saturday 12 May, and I encourage the public and all interested parties to make a submission.

#### HICKS, Mr D.

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

Leave granted.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** Today, I wish to provide further information in relation to the transfer and imprisonment of former Adelaide resident David Hicks, who last month pleaded guilty in a US military court in Guantanamo Bay to supporting terrorism. Discussions between relevant state and federal agencies have been under way since the application from David Hicks to transfer to Australia was received by the commonwealth. These discussions have centred on matters of accommodation, security and the transfer of David Hicks from Guantanamo Bay to Adelaide. I understand that the commonwealth Attorney-General is to write to the South Australian government in the next few days. This will begin the final phase of the transfer process. The South Australian government will give its consent once this formal request has been received. The transfer process should be completed by the end of May.

While David Hicks will be a federal prisoner, he will be subject to South Australian laws. Initially, David Hicks will be managed according to the national guidelines for the management of terrorists, and it is intended that he will be held in the maximum security G Division at Yatala. I am informed that during this time he will have little or no contact with other prisoners and telephone conversations will be monitored. In addition, his strictly controlled visits will be limited to non-contact sessions. He will obviously be entitled to meet with his lawyers. Following the initial assessment period, further decisions will be made in relation to the management regime to which David Hicks will be subject, but security considerations will be of the greatest importance in this regard.

South Australia intends to send two Correctional officers to act as a security escort for the transfer of David Hicks back to Australia. As to what happens to David Hicks when he is released from prison, which I understand will be at the end of December this year, the government has some serious concerns. Today I wrote to the Prime Minister outlining these concerns, and I would like to share them with the house. My letter reads as follows:

Dear Prime Minister,

As you are well aware, David Matthew Hicks was convicted and sentenced on his plea of guilty to the charge of providing material support to an international terrorist organisation, namely, al-Qaeda. Hicks has applied under the International Transfer of Prisoners Act 1997 to serve the balance of his sentence in Australia.

The government of South Australia, through its officers, has been involved in discussion with the commonwealth government, through its officers, about the proposed transfer of Hicks to South Australia to serve his sentence as a federal prisoner in a state correctional facility. I have already advised the commonwealth Attorney-General, the Hon. Philip Ruddock, and have publicly indicated that the government of South Australia is fully prepared to agree and to facilitate these arrangements subject, of course, to the satisfactory completion of the necessary formalities.

I am concerned about the implications arising from Hicks' presence in South Australia as a prisoner and upon his anticipated release at the end of 2007. I am advised that the documents submitted to the Court for Military Commissions, endorsed by Hicks' defence counsel, Major Michael Mori, and prosecution counsel, acknowledge that Hicks was an unlawful enemy combatant.

The relevant document details Hicks' involvement with a number of terrorist and paramilitary organisations between 1999 and 2001, including al-Qaeda, Lashkar-e Tayyiba and Kosovo Liberation Army. The document shows that during this period Hicks received extensive training in military and guerilla warfare, the use of

weapons, kidnapping, urban warfare, surveillance techniques, the passing of intelligence and assassination methods, amongst other activities. The document reveals—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** If you want to disagree with the Prime Minister and the federal government, please say so. My letter to the Prime Minister continues—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** I think the people of South Australia have a right to know and I am going to insist that they have a right to know.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** Mr Speaker, this is a serious matter in relation to terrorism and I would have thought that members opposite, particularly the Leader of the Opposition, would regard it as a serious matter—certainly the Prime Minister does. I will continue:

The document reveals that in about mid 2000 Hicks travelled to the border region of Pakistan and Kashmir where he engaged in hostile action against Indian forces by firing a machine gun at an Indian Army bunker. According to the document, in October 2001, Hicks' al-Qaeda training culminated in a briefing by the then al-Qaeda deputy commander who was organising al-Qaeda forces in Afghanistan.

Hicks was informed about locations where fighting was expected against US and Coalition forces and chose to join a group of al-Qaeda and Taliban fighters near Kandahar airport. The document details how Hicks was issued with an automatic rifle, ammunition and grenades to fight US, Northern Alliance and Coalition forces at this location. Later, Hicks was reassigned to an armed group guarding a Taliban tank for about a week outside the airport. During that time he was supplied by al-Qaeda with food and briefings.

Based on Hicks' activities as reported in the document, endorsed by his defence counsel, I have grave concerns about the security implications associated with Hicks' release from custody. I therefore—

this is in my letter to the Prime Minister—

seek your urgent advice as to the measures the commonwealth government has approved or is contemplating to ensure appropriate levels of protection of community safety and security. I am sure you will agree that the South Australian government and the South Australian public have a right to know about the conditions applying to Hicks' release. In particular, I would be grateful if you could advise whether control orders will be sought under the 2005 counter-terrorism amendments to the commonwealth Criminal Code.

I understand that the Australian Federal Police may, with the consent of the Commonwealth Attorney-General, seek a control order from a Federal Court in relation to a person who may involve a risk to the community. I am informed that a control order issued by a judicial authority may impose strict conditions including home detention, a curfew, limits on movements and restrictions on association with other named persons or class of persons. Whether or not sufficient grounds exist or can be established to seek a control order and persuade a court to issue such an order is for the commonwealth government and its agencies to assess.

I am also concerned that Hicks may seek to profit from this matter by publishing his account of his detention, the events leading to his detention and subsequent conviction. I understand that some doubts have been expressed about whether or not Commonwealth legislation can prevent such an abuse. While I support the right of individuals to tell their story, I do not support convicted persons profiting from selling their story.

The Government of South Australia is prepared to introduce legislation in the Parliament to prohibit Hicks (or any persons in the same or similar position to Hicks) from profiting from the publication of his story. I am advised that the necessary nexus with South Australia can be established under the Constitution Act (SA) to authorise extra territorial legislation.

That is my letter to the Prime Minister. I think that all members would want to know what the conditions of Hicks' release into the community will be and whether or not the

federal government will apply to the courts for a control order, given his unsavoury record.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

## PAPER TABLED

The following paper was laid on the table:

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

State Electoral Office, Local Government Activities—  
Report 2005-06.

## LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE

**Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens):** I bring up the first report of the committee.

Report received and read.

## VISITORS TO PARLIAMENT

**The SPEAKER:** I draw to honourable members' attention the presence in the chamber today of students from Mount Barker Waldorf School, who are guests of the member for Kavel, and students from Our Lady of the Sacred Heart College, who are guests of the member for Enfield.

## QUESTION TIME

### WATER INFRASTRUCTURE

**The SPEAKER:** Questions without notice. The Leader of the Opposition.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Leader of the Opposition):** Thank you for that well-rehearsed welcome. I look forward to many long question times. In fact, I asked a few questions yesterday, but I have not—

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr HAMILTON-SMITH:**—heard many answers, Mr Speaker.

**The SPEAKER:** The member will get on with his question.

**Mr HAMILTON-SMITH:** My question is to the leader. Why did Labor under his leadership—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr HAMILTON-SMITH:** Why did Labor under his leadership fail to foresee, over the past five years, the need for alternative water infrastructure investments to supplement our reliance on the River Murray while Labor governments in Western Australia and Queensland have identified the need and acted upon it?

**The Hon. M.D. RANN (Premier):** Can I advise the Leader of the Opposition that I am not the leader of the opposition; I am the Premier of South Australia. I read that yesterday we suffered from a blitzkrieg from the Leader of the Opposition. My mum and dad went through the real Blitz, and what took place yesterday was no blitzkrieg. You would be well aware of the work that we have been doing with the Waterproofing Adelaide initiative. You would be well aware of the negotiations we have been having, started by me as a COAG process, I think back in 2003. It was I who took it to COAG, and you would be aware of the negotiations that are going on right now with BHP Billiton to establish—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** Breaking news: we have had the blitzkrieg. There will be a desalination plant here in South Australia. It will be the biggest in the southern hemisphere and one of the biggest in the world. It is designed partly to relieve pressure on the River Murray and partly to underpin the mining boom that we have set ourselves the task of initiating. We also have a group that is currently looking at options for a second desalination plant. While you have been talking—all mouth and no trousers—we have been acting.

### WORKCHOICES

**Mr BIGNELL (Mawson):** My question is to the Minister for Industrial Relations. What is the impact of WorkChoices on South Australian families in light of recent reports about Australian workplace agreements?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** I rise on a point of order. The minister is not responsible for federal legislation.

**The SPEAKER:** The minister can still answer in terms of the implications for the state government's policies from federal government legislation. That still comes within his responsibility. The Minister for Industrial Relations.

**The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT (Minister for Industrial Relations):** The member's question is important for at least two reasons: first, because of the devastating effect of AWAs on South Australian families; and, secondly, because of the Liberal government's claim—

**Mr WILLIAMS:** Point of order, Mr Speaker. The minister is clearly debating, and I am absolutely certain that his intention is to continue to debate.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The minister has not even completed a sentence. I do not know how the member comes to the conclusion that he is debating. The Minister for Industrial Relations.

**The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT:** Thank you, sir; and, secondly, because the Liberal government's claim that working conditions were protected by law has been shown to be completely untrue. A recent report in the *Workforce Daily* newsletter stated that, of 5 250 AWAs examined, 45 per cent stripped away from all award conditions; 33 per cent provided no wage rises; 27.8 per cent might have broken the law; 76 per cent removed shift loadings; 59 per cent removed annual leave loadings; 70 per cent removed incentive pay and bonuses; and 22 per cent removed declared public holidays.

As time goes on, more and more South Australian families will suffer because of WorkChoices. AWAs under WorkChoices are like a chainsaw ripping apart the rights of working families. John Howard threw the truth overboard when he claimed that workers' rights were protected by law. We will continue to expose his deception of Australian working families.

### DESALINATION PROJECTS

**Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Leader of the Opposition):** When will the Premier deliver a desalination plant for Adelaide, and when will he get the results on water security that he promised during the last election campaign?

**The Hon. M.D. RANN (Premier):** It is obvious that the Leader of the Opposition saw this morning's poll, which shows that the Liberals have gone down since he became the leader, and he has decided, 'I know what I will do. I will go back to Iain Evans's policy.' We have been negotiating an

agreement to give an independent commission control over the River Murray because the problem we have had for years, as the downstream state—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I cannot hear a word the Premier is saying.

**Ms Chapman:** It's not worth it.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I am on my feet. I will not be spoken over when I am on my feet. The house will come to order.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** It was not me who described it as 'catastrophic' but what happened is that the Leader of the Opposition, with not one single policy clue in his head, decided that perhaps the former leader, with a bit more substance—that he should actually return to see what he was up to, and that is what we are seeing today—a press conference to announce Iain Evans's policy. It is kind of like: is Vickie liked?

The fact of the matter is that we have a situation now where South Australia has negotiated for an independent commission to run the River Murray. That is about guaranteeing environmental flow down the river. That is about making sure that the river is run for all the people along the river not just the upstream states. That is why it was critically important to negotiate that deal. Of course, members opposite believe that by sitting back and doing nothing things happen. That is what they did in their 8½ years. We have started a process of negotiating for the biggest desal plant in the southern hemisphere. We have been pushing the waterproofing of Adelaide, and we have negotiated the deal with the federal government to get the River Murray back on track.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! There is a big difference between interjecting and trying to scream down a minister while he is attempting to answer a question; I remind members of that.

### FLU VACCINATIONS

**Ms FOX (Bright):** My question is to the Minister for Health. What is the status of this year's rollout of the flu vaccines for South Australians?

**The Hon. J.D. HILL (Minister for Health):** I thank the member for Bright for this important question. On Monday I asked all South Australians who are elderly, sick or who work in the health care industry to get their annual vaccination to protect themselves against the coming flu season. People over the age of 65, in particular, those who have chronic diseases, and those who have some other reason are in danger of catching the flu. People who are in high risk groups should seek a vaccination. They include, as I said, people over the age of 65, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders over the age of 50—

**Mrs Redmond:** People who work in airconditioning?

**The Hon. J.D. HILL:** I am not sure about people who work in airconditioning; that is most people, I guess. Other people included are chronic disease sufferers, people with immune deficiencies, people in nursing homes and health care workers who have contact with people in high risk groups. The Department of Health provides free flu vaccines to all people over the age of 65, indigenous people over the age of 50 and indigenous people aged 15 to 49 who have chronic diseases.

I am advised by the state's chief medical officer that this year's flu strain is likely to be different to the one we had last year. We were lucky last year because the flu outbreak was



not as great as it otherwise might have been, but this year it is expected that we will see the re-emergence of the H3 strain of influenza from northern Asia. The good news is that the vaccination has taken this into account and those who have had their shots already will be protected. Last year we distributed 222 130 vaccines across the state to GP clinics. Already this year we have distributed about 200 000 shots and we are expecting more orders by the end of May.

During the last year, our state's vaccine program had the highest coverage in Australia for over 65 year olds; 84 per cent of this group was vaccinated, which is 6 per cent higher than the national average, so that was a good outcome, particularly since we have an ageing state. We have maintained this high level of vaccinations over the past five years.

One important aspect of our vaccination program is targeting health care workers for a flu shot. Interestingly enough, a lot of health care workers choose not to have vaccinations. We are encouraging them to take this step. Health care workers are at increased risk, of course, of contracting the disease and transmitting it to others. Last year we distributed 25 000 vaccines to staff in public hospitals and achieved a coverage rate of about 51 per cent, which is 10 per cent better than the year before, so progress is being made. Clearly, there is much room for improvement on this front. I encourage every staff member of a hospital, health care unit, aged care facility or GP clinic to get their flu shot as soon as possible. I would also encourage all members in this place to show leadership—perhaps in their newsletters use photographs of themselves being inoculated—to encourage the broader community.

I understand the Deputy Leader of the Opposition has criticised my promotion of people getting a flu shot, which is quite surprising. I am advised that around—

*Ms Chapman interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.D. HILL:** She says I should have made comments about salmonella. Let me tell the Deputy Leader of the Opposition that each year in Australia around 1 500 Australians die from influenza-related complications, and I was criticised for encouraging people to have flu shots. This disease also represents a large number of the winter presentations we see in our emergency departments each year. All this is completely preventable if people have a flu shot every year. So, I strongly believe it is our public health responsibility to provide these shots to key groups at risk, and my responsibility is to promote this activity in the community. I encourage all members in this place to show some leadership in this regard and have their own flu shots, and also encourage their communities to do so.

**An honourable member:** I have.

**The Hon. J.D. HILL:** That is good to hear.

#### WATERPROOFING ADELAIDE

**Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Leader of the Opposition):** When will the Premier deliver on the recommendations of his Waterproofing Adelaide studies to construct major stormwater retention and reuse infrastructure, and when will he start getting the results he promised?

**The Hon. K.A. MAYWALD (Minister for Water Security):** I thank the leader for the question. Waterproofing Adelaide is a strategy that aims to secure Adelaide's water supply into the future through a range of different measures, one of those being stormwater reuse, and also effluent reuse and demand management. As the Premier indicated earlier in his answer to a previous question, we also have a task force

that is currently looking at the feasibility of including desalination as one of the measures to waterproof and secure Adelaide's water supply in the future. That desalination working group is working particularly hard to look at all the options for desalination. The issues that need to be considered are the environmental issues, the kind of technology that needs to be looked at and would be suitable, the size of the plant that would be suitable for Adelaide, what the costs and the greenhouse gas emissions impact would be, and what sort of electricity requirement would be needed. All those kinds of issues need to be dealt with before a decision is made whether desalination is part of the mix.

However, the Waterproofing Adelaide strategy has a range of other measures that will certainly work towards securing Adelaide's water supply into the future, and that includes stormwater reuse. The opposition leader may be aware that the state government has been working with the Salisbury council, and other councils in the north of Adelaide, and in fact they have made a successful application to the Water Smart Australia fund for their \$90 million Waterproofing the North project. The Waterproofing the North project aims to return about 25 gegalitres of water off the mains system to ensure that we can secure the Waterproofing the North strategy and reduce the impact on the River Murray. I think the important thing here is that that project is a very good partnership project. It is about the state government working with the local and federal governments and also the private sector to deliver really good outcomes. That 25 gegalitres is anticipated to be delivered for \$90 million, and it is a tremendous project.

There are a number of other projects that are currently being worked on through the Waterproofing Adelaide strategy, including the Waterproofing the South project, which we are negotiating at the moment with the Onkaparinga council and also the National Water Commission. We are looking at a pipeline from the Glenelg waste water treatment plant into the Adelaide Parklands, which is another really good project. There is a whole range of projects that we are currently working on and, as part of the strategy, we will be delivering secure water for South Australia.

#### PUBLIC HOUSING

**Ms PORTOLESI (Hartley):** My question is to the Minister for Housing. What has led to the sale of public housing stock in South Australia over the last decade?

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Minister for Housing):** I note that some remarks were made by the federal Minister for Family and Community Services, Mal Brough, in the media where he said:

Back in 1996-97 [SA] had about 60 698 public houses, today you have 51 628, almost exactly a drop of 9 000 homes. And the only conclusion I can come to is the state is selling those properties and not reinvesting the money in more public housing but putting the money into consolidated revenue and for other purposes.

I cannot let those comments stand because they are completely factually inaccurate, and they fail to—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** Just listen here. I am defending your honour a bit because, in fact, the government that actually took to selling public housing with great alacrity was, in fact, the previous government.

*Ms Chapman interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** You would have to stand on your head to come to that conclusion, because public

housing grew in every year until 1992-93, when it started its decline and, of course, that coincided with the advent of the Liberal government. I think what—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** No, I am going to defend you here and help you out a bit, because it was not all your doing, and what we do need to acknowledge is that over the life of the Howard government, federal government housing policy settings have had their absolutely intended effect; that is, to run down the public housing stock in this state. In 1996 we had the largest public housing stock as a proportion of our overall stock of any state in the nation. Even now, after a decade of house sales, South Australia has public housing stock of 8 per cent, and the national average is around 4 to 5 per cent, so in South Australia we still have almost double the national average.

The reason for this large stock was that over the decades the South Australian government—and this was a generally held bipartisan view—that there was more to public housing than welfare housing. It was actually about providing for low and moderate income earners. That was largely supported by federal governments of both persuasions over the years, beginning with the very important initiative of the Chifley Labor government in 1945, the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement. But this dramatically changed in 1996 when John Howard took government. Their vision was that public housing should be confined to welfare housing and that the commonwealth rent allowance program would take care of the rest of the population.

The policy that was set was that the public housing system would be increasingly oriented to those with the highest needs, and South Australia has been systematically punished for the size of our public housing stock. Not only did the commonwealth fail to recognise that because of the direct provision of public housing we were relieving the commonwealth of the obligation to provide commonwealth rent allowance payments to tenants in South Australia, but also in their first year of government, instead of recognising that and providing us with an adequate level of funding to match our much higher public housing stock, the first thing they did was to cut commonwealth funding to South Australia by \$19 million and, over the life of that agreement and updated to the present day, there was a 36 per cent cut—a real cut—in commonwealth funding to South Australia in relation to our Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement.

This was the picture: public funding cut dramatically; revenues eroded because we are placing some of the highest-need people in our housing. So, instead of having something like 70 per cent of people who are on Centrelink benefits, now it is 85 per cent heading up to 90 per cent, resulting in reduced revenues from our client base and, of course, in the higher cost of supporting those higher-need tenants, still leaving the heavy debt burden associated with our traditionally large investment in public housing over the previous decades.

As I said, this shift in federal government thinking very much accorded with the thinking of those opposite. They sold 10 000 houses between 1993 and 2002, averaging about 1 000 a year. We arrested this dramatic decline but unfortunately still had to sell 400 houses a year just to meet the shortfalls between revenues and expenses. We must acknowledge that we now have a plan to restore the viability of the housing system, but the federal government's policy in this area is having precisely its intended effect. It has never acknowledged that South Australia is in a different position,

with a much different commitment to public housing in this state, and we have been systematically punished by the federal government. So, it is the height of hypocrisy for the federal government to set in place provisions which punish South Australia and which drive us to sell the stock to make ends meet and then point out that somehow our stock has been reduced—absolute hypocrisy.

#### WELLINGTON WEIR

**Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Leader of the Opposition):** Again I direct my question to the Premier. Why is it that under his leadership over the past five years the state government has left itself with no option other than to provide for additional water for Adelaide by building a weir at Wellington? In a speech to the National Press Club on 20 February 2003—four years ago—the Premier clearly knew about the impending water crisis when he stated that we must 'cut our reliance on the Murray' and 'The drought cannot be used as an excuse.' In addition, he said, 'We want to find ways to use the billions of litres of stormwater that falls across Adelaide each year which we let run out to sea.'

**The Hon. M.D. RANN (Premier):** Exactly. I am pleased that we are having an orgy of questions on this matter. I am really pleased that you read that speech, because that was part of the launch to get this thing on the national agenda, and that is exactly what the Waterproofing Adelaide strategy is about. I am really pleased that you have honoured your predecessor as Leader of the Opposition by reprising his press conference in the vain hope that the media will think, 'Maybe this is a new one from the Leader of the Opposition; we won't remember what happened a few weeks ago.'

**The Hon. P.F. Conlon:** It's not a new policy: just a new leader.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** It's not a new policy: just a new leader. I am very pleased that the Leader of the Opposition, following yesterday's performance, is doing some real research and reading my Press Council speech.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

#### NATIONAL YOUTH WEEK

**Mr PICCOLO (Light):** My question is to the Minister for Youth. What were some of the highlights of National Youth Week held recently in South Australia?

**The Hon. P. CAICA (Minister for Youth):** I thank the member for Light for his question and for representing me recently at the Gawler Young Achiever awards. I am pleased to report to all members of the house on the success of the National Youth Week in South Australia. Now in its seventh year, National Youth Week was held from 14 to 22 April. This year's theme was 'Launch Yourself', which encouraged young people to make the event their own. This meant that more young people than ever were involved in creating, organising and managing activities. The state government is committed to youth engagement and participation, and this is reflected in more than \$100 000 of funding provided to almost 60 organisations to support National Youth Week. More than 600 young people brought 110 official National Youth Week activities to life. Their hard work resulted in an estimated 15 000 young people across South Australia taking part.

The Office for Youth held workshops for young people in a dozen locations across our state, where the participants

learnt about events management, how to handle media and communications, and how to handle their events. This opportunity provided them with invaluable skills and valuable knowledge that will stand them in good stead as they pursue whatever career they wish to pursue. There were many highlights during National Youth Week, and time permits me to mention only a few.

However, one that drew my attention—and I wish I had known about it beforehand, because I certainly would have sent my pair of boys along—was cooking for home leavers, which was an event mostly attended by 16 and 17 year old males. The participants cooked up a storm and created four dishes in 20 minutes. Hopefully, there will be a lot more budding young chefs among them who will be able to take advantage of the training system for cookery we have within TAFE.

*The Hon. P.F. Conlon interjecting:*

**The Hon. P. CAICA:** That is one of my favourite meals, Patrick, but you left off the mashed potatoes. It was a good event—and it was a good event for those kids. As I have said, I wish I had sent my boys along. Many events were based around significant issues, including mental health, affecting young people. A mental health workshop called ‘Talk out loud’ was conducted by the Red Cross, and it brought together young people to talk about the differences between mental health and mental illness and how to avoid negative peer pressure in relation to drugs and alcohol. In the South-East, nearly 200 young people participated in an activity called ‘Road safety, not road trauma’ to raise awareness about road safety, an issue that impacts on far too many of our young people and their families.

National Youth Week taps into existing interests and talents and opens up many new and exciting possibilities for our young South Australians. It can challenge them, give them direction and in some cases turn their life around. National Youth Week gets local communities involved, gives young people the chance to learn practical skills and provides opportunities for them to speak their mind on a range of issues important to them. I congratulate all the participants for their enthusiasm and the organisers for helping to make National Youth Week in South Australia a success once again.

#### UNITED WATER

**Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Leader of the Opposition):** My question is once again to the Premier. Will the Premier rule out renewal or extension of the United Water outsourcing contract for the management of state-owned water infrastructure when it falls due for renewal in 2011? In 1996, the South Australian government awarded United Water a 15-year contract to manage and operate the state government-owned metropolitan Adelaide water and waste water systems. The contract is due to expire in 2011. Both the Premier and the Deputy Premier railed against the decision at the time, based on their principles.

**The Hon. K.A. MAYWALD (Minister for Water Security):** The water contract with United Water has another 4½—

**Mr HAMILTON-SMITH:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker. The Premier has been waiting with bated breath for questions. This is an important question—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! There is no point of order. The Leader of the Opposition well knows there is no point of order. The Minister for Water Security.

**The Hon. K.A. MAYWALD:** Thank you—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Minister for Water Security.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Minister for Transport and the Leader of the Opposition will come to order.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! It is a grave discourtesy to the Minister for Water Security for ministers on her own side to be speaking over her while she is attempting to answer the question. The Minister for Water Security.

**The Hon. K.A. MAYWALD:** Thank you, sir. This is a very important question. Of course, there are 4½ years to run on the contract and, in the fullness of time, we will be looking at the options for the future.

*Members interjecting:*

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

#### BHP BILLITON

**Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Leader of the Opposition):** My question is to the Premier. Where is the Premier? He has been waiting for question time, but he is not here. Oh, there he is. Thank you very much, Premier; we missed you. You have been anticipating this so much, at least you could be present.

**The Hon. P.F. Conlon:** You won’t see the end of the year, Marty.

**Mr HAMILTON-SMITH:** We’ll see about that, Pat.

**The Hon. P.F. Conlon:** We will. I’d take a bet.

**Mr HAMILTON-SMITH:** You’ll wait. My question is to the Premier, now that he is back in the chamber. Has the Premier spoken with the owner of Roxby Downs, BHP Billiton, to gauge its reaction to the federal Labor Party’s plan to ban the use of AWAs and, if so, what was the response? In 2001, a review comparison of operations of BHP Iron Ore Pty Ltd and Rio Tinto Hamersley Iron Pty Ltd, conducted in the late 1990s, found that statutory individual agreements at Hamersley facilitated an increased capacity to implement change, improve the focus on business outcomes and improve efficiency by 25 to 30 per cent.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN (Premier):** I was told yesterday that he was going to do me slowly. I am not sure from where he borrowed that one. We know where he borrowed his desalination policy from.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** Maybe it was Paul Keating. Then he was going to invite me to ‘rumble’. I got a bit excited.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr WILLIAMS:** Point of order, Mr Speaker.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I know what the member’s point of order is. The Premier will come to the question.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** I was a bit excited because I thought he was inviting me to a rumba. Yes, I have discussed this with BHP Billiton. In fact, I met with Chip Goodyear, the CEO of BHP Billiton, just the other night when I had dinner with him, along with other ministers. There could not be a better relationship between a government and BHP Billiton. In fact, today I invited BHP Billiton, Santos and a range of other companies—including the South Australian Chamber of Mines and Energy, Tom Phillips (from a uranium company), the Engineering Employers Association, Peter Vaughan from Business SA, and other business leaders—to meet with the federal Leader of the Opposition, Kevin Rudd,

to discuss this very issue. I am going to ask the Leader of the Opposition a question.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** That question is: how many employees in Australia—what percentage—does he think are actually on AWAs? Can he tell us?

*Mr Hamilton-Smith interjecting:*

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** You must know. I have been over there and you are still over there. How many do you think it would be, what percentage?

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Leader will take his seat. The house will come to order.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** It is quite clear that the Leader of the Opposition does not have a clue. The fact is that I am advised that it is just about 3½ per cent.

*Members interjecting:*

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

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

**Mr HAMILTON-SMITH:** Mr Speaker, the Premier seems uncertain of whether he is the Leader of the Opposition or the Premier. He wants to ask questions of the opposition. Standing orders actually require the opposition to ask questions of the government. The Premier seems wobbly on this. Could you please clarify the situation?

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! It is disorderly for the Premier to debate. If the Premier was asking questions—even of a rhetorical nature—of the Leader of the Opposition in order to engage in debate then, yes, that is disorderly. The Premier has the call.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** Thank you, sir. The Leader of the Opposition asks whether I know whether I am the Premier or the Leader of the Opposition. It is quite clear from this morning's newspaper that the people of South Australia know. The business concern about policy that has been raised and, in particular, its impact on the resources industry, has been outlined by BHP Billiton and also by Lee Clifford who, of course, is the retiring CEO (and a prominent South Australian) of Rio Tinto—in particular, the claim that the policy could, in fact, have an impact on their companies. This morning we have heard Alexander Downer, and others, saying it could undermine the expansion of the resources industry.

I have mentioned that South Australia is facilitating discussion between the federal opposition and local business, including the resources industry, because it is committed to both flexibility and fairness, and that is the difference. You support WorkChoices—which is about flexibility—downwards, and we support flexibility upwards, and that is the difference. That is the clear difference. If you want to sign up to WorkChoices then say it now, because I know what the people of South Australia think about WorkChoices, because it removes fairness from the system.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** Mr Speaker, you asked me not to engage in debate, but it is very hard to hear oneself over a barrage of abuse, which apparently is the tactic: the rapt look as the Leader of the Opposition asks the question and then everyone has to shout afterwards. I am happy to speak about this issue at length.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Has the Premier finished his answer?

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** No, absolutely not. This is going to go on a long time. I mention that 3 to 5 per cent of the workforce are on AWAs and, from memory, about 38 per cent are on enterprise agreements. About 19 per cent of the Australian workforce are under awards, and the rest would be under various common law arrangements. The key issues in the Labor critique of AWAs concern removal of the safety net, removal of collective bargaining rights, removal of the independent industrial umpire, removal of the no disadvantage test, and unfair dismissal provisions that make workers vulnerable.

**Mr WILLIAMS:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: the Premier has been wanting to be asked questions from the opposition, but he will not answer them. He then asks his own questions and proceeds to answer them.

**The SPEAKER:** What is the point of order?

**Mr WILLIAMS:** The point of order is that this has no relevance to the question the opposition asked. It has relevance only to the question the Premier asked himself.

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

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** Let me just remind members that I was asked a question about AWAs; I was asked whether I had spoken with BHP Billiton on this subject; and I was asked a question about what our policy response is. That is exactly what I am doing, and perhaps if you started listening more and stopped shouting you might learn something. As I say, Labor seeks to recognise the imbalance in power between, say, a young worker and his or her employer whilst providing flexibility and less red tape. This means reinstating collective bargaining awards with at least 10 minimum conditions and a maximum of a further 10 conditions. In response to the concerns that you have raised, Julia Gillard has said:

Labor's flexible alternative to the Howard government's individual statutory contracts or AWAs will be a combination of collective enterprise agreements, simplified modern awards and individual common law agreements.

Ultimately, the difference between Labor's plan and the Howard government's WorkChoices laws is that under Labor flexibility up will be encouraged but flexibility down will not be permitted.

We understand in the mining sector that flexibility up—

because, of course, of the terrific salaries and wages people are earning—

is important, and we are happy with that. What Labor does not accept—

I am quoting directly from Julia Gillard—

is that basic conditions and entitlements can be stripped without negotiation and compensation. Under John Howard's WorkChoices laws, AWAs allow this to occur.

What Julia Gillard said is that Labor will have sensible transition options for those employers and employees who use AWAs. As I pointed out before, that is about 3 to 5 per cent of the workforce. Of course, Labor will be consulting further and extensively with business on the transitional provisions.

To return to your question (if you remember what you asked), BHP is seeking flexible working arrangements to help underpin our resources boom, and so does South Australia and the South Australian government. South Australia has, of course, a brilliant industrial relations record upon which we want to build, and that has been our concern about the federal takeover. We have by far the best record of industrial relations and industrial peace. Compare us with Victoria, where Jeff Kennett handed over the industrial relations powers some years ago. Compare our industrial relations

record with Victoria. Compare our industrial relations record with Western Australia.

Our concerns about WorkChoices are not only about its being unfair as applied in some areas but also because it is actually John Howard's law of the jungle approach to industrial relations which can threaten South Australia's ability to win major projects. South Australia has over \$30 billion worth of projects in the pipeline. Our excellent industrial relations record has been a major factor in our success in gaining major development projects. These include, of course, the \$6 billion air warfare destroyer contract, the largest defence contract—

*Mr Hamilton-Smith interjecting:*

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** Earlier on we heard the Leader of the Opposition laughing while I was talking about terrorism issues. Now he seems to be laughing at the fact that we have won the biggest defence contract in Australian history. We have an outstanding relationship, and I have every confidence in BHP Billiton. I have every confidence in the mining industry to provide employment conditions that are fair as well as productive, and they are proving this every day in South Australia. We are fully committed to the mining industry, as we have shown. We want to work with the mining industry and industry generally and with Kevin Rudd to ensure that workplace changes actually help employers through simplification and red tape reduction, as well as providing security, stability, and a career path for employees.

As I mentioned, BHP Billiton operates in many countries and under many different IR systems, and it does so very successfully. Kevin Rudd came here today to listen, and I have every confidence that a cooperative dialogue will give industry the flexibility it needs and employees the security they need. I also have every confidence that BHP Billiton and its workforce will negotiate terms that are mutually acceptable, fair and competitive.

**Mr HAMILTON-SMITH:** In light of his answer to my earlier question, when the Premier had dinner with Mr Chip Goodyear the other night over cognac, did he discuss with BHP Billiton's leader—

**The Hon. P.F. CONLON:** Point of order, Mr Speaker. We have had several points of order contesting the Premier debating matters. If the opposition does not want the Premier or any minister to debate matters, it should not be so plainly inflammatory and insulting in what purports to be an explanation.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Minister for Transport. Questions cannot contain debate. I am not sure that it was debate as such; it was just a silly remark. I suggest that the Leader of the Opposition just asks his question.

**Mr HAMILTON-SMITH:** Did the Premier find himself agreeing with Mr Goodyear's statement that 'the ALP's industrial relations policy has the potential to damage the continued expansion of the minerals industry'? Did he discuss with Mr Goodyear the views of the WA Premier, Alan Carpenter, who has called on the federal Labor Party not to ban AWAs, which are used extensively by the mining sector in his state?

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** I have just pointed it out to the honourable Leader of the Opposition. By the way, I do not drink cognac. I guess that shows a bit of difference between us. Perhaps that is just the sort of rarefied air he lives in. I do not know. The very fact of the matter is that, at my meeting with BHP Billiton the other night in, I must say, the most

cordial circumstances, BHP Billiton thanked me for our role as a government in facilitating the proposal to expand the Olympic Dam mine. You would also be aware of the congratulations from the mining industry—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** —for crashing through and taking on our own party, both Kevin Rudd and I, in changing the ALP national policy on uranium mining to allow mining. If you think that this was somehow some kind of adversarial approach to having dinner together, then you are sadly mistaken. Following that meeting and following my discussions with Kevin Rudd, I was very pleased today to arrange a meeting involving Roger Higgins, who is the head of BHP Billiton's Olympic Dam and also the Cannington mine in Queensland, and Kevin Rudd to discuss these issues. That was terrific. So, there was no cognac, and there was no adversarial approach. It was extremely collegiate.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Before I call the deputy leader, the member for Unley has already been warned once and I am not obliged to warn him at all. He may want to go and get himself a cup of tea, if he is unable to restrain himself. I call the Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

#### HIV INCIDENT

**Ms CHAPMAN (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** Has the Minister for Health identified any person or persons in the health department who has failed to advise his chief executive officer or him of the HIV person under direction of the public health department for two years and, if so, have any of those persons been suspended or dismissed from their employment?

**The Hon. J.D. HILL (Minister for Health):** Members would be aware of an HIV man who is currently being detained. His detention was brought about as a result of an application being taken to the Magistrates Court by my department a couple of weeks ago. He is currently being detained for some 30 days. This particular gentleman's circumstances raise issues of concern for me and, I guess, the general community about how people with HIV/AIDS are managed within our system. We have a system in Australia which has now been in place for something like 20 years which, by and large, has managed to keep to a very low level the number of people living with HIV/AIDS in our community. There are far fewer people per head of population with HIV or AIDS in Australia compared to other comparable societies, notably the United States. That is as a result—

*Mrs Redmond interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.D. HILL:** The needle exchange program, the whole lot, and there has been strong bipartisan support for the policies that have produced that outcome. So, we have had a very good infrastructure and a very good policy framework to manage these issues. This particular incident raises the question of what you do about somebody, and I have to be a little bit careful because this person who is currently in detention has not been charged with any particular offence—

*Ms Chapman interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The deputy leader will come to order. The Minister for Health has the call.

**The Hon. J.D. HILL:** Thank you, Mr Speaker. I have to be careful—and I think members would understand, particularly those with legal backgrounds—because it is very unfair

to talk about a particular person who has not been charged with any offence. So, the—

*Ms Chapman interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The deputy leader needs to contain herself as well. The Minister for Health has the call.

**The Hon. J.D. HILL:** Thank you, Mr Speaker. I am happy to answer any question the member would care to ask me seriatim, but if she asks me questions in the middle of what I am saying it interrupts my train of thought and I am forced to go back to my original starting point. I was making the point to the house and the member who asked the question that the issues relating to this particular person have to be dealt with with some sensitivity because the person has not been charged. He has been detained under legislation similar to that which John Howard brought in federally to deal with terrorists. It is extremely tough legislation and the consequences for that individual are extreme. However, his particular case has to be referred to because of highlighted issues with the management of HIV/AIDS when it applies to people who are reckless or indifferent or deliberately infecting other persons.

I am not saying in that particular gentleman's case that he has been doing those things, though the Department of Health, through the Health Commission, which is the agency which manages these things, was concerned that he may be recklessly endangering the health of others, so we applied that particular set of circumstances. When we analyse the process that he has been put through—and I point out to the house that we are having this independently assessed and examined by a QC, Stephen Walsh—and I have had a close look at the process we go through, we have a set of protocols and guidelines in place which are based on a philosophy that we should encourage people to come forward if they have HIV/AIDS, in order to identify themselves and we manage them so that they can live in the community without discrimination. That has been the process that has worked remarkably well in Australia and, as I say, it has limited the number of people who have HIV/AIDS in our community. We have to maintain that general policy framework.

However, how does it apply to people who have not really played by the rules? That is what I am looking at closely. The protocols in place, I think, need to be changed, and I suspect I will need to come back to the parliament with some legislative framework which takes into account people who have those particular difficulties associated with it. What the Deputy Leader of the Opposition invites me to do is embark on a witch-hunt and name public servants, which is absolutely typical of the opposition. They just cannot wait to get into public servants whenever there is an issue before the house.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.D. HILL:** I have to say about the public servants who work in public health—

*The Hon. I.F. Evans interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.D. HILL:** The ghost of Banquo's supper there.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.D. HILL:** I can almost hear you, Iain. You had better come a bit closer, pal. I would say about the opposition that they are always keen to jump into the Public Service, particularly those at the lower levels providing services in our community.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.D. HILL:** I want to say about the public servants who work in the health system—

*The Hon. P.F. Conlon interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.D. HILL:** If my own side will stop interjecting also, I will continue. I want to say about the public servants who work in health, particularly in this area of communicable diseases and the management of HIV/AIDS patients, that they do a remarkable job. I spent a little time last week at the STD clinic on North Terrace talking to the doctors.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.D. HILL:** My first visit!

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.D. HILL:** There is much more that I can share with the house, Mr Speaker, and I intend to.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.D. HILL:** I am not like the Liberal member of the opposition in Victoria who attended a gay nightclub to determine what happened in that environment. I hope some of our colleagues on the other side undertake a similar bit of research. His parliamentary research paper would have been fascinating. I did attend the STD clinic—

**The Hon. K.O. FOLEY:** I have a point of order, Mr Speaker. I think the Minister for Health has more than answered the question.

**The Hon. J.D. HILL:** I want to make this point, Mr Speaker. I did attend the clinic, and I invite members of the house to go and visit the clinic and talk to the doctors.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.D. HILL:** To make a serious point—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.D. HILL:** I know sex makes people laugh, but members should talk to the doctors who deal with the consequences of people who have HIV/AIDS. They are dealing with people who in some cases have intellectual impairment and do not really understand the consequences of their own behaviour and do not understand what safe sex means. They are dealing with people who solicit sexual partners by using internet sites such as Gaydar, and I understand there are worse sites than that; there is one called Squirt, I think, which is an extraordinary site where members of the gay community (and I am sure there are heterosexual sites of a similar nature) solicit sexual partners in the most—

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.D. HILL:** I am not trying to be prurient here. I am trying to answer the deputy leader's question. We get accused—

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.D. HILL:** Well, she asked the question, and I think it is important to answer it. These people are dealing with members of our community who are engaged in the most bizarre, distasteful, desperate and very dangerous behaviour, and they deal with them on a day-to-day basis. I will not see them attacked or condemned by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition on no factual basis whatsoever. If people in the health system have made mistakes, they have been honest mistakes, but they will be investigated and, if there are any issues of impropriety, whatever consequences there are will be pursued. The point I would also make is that the person who ran the communicable diseases program when this happened no longer works in our state. We have a new manager in place in South Australia.

### FALL OF SAIGON ANNIVERSARY

**Ms CICCARELLO (Norwood):** Will the Minister for Multicultural Affairs inform the house of the significance of the anniversary of the fall of Saigon to the South Australian Vietnamese community, and indicate the implication for human rights in Vietnam today?

**The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON (Minister for Multicultural Affairs):** I thank the member for Norwood for an important and timely question, which touches on issues of human rights. These should be the concern of every South Australian. On Monday 30 April we marked the 32nd anniversary of the fall of Saigon. It was a particularly poignant day of remembrance; 30 April 1975 was the day that the North Vietnamese forces invaded Saigon, the capital of the Republic of Vietnam, and established a communist government, the Socialist Republic of Vietnam.

The anniversary was formally recognised on Sunday, and I attended two functions arranged by our Vietnamese Australian community. They were both sad occasions. Our valued and hardworking Vietnamese-Australian community, who lost so much and risked all for their beliefs, remain truly troubled and distressed about the events of 1975 and what has occurred subsequently.

The communist regime in Vietnam now rules with an iron fist. I speak with first-hand knowledge as, together with you, Mr Speaker, and my parliamentary colleagues—the members for Norwood and Morialta—I visited Vietnam on a study tour last August. Communist Vietnam today is an elite of about 2 million Communist Party members ruling and riding roughshod over 80 million of their countrymen. Imbued with absolute paranoia, the Communist Party reacts swiftly and sometimes violently whenever it perceives that its authority is being challenged. Indeed, when the Socialist Republic of Vietnam became aware of the unveiling of the Vietnam war memorial here in Adelaide, it got in touch with Alexander Downer and made sure that no federal Liberal government officials attended the unveiling.

One of the saddest examples of this paranoia is the subject of the T-shirt I have been wearing today and yesterday. The image is that of Catholic priest Father Nguyen Van Ly and it clearly shows the loss of human rights in Vietnam since the fall of Saigon. Members may have seen the quarter-page advertisement in *The Australian* newspaper last Friday alerting us to the fate of Father Ly. Father Ly is 60 years old, he is a peaceful man and has long been an advocate for religious freedom in his country. For this he has suffered periods of house arrest.

I have some first-hand experience of this. When our delegation visited the Archbishop of Hue last year, Father Ly was confined to the archbishop's house. As we arrived, Father Ly was surrounded by plain-clothes police to prevent him from making any contact with our delegation. In February Father Ly was re-arrested, charged with distributing anti-government material—and I can assure you that is milder than anything that is said about the Rann government on talkback radio in Adelaide—and being in contact with anti-government organisations overseas. Presumably that includes the parliament of South Australia.

On 30 March Father Ly was put on trial—a kind of trial. When he tried to speak he was gagged. This image shows Father Ly in court guarded by two soldiers. A third plain-clothes official has his arm around Father Ly's neck and his hand over his mouth, preventing him from speaking. That is a fair trial in the Socialist Republic of Vietnam, apparently!

Father Ly was found guilty, of course, and sentenced to eight years' imprisonment.

Sadly, many other citizens of Vietnam suffer likewise. Leaders of religious bodies not under state control, like the Hoa Hao Buddhists, journalists, independent unionists and others, are all in gaol or under house arrest for exercising what we regard as the most basic human rights and freedom of speech. There is no freedom of speech in the Socialist Republic of Vietnam, nor is there freedom of association, press or religion. Those who speak out are persecuted. I encourage the house to reflect on this tragedy and injustice and to let our Vietnamese-Australian community know that our thoughts are with them. Moreover, I call upon all members to express their concerns directly to the Socialist Republic of Vietnam in Canberra. Father Ly must be released. Vietnam must be made aware that this continuing and blatant abuse of the most basic human rights will not go unnoticed.

**Honourable members:** Hear, hear!

### HIV INCIDENT

**Ms CHAPMAN (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** Again I direct my question to the Minister for Health. What are the terms of reference of the inquiry to be held by Mr Stephen Walsh QC, and do they include a term of reference to inquire as to why you or your CEO were not told about this issue for two years?

**The Hon. J.D. HILL (Minister for Health):** The terms of reference are essentially for Mr Walsh to give advice to the government in relation to the protocols and systems that exist in health to manage these cases and to give advice in relation to how they were managed in these instances. That would include, as I understand, whether advice ought to have been given to the CEO or the minister at earlier times.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** Again I direct my question to the Minister for Health. Why is it that Victoria's health minister has been able to act to dismiss the department head, Robert Hall, responsible for the failure to advise on its HIV case, while no-one has been identified as responsible in SA; although, in fairness to the minister, he has indicated that there is some person who has now gone interstate. Has he advised his counterpart, the minister in the state that is the recipient of that person, that they are there?

**The Hon. J.D. HILL:** The deputy leader asks me some interesting questions. She asks me to comment on actions taken by a minister in another state in relation to a separate set of circumstances. In fact, as I understand it, that person was dismissed for not communicating about a salmonella outbreak in an aged care facility.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.D. HILL:** Calm; a Zen approach to these things is always necessary. The second question was whether I had advised another minister about this person. The honourable member is assuming that the person who used to work in South Australia now works in another state's health department.

### WASTE LEVY

**Mr PENGILLY (Finniss):** Will the Minister for State/Local Government Relations assure the house and local councils that the extra \$3 million raised from the increased waste depot levy from 1 July will be allocated to Zero

Waste SA to encourage industry and local government to invest in recycling initiatives? Genuine concern is being expressed by local councils that not all of the \$3 million will be available for recycling initiatives but that, rather, 50 per cent of the increased waste depot levy has been tagged by the state government to go into general revenue.

**The Hon. J.D. HILL (Minister for Health):** I am happy to take this question on behalf of my colleague the Minister for Environment and Conservation in another place. Zero Waste is funded by—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.D. HILL:** She is not the minister responsible for this, so why would you ask her? Zero Waste SA is funded by a levy that is placed on waste going to landfill sites. I have to say that the recycling industry in South Australia lobbied hard to increase the levy to encourage recycling rather than dumping, and I am proud to say that our state leads the way in Australia in recycling from households right the way through. I do not have the exact figure in front of me, but I think that well over 75 per cent of waste in South Australia is now recycled—an astonishing outcome. I will get the exact figure for the honourable member. As for the detail of the funding, I will refer the honourable member's question to the minister in another place.

#### TRAM AIRCONDITIONING

**Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett):** I direct my question to the Minister for Transport. Is the orange and green fungus growing in the airconditioning system of the new trams a health hazard for employees and passengers?

**The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Minister for Transport):** It is always good to get a question from the very big supporter of our tram extension. I place on record that I am grateful for his support for our tram extension. My advice today is that there is bacteria (I cannot remember what colour fungus it is), but it is not at dangerous levels. If there is any change to that, I will let the member know.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. P.F. CONLON:** The member said it just stinks. I do not know whether that is the case, either, but, of course, facts have never intruded into an argument from the opposition. I must say, though, that I have enjoyed the last couple of days; it has been very refreshing. I was sitting there last night trying to remember what the delivery style of the Leader of the Opposition was like yesterday, because I knew it reminded me of something. It came to me late last night, and it is the Dreamland dance. Do you remember the Dreamland dance?

**Ms CHAPMAN:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker, the conduct yesterday of the Leader of the Opposition hardly has any relevance whatsoever to fungus on trams.

**The SPEAKER:** I do not think the minister was answering the substance of the question.

**The Hon. P.F. CONLON:** If I could make the point, sir, that, if he is no good at this, he can take up selling beds.

## GRIEVANCE DEBATE

### KANGAROO ISLAND ROADS

**Mr PENGILLY (Finniss):** Yesterday, in concluding my Address in Reply speech, I raised the issue of roads within my electorate, specifically Kangaroo Island. I was astounded when I heard on the radio yesterday some information coming through from the Mayor of Kangaroo Island in relation to a study to be undertaken on roads on Kangaroo Island. However, I was really astounded when I received a couple of telephone calls from the island in response to comments the minister made on Radio FIVEaa this morning in relation to funding for roads on Kangaroo Island. She said:

... in relation to road funding specifically, it's my understanding that KI gets something like about \$550 000 a year through the Grants Commission that is commonwealth money for local roads. . .

The fact is that the \$550 000 a year is FAGs grants, which is basically tied to administration, and it has absolutely nothing to do with road funding. I do not know who is advising the minister, but it is totally incorrect for that to be broadcast on radio, because it is quite the opposite to the truth of the matter. My concern goes further in that the minister also said:

... the state government provided some money for the upgrading of the South Coast Road a couple of years ago. . .

Actually, the South Coast Road was finished two or three years ago, and it was an initiative of the former Liberal state government, funded by the Premier's Infrastructure Fund under the premier at the time, Dean Brown. That fund sealed the South Coast Road, the West End Highway and some roads in Flinders Chase. To say that money was provided a couple of years ago is arrant nonsense. In fact, almost nothing has been put into roads on Kangaroo Island since this government came to power five years ago. There has been a minimum amount of funding through the Department of Transport for maintenance on a couple of hundred kilometres of road that is under the control of that department, but there is still 1 100 kilometres of dirt road on Kangaroo Island which is maintained by the local council and which, to all intents and purposes, is falling apart at the seams.

While I support the minister's study into the roads on Kangaroo Island, I have said on numerous occasions in this place that the government needs to get serious about this matter. We cannot have First World tourism on Kangaroo Island with Third World roads. This is a major problem. We have interstate and intrastate tourists going to Kangaroo Island, down through the Fleurieu Peninsula and, when they get over there, they find the roads are in an appalling state. This state government stands condemned for not picking up this issue and putting money back into initiating another fund to do something about those roads.

**The Hon. J.M. Rankine:** That's just wrong.

**Mr PENGILLY:** I know the minister is not happy about what I am saying, but she can wear it. The fact of the matter is that not one red cent has been spent by this government on the local roads over there, minister, I am sorry. If the government wants to keep stating that it is supportive of tourism, that is terrific, but we cannot have thousands of international tourists going there and travelling on Third World roads and suffering traumas and whatnot. The government cannot keep waxing lyrical about how good the tourist experience is when tourists cannot get up and down the roads.

*The Hon. R.G. Kerin interjecting:*



**Mr PENGILLY:** Yes. I am glad the minister is here because I am hoping that he might pick up on it and, once again, have some money come through in the state budget this year to initiate a project not only for the roads on Kangaroo Island but also across regional areas of South Australia. There are myriad roads that need money, right across broad regional South Australia. I urge the government to get serious about it. The \$31 million being spent on trams might have gone well towards doing something about roads in regional South Australia instead of the situation we have at the moment, where little or no funding is going in. It is no good saying that FAGs grants come from the commonwealth to councils to be used on roads because it is totally, absolutely incorrect. Even the Minister for Transport—

*The Hon. P.F. Conlon interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Minister for Transport knows better.

**Mr PENGILLY:** I am glad to see that he has come over to our side, because I would like to get him used to being back here. I welcome his input from this side but it would be far better if he were sitting back here behind me in another life, and we will actively work towards that. I point out that the correct information needs to be given out on the radio, and the correct information is not that FAGs grants are used for local roads.

Time expired.

#### ANANGU ELDER

**Ms THOMPSON (Reynell):** Recently, I was privileged to represent the Premier at the funeral of a senior Anangu woman at Amata. While I know that it is normal courtesy not to refer to a deceased person from the lands by name, for the sake of the record I will record her name once. This woman, Nganyinytja Ilatjari, simply known far and wide as ‘Nun int ja’ was an extremely important woman in the AP lands and in South Australia. Her passing was a sad loss for us all, especially for the Pitjantjatjara people. She was widely respected as a strong and influential person, always working to bridge the gap between the Aboriginal and European cultures.

Those who knew her speak of her as a deeply caring person who kept an open heart for everyone. She had been ill for nearly a decade, living in a hostel in Alice Springs. In her healthy days, she worked tirelessly to maintain and pass on culture to the next generation while also being an innovator, advocating new ways that would help the health and well-being of her people as they were impacted by European settlement.

She worked as a monitor and teacher’s aid in the Ernabella school in the 1940s, and later lobbied for years to secure a school in Amata, which opened in 1961. She was one of the first women to ask the European health sisters for help in caring for her babies and encouraged other women to do the same. She chaired the first modern political women’s meeting on the APY lands in the early 1980s. Her words and vision inspired the formation of the NPY Women’s Council in December 1980. In the 1970s, when she and her family went to live on her tradition country west of Amata, she established the first outstation rehabilitation program for petrol-sniffing young men on the AP lands. Many youth and families were saved through her tireless work.

At the funeral, precedence was given to a large group of women (together with some men) wearing T-shirts celebrating the achievements of the NPY Women’s Council. In

talking with them, I discovered that they were also mourning the loss of the continuance of the work that was established by this woman in terms of support for petrol-sniffing young men. Only that month they learned that the federal government has failed to continue funding for the important Reconnect program that has been run by the NPY Women’s Council since the 1980s. That was an important legacy of this woman, and they were extremely disturbed that when finally some substantial funds were coming from the federal government to assist people in the lands—with the help of various workers—to deal with the scourge of petrol sniffing, the experience and commitment displayed by the NPY Women’s Council for about a quarter of a century on this matter was being ignored. Instead, an \$8 million contract was given to a service provider with no record of working in remote areas and no connection at all with the relevant lands.

This service provider is admirable in many ways, but the NPY is outstanding. The work it has pioneered with so many volunteers and so many dedicated workers for many years should be celebrated and used, not put aside and abused, as has, effectively, been done. It was certainly a point of much discussion at the funeral of this very important woman that not only had they lost her but also that they felt that, in almost the same week, the community had received a slap in the face by the failure of the federal government to allow the continuation of the work she pioneered. I offer my condolences to all concerned.

#### POLICE HIGHWAY PATROL

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Stuart.

**Ms Breuer:** A good member—old, but good.

**The Hon. G.M. GUNN (Stuart):** The honourable member should not talk about age, because she is certainly showing her age. Normally, I would not make such comments, but I think that, if she had a quick look in the mirror, she would not reflect so much on others, who are young at heart, energetic and looking forward to continuing—

**Ms Breuer:** Are you going to run again?

**The Hon. G.M. GUNN:** Good things come to those who wait. As a quiet country farmer, I am enjoying the challenges of representing people in the rural sector against the decisions of this government and its bureaucrats. I really cannot understand why certain sections of government have taken it upon themselves to make life as difficult as they possibly can for parts of the rural community.

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

**The Hon. G.M. GUNN:** You want to listen, Rory. I am pleased that the minister for agriculture is in the chamber. The police have been unfair and unreasonable towards the agricultural sector in an unjustifiable way. I hope that the minister will have something to say about it.

**Mr Pengilly:** He’s gone.

**The Hon. G.M. GUNN:** But I am pleased that he heard my remarks. These are the facts. People have to get on with their lives, and they have to be able to operate and run their businesses. It is not the role of government, its agencies or instrumentalities to be unreasonable or to get in the way. Today, we heard the Attorney-General waxing lyrical and rightly pointing out the injustices that have taken place in other parts of the world. We pride ourselves that we encourage people to have a point of view and to express it free from the fear of threat or intimidation.

One of my constituents had the wisdom to complain to the local police about the actions of a highway patrol at Gawler.

It was brought to his attention that the officer from the highways department indicated that he would throw the book at him as a direct result of that person having exercised his democratic right. I suggest to the people in charge of the highway patrol at Gawler that that individual ought to be cleaning cars and not policing the roads.

The second thing is that constituents of mine have been told that they are going to be really after farmers shifting machinery up and down the roads. Do they want to stop them from farming? Are they not aware that we face one of the worst droughts in the history of this state and nation? People are under great stress, and they do not need this sort of harassment, hindrance and silly policing. I do not want to have to talk about this again in parliament, but until some fairness and common sense prevail, I intend to pursue these people day in and day out. You will see put on the *Notice Paper* question after question about them. I want to know why, when they sign these on-the-spot fines, you cannot read their names. I asked the Minister for Police whether it is the policy of the state government to harass, hinder and make life as difficult for farmers, pastoralists and small truck operators as possible. Is that the policy of the South Australian government? We are entitled to know, because that is what is taking place out there. Some people are trying to rewrite the law to suit their own purposes. That is what they are doing. It is an affront to commonsense and fairness.

I am elected to this parliament to represent people, and I will do it. That means that, if I have to be difficult and hard to get on with and make life difficult for these people, I will do it. I would sooner not. I would sooner let us get on with the business and do what is sensible, but these dreadful on-the-spot fines are being misused and abused. The member is shaking his head. People of moderate means are getting unfairly pinged on these things. It is not a fine: it is an imposition on many people. They do not have the money. It is too easy to issue them. It is a public disgrace, and people should have the right to object and have them independently adjudicated. The police will say, 'Oh, well, it could have been over docked; there's nothing we can do.' That is not good enough. What is happening at Gawler is that the highway patrol is an absolute nonsense.

Time expired.

### WOMEN IN PARLIAMENT

**Ms PORTOLESI (Hartley):** Today I feel compelled to speak out against one of the most disgraceful displays of behaviour that I have ever witnessed from someone in public life. Of course, I refer to the media report today of Senator Bill Heffernan's comments. He is reported as standing by comments he made, I think last year, where he attacked the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, Julia Gillard, for being 'deliberately barren'. He said, 'I mean, anyone who chooses to deliberately remain barren. . . they've got no idea what life's about.' He then went on to attack people on his own side, saying, 'We've got a few on our side as well. . .' He continued, reflecting on his previous comments:

I won't walk away from that. So rude, crude and unattractive as it was. . . If you're a leader, you've got to understand your community. One of the great understandings in a community is family, and the relationship between mum, dads and a bucket of nappies.

Senator Heffernan links Julia Gillard's capacity as a leader with her reproductive status. Today I am ashamed to be a politician when there are politicians like Senator Heffernan

demeaning women. Although I am not responsible for his behaviour, when other MPs behave like this, we all get tarred with the same brush. We all know that Senator Heffernan does the Prime Minister's dirty work. Today, I join with Kevin Rudd, the federal Leader of the Opposition, in calling on the Prime Minister to repudiate Senator Heffernan's comments.

Today I also call on the deputy leader of the Liberals in this place, the member for Bragg, the most senior Liberal woman in this state, and other members in the other place, such as the Hon. Michelle Lensink who, I understand, has no children or, according to Senator Heffernan, is 'deliberately barren' to speak out and repudiate the senator's comments. I ask them to put aside party politics, do what is right and reject Senator Heffernan. I am no better an MP because I am a mum, and Julia Gillard is no worse an MP because she is childless. Heffernan says that Julia Gillard is unqualified for leadership because she does not understand 'a bucket of nappies'. Well, I have changed dozens of dirty nappies and, trust me, it does not qualify me for the deputy leadership of the Labor Party.

How do women of Australia feel today, having confronted Senator Heffernan's comments this morning? What about women who cannot have children? No wonder politicians are held in such low regard. No wonder the federal Liberals are doing so badly. At least Julia Gillard has the guts to acknowledge publicly what we all know; that is, being a mum and being an MP is a nightmare.

You just have to look around you in this place and count the number of women in here with young children or dependent children. I think at the last count there were two of us: the Hon. Trish White and me. How long has it taken for us to change sitting hours? There is an appalling double standard in politics, and I urge all MPs to speak out against this. Do we ever debate John Howard's reproductive status? Does anyone ever ask questions about that? I give you Nicole Cornes as another example of this appalling double standard. She is attacked for giving a poor media performance or a performance that lacked polish; yet, on the other hand, politicians are attacked every day for giving too polished a performance—something I have never been accused of.

I keep hearing commentators say that they are sick of polished, well-spun rhetoric. Well, what is it to be? Let us be honest here: politics is show business for ugly people. Would the reaction to Nicole Cornes be the same if she were not an attractive young woman? I offer her, Mia Handshin, and all the other candidates who have been preselected, my congratulations. In closing, I urge all members in this place, in particular the Liberal women opposite, to reject Senator Heffernan's comments and the demeaning of women.

### BRANCHED BROOMRAPE

**Mr VENNING (Schubert):** Today I wish to highlight the dissatisfaction and accompanying stress felt by constituents of mine who are farmers on the Murray Plains and have been under quarantine conditions for almost 10 years because of an infestation of that insidious weed branched broomrape. My Liberal colleague the member for Hammond has raised the issue before in this house, as I have done in previous parliaments, and as did the previous member for Hammond. I acknowledge the assistance the current member for Hammond has given to farmers on the Murray Plains, some of whom are my constituents but who find the proximity of his electorate office in Murray Bridge more convenient to

access than mine. However, I am aware of a number of challenges facing my constituents in the Murray Plains area. Indeed, many of them are doing it tough with this drought, particularly the dairy farmers, but that is a serious issue in its own right and another subject for grievance on another day.

In regard to the branched broomrape eradication program, there have been financial cutbacks. In this house on Tuesday 27 March last, minister Hill made a reply to the member for Goyder in response to a question in Estimates Committee B of 25 October 2006 in respect of the natural resources management boards. The minister indicated that there had been savings arising from modification of the fumigation program and the implementation of better application technology under the branched broomrape eradication program, resulting in a reduction in expenditure associated with that program in the order of \$500 000 for 2006-07.

In fact, from my discussion with a member of the Branched Broomrape Community Focus Group, I understand that the seasonal conditions were not right for spraying in the first half of 2006 and there was a delay in spraying until after 30 June 2006. This meant that less money was spent by farmers on sprays in the year ended 30 June 2006. Furthermore, it is my understanding that, as a result of that money not being spent prior to 30 June 2006, the budget for the program was cut for subsequent years. So, although the \$500 000 carryover from the 2005-06 year was made available earlier this year, it appears that there is still going to be a shortfall each year of around \$500 000. In speaking with a member of the community focus group, I am advised that farmers would be spending far in excess of the amount they are reimbursed per hectare for sprays. I understand that 168 farmers are on the board program and they receive \$2.50 per hectare for spraying. Cutbacks and increased bureaucracy associated with the program could be disastrous.

My colleague the member for Hammond raised a question in this house last week regarding a Branched Broomrape Eradication Program Grant Agreement. I note that the minister is here. A number of larger farm owners have evidently received a letter from the Attorney-General's office indicating that any farms exceeding \$5 000 in reimbursement for eradication treatments must sign this Branched Broomrape Eradication Program Grant Agreement; the funds must be applied for the specific purpose, kept separate to the major business of the farm and be audited within 15 days of the termination of the process. There is a concern that if the process becomes too bureaucratic and difficult farmers will just give up the program, and that would be a major setback.

For those members here who are not aware of the nature of branched broomrape, I will explain that it is a parasitic weed of a range of broadleaf crops, but it can grow on broadleaf weeds and native plants too. I call it insidious because it grows underground on the roots of a broadleaf host plant for about six weeks before emerging in late spring or early summer. Then, within two weeks, it will flower, with up to 500 000 seeds per plant the size of dust particles with a dormancy of up to 10 years. For those farmers who have had an emergence of broomrape for one year, I understand that they have to be under quarantine conditions for 12 years before being given the all-clear. The quarantine imposed on these farmers is very stressful. There are protocols for the movement of grain, machinery, soil, horticultural produce and livestock.

There is no room for complacency about this weed. One farmer suggested it is not as bad as it is made out to be. He advised that it only lives for about three weeks and does not

appear to kill any plants in the Murray Plains area. Evidently, under research, it was hosted onto several potato plants in Australia and did not kill them. Then it was hosted onto an Israeli potato and it did kill that plant. My constituent could not understand why there was so much fuss about the weed if it does not appear to kill any Australian plants. However, there are important implications for our export markets and, if it were transferred from Australian export crops to overseas, there would be serious repercussions, and it is a very serious matter.

I well remember, and remind the government, that it was a very important part of the previous member for Hammond's compact with the government to deliver the money in respect of this matter. After all, the previous member for Hammond did deliver government to the Rann Labor government and, as I say, it was a very important part of that compact. I think it is a very insidious and serious matter now that it would seem the government is reneging on that deal.

### K-KIDS CLUB, NORWOOD PRIMARY SCHOOL

**Ms CICCARELLO (Norwood):** Today I am delighted and proud to speak about a new group that has recently formed within my electorate, and that is the K-Kids Club of Norwood Primary School, which was chartered with 59 members on 29 March 2007. This is only the second K-Kids Club to be established in Australia and, with close to 60 members, is one of the largest outside of the United States. The club was jointly sponsored by the Kiwanis Club of Burnside East Adelaide and the Kiwanis Club of Prospect.

Most people are aware that Kiwanis is a global organisation of volunteers dedicated to providing the children of the world with better welfare, health development, education and opportunity. K-Kids Clubs are an integral part of Kiwanis and are now the fastest growing and largest service organisation for primary school children in the world, with over 900 clubs and 20 000 members. The first K-Kids Club was chartered in 1990, and they now operate in Australia, the Bahamas, Barbados, Canada, Italy, Jamaica, Malaysia, Martinique, Nigeria, the Philippines, Trinidad and Tobago and the United States. Its objectives are clear and are as follows:

- to give members the opportunity to serve their schools and their communities locally, nationally and globally through meaningful projects;
- to develop leadership and organisational skills, together with self-esteem gained from the successful accomplishment of the projects;
- to learn the value of caring for others; and
- to foster international relationships with other K-Kids members.

It was this commitment to the strengthening of personal values and willingness to help others which encouraged Norwood Primary School to become involved. Another motivating factor was the desire for students to become an integral part of the K-Kids Club global village. With the world becoming a smaller and smaller place through the click of a button, the establishment of the Norwood Primary School K-Kids Club is a fantastic way to facilitate the mutual exchange of ideas, views, and even work projects for comments and discussion with children on the other side of the world. I understand that already there are plans afoot to open up communications with K-Kids Club students from the United States and Malaysia in the near future.

This new organisation has certainly hit the ground running. I am reliably informed that the years 6 and 7

students who make up the Norwood Primary School membership are over the moon at being involved, and are backing up their excitement with enormous interest and enthusiasm. As a student-led club, they have elected their own officers—president, vice president, treasurer, secretary and five directors—and each member has been organised into various committees so that everyone has a distinctive role. All members will therefore learn the invaluable lessons of being part of a formal organisation, maintaining meeting and attendance records, keeping minutes, examining projects, organising activities and operating their own bank account. The head office in Indiana, United States, has also provided the club with an embroidered banner emblazoned with its name, a code of protocol (which I hear is quite strict), and a brass gong to announce when meetings begin and close. I am not sure whether the gong can be used to disrupt rowdy behaviour, but I will make sure I keep abreast of how it is all working so that I can make some recommendations to the Speaker in the future!

But, joking aside, this is not a club that has been formed simply to make a good impression or enhance reputations. It is a club firmly committed to focusing upon international, national and local causes and to helping in any way that it can. It has already begun work on its selected international cause—to make a financial contribution to Sunrise Children's Village, an orphanage established by South Australia's own Geraldine Cox AM in Cambodia, 20 kilometres south of Phnom Penh. In just one month of operation the club has raised just over \$400 to help with this worthwhile cause, and is currently exploring further fundraising initiatives to increase this total.

The club is also in the busy process of sorting out which projects it can support in Australia, as well as in our own community. These could range from projects as diverse as raising funds for heart and cancer research, to more local programs designed to foster pride in one's own school and community. These might include such ventures as the school recycling collection point or a clothing drive to support a local shelter. In a few weeks' time there will be a Redlegs Day fundraiser with the Norwood Football Club, which I am looking forward to supporting. However, whatever the club selects to become involved in, I am confident that it will achieve its goals with determination and respect. Congratulations to the K-Kids Club of Norwood Primary School and your teacher, Sue Deleo, for putting it all together and making sure it continues to run smoothly. I also thank their principal, Rob Harkin, who is always supportive of new initiatives on behalf of his students.

---

#### ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption (resumed on motion).

(Continued from page 90.)

**Mr PEDERICK (Hammond):** I thank the Lieutenant-Governor for his opening speech at the celebration of the 150th Parliament of South Australia. I also thank him for his service, and the Governor, Marjorie Jackson-Nelson, for her service to this state. I believe they will make a valuable ongoing contribution to this state in retirement.

The Governor's speech highlights the city-centric policies of this government and the lack of planning and investment in rural and regional South Australia. Let us start with water and the drought that no-one could have predicted. It is remarkable how the graphs have a consistent pattern that foretold a drought. Yes, it was a bigger drought than expected, but it is not as if experts have not been warning us for years, partly because the real underlying problem that has made this drought so severe was the overallocation of water from the River Murray, and that has been occurring for decades.

What is our government doing about it? Apart from threatening one of the country's greatest natural assets with destruction, its best response is to copy Liberal policy and start looking at desalination. BHP's proposed plant near Port Augusta is valuable, but only as part of a whole state desalination program. It will have its limitations in capacity and brine disposal options. Another purpose-built plant is needed to serve Adelaide directly, and keeping the thinking and planning open will stimulate public involvement and contribution. Such open communication would minimise later controversy that often occurs when sudden announcements leave people confused and threatened by something they do not understand and have not been kept informed about.

To emphasise this point, I quote from a recent report commissioned by the government entitled the Lower Murray Drought Impact Study of February 2007. The author, Dr Jonathan Sobels, refers to the lack of early, open and complete consultation with an anxious community threatened by the prospect of a man-made drought in the form of a weir. Dr Sobels said:

The gulf of uncertainty is a prime motivation affecting behavioural responses to the drought. Of great interest to me was the extent to which the announcement of the weir caused such universal fear and uncertainty in all the Lower Lakes communities that it galvanised a large community reaction well beyond anything that would have happened with just the drought.

Dr Sobels continued:

The government got into this furore because it had made an announcement that affected people's livelihoods without first talking with them. Considerations of local knowledge and perceptions were apparently ignored. There were no effective channels of communication opened with the communities by government, and no information was made available to assuage their uncertainty.

All this time the government was conducting a series of public meetings around the region. The problem was it still was not consulting with the public. People attending these meetings often commented afterwards that they felt like they were talked at, not consulted. There was no exchange of ideas, just statements of facts as speakers saw them, which left people feeling their opinions were heard but not listened to. The same protest arises regularly when contentious issues are raised, and, as long as this government is calling the shots, I believe it always will. It is the way that bully boys do business.

The desalination plant on Kangaroo Island has proven to be very effective, but what about looking at more around the state, including Yorke Peninsula, southern and western Eyre Peninsula, the South-East, etc. These may present ways of insulating the state from its eternal dependence on the Murray and ease the temptation to over use the aquifers that take so long to recharge. Other water sources and conservation measures need full and ongoing investigation, regardless of whether the drought breaks or not. Over-allocation remains the real villain of the situation and no amount of rain will fix that. Stormwater capture, grey water reuse and sewerage

mining are not new ideas. Other cities around the world have utilised these resources for many years, yet we are so far behind that we are still at the stage of trying to gently convince the public that these alternatives are acceptable. Dying of thirst has a way of adjusting people's mindsets, but it will be a mark of our failure and immaturity as a 21st century community if it comes to that.

The river has changed a lot since white settlement and many of those changes are irreversible. One of the answers to water worries may lie beneath the surface of the river. The river bed is heavily silted up, since the river's flow has been slowed. Up to 10 metres of silt chokes the river bed, inhibiting the natural ecosystem and reducing the river's holding capacity. Dredging this will dramatically increase its holding capacity, with cool, deep water, have almost no impact on the riverine environment and potentially provide a resource in the dredged material.

Providing real incentives for people to catch and conserve rainwater through an effective rainwater tank scheme would undoubtedly be the simplest and most cost efficient part of an overall plan to fix the state's water problems and remove our cap in hand dependence on other states. The river is a living, breathing river, the main artery of our country and, like blood, it must circulate to keep the country alive. It is hard to believe that things could get so desperate, that the river's existence is under such threat, and there are some who advocate blocking it off permanently.

Let us have look at the sequence of events over the past six months. Late in 2006 there is a series of drought meetings around rural areas as the drought worsens. On 7 November Premier Rann announces the South Australian government's intention to commence planning for a weir at Wellington, with an approximate cost of \$20 million.

*The Hon. K.A. Maywald interjecting:*

**Mr PEDERICK:** I remind members opposite that they can all have a go in this debate in due course. In November, the Liberal Party presented three water saving bills in the upper house, to do with grey water reuse, sewerage mining and rainwater management, and the government rejected them all. In November, community groups, at least four of them, began to form to pursue detail and demand alternatives. These are not made up of rampant greenies but ordinary people whose knowledge and experience of the river and dependence on it ensure them to be alarmed by the government's apparent preparedness to write them off, offering only vague promises to consider assistance. During November and December rural drought meetings take on new urgency as river communities demand clarification of weir plans. By December community meetings are drawing hundreds of people as the community searches for information, reassurances and answers.

Early in 2007 there is much speculation and confusion about where a weir might be built. The subject angers Lower Murray locals who know well from previous studies and constructions that there is almost no firm bottom to the river below Murray Bridge. On 25 January the Prime Minister announced his \$10 billion national water plan to fix the river problems, and I think this is our get out of gaol card so long as Victoria comes on board.

On 29 January, the Liberal Party proposed a desalination plant for South Australia as part of its water policy. On 18 February, on the morning of a protest rally against the weir, Rann declared that the chances of a weir being built had been reduced. The media reported that there was a major protest rally through the streets of Adelaide, attended by

around 600 people on a 40° day, with many country people unable to get to the city. On 27 February, an impact study into the effects of drought and low flows on Lower Murray and lakes region was released through minister McEwen instead of minister Maywald. A consultant pointed out the government's poor communication and consultation as major reasons for unrest and panic.

On 1 March, minister Maywald named the location of the weir, Pomanda Island, downstream from Wellington at a cost of \$110 million. We were led to believe at that point that the government was aware on 4 December the cost would be at least \$90 million. The government promised to remove the weir after the need had passed, but no time lines were put in place. The cost was estimated at \$10 million to \$25 million, and it was declared that there was a reduced chance that the weir would be required and the decision was deferred. Negotiations with landowners continued unresolved as the decision to proceed was further delayed. On 20 March, minister Maywald was presented with 24 questions about the weir and related matters at a Murray-Darling Association meeting at Murray Bridge.

Many scientific experts have expressed doubts about or their opposition to the weir proposal, confirming the community's widely held general opinion that a weir would cost too much in the longer term. Opponents included Dr Mike Young, Dr Mike Geddes, Peter Cullen, Dr Peter Schwerdtfeger, Professor Keith Walker, Dr Kerri Miller, Dr Tim Flannery and many other academics specialising in the river and lakes environment and water management.

Is it a coincidence that the last piece of water infrastructure built in South Australia was in 1979, the same year Dartmouth Dam was built? Did that make us all over confident? Country communities continue to cry out for suburbia and metropolitan industry to carry their share of the load on water restrictions. The government's habit of pre-announcing water restrictions has the effect of increasing water consumption, reducing the urgency and leaving most of the state's population underestimating the gravity of the water crisis. Metropolitan residents remain blissfully unaware of what is to be sacrificed. Most are yet to realise that the death of the Lower Murray, lakes and Coorong, let alone the whole river system, will eventually impact on them directly. When they wake up, the decision makers behind this environmental vandalism had better hide. 'Why didn't you tell us all the facts?', they will say.

Dr Peter Schwerdtfeger has repeatedly criticised the calibre and ability of the government's departmental advisers, and some of these advisers (I will not name them today) are hell bent on building this weir. I do not know why, because we are already getting a monument out the front of this place which will be the one legacy Rann will leave this state. Early statements about what can and cannot be done are later contradicted. For example, first the foot pumps cannot be lowered, and then they can; in January, a weir was inevitable, now it is unlikely; in a February 'frequently asked questions' from the Department of Water, Land and Biodiversity Conservation, there was acknowledgment that a weir would cause rapid and serious deterioration in water quality above the weir, but there were no plans to assist direct water users.

The confusion in South Australia is compounded by newspaper reports from across the border describing South Australians as selfish and stupid for not building a weir. Many reports both interstate and in South Australia suggest the lakes were originally salt water. The indigenous communities around the river and lakes deplore the government

ignoring them completely. They more than anyone understand that the river is a living, breathing creation and not merely a convenient source of and storage for water. The government keeps claiming that it could not have anticipated such a severe drought, yet records and history show serious droughts are part of the system—and that was before the widely recognised overallocation. Why else would the government arrange a study on drought and low flows in the Lower Murray and lakes, a study in which community participants were asked not to talk about a weir?

For years, there have been plenty of warnings from all sorts of water and climate experts about the looming crisis. Is this the drought we had to have for the government to wake up? This has happened on the watch of a government that so-called waterproofed Adelaide three years ago, yet it has done almost nothing to wean the city off a water source it knew was overstressed. While asking for more water from upstream to improve the river's health, the government did little to take the load off at this end. We have been caught unprepared, without the will or the weapons to fight the most devastating enemy—not drought, but mismanagement and inactivity, which are two things we could have controlled.

Let's lead a concerted effort to change the mindset of all Australians that the river is simply a resource to be used to its maximum. There are those upstream who say that any water flowing past their door is water wasted, yet the more you let them have the more they waste. We have to lead the way, with our decades of experience, to correct the inefficiencies of irrigation back up the river—inefficiencies brought about by interference in the natural flow of the river which contribute to 1 800 gegalitres of evaporation which occurs before the river's water even gets to the South Australian border. Do those upstream who point the finger at us realise that fact, and whose job is it to give them the facts? We must work to make the survival of the whole Murray-Darling system a national priority. We can then work to return the once mighty Murray-Darling to its former glory and pride of place as one of the world's most important river systems, with its majestic miles and its unique and world-renowned estuary, the Lower Lakes and Coorong.

I will now move onto our search for alternative energy sources. We need to redouble our efforts and commitment to research into other potential sources, that is, wind, solar, wave action, as well as nuclear, geothermal, geosequestration, etc. We should rule nothing out. Thorough investigation and research might prove useful later as technology advances might turn old ideas that were discarded as unworkable or unacceptable into future solutions. The same is true for water sourcing. Australian scientists have proven to be among the world's most innovative and creative, making many surprising and valuable discoveries. More investment into clean coal technology might advance its success and give us the best of both worlds. Once these discoveries are made, we must back them into production so as not to lose our best ideas and best people to more adventurous investors from overseas.

I now want to address a few local issues. We have already heard today from the member for Schubert about the branched broomrape eradication program. It has had \$3¼ million cut out of its program over four years, and just recently growers under the grant funding scheme who need to receive over \$5 000 have to sign an extensive contract. This has not been before the ministerial advisory committee or the community consultation group, mainly because the ministerial advisory committee has not met under minister Gago, to my knowledge.

We have had exceptional circumstances; it has been an exceptionally dry year. I commend PIRSA for all the work it has done in helping areas throughout South Australia. I believe 11 areas now have full exceptional circumstances listing. However, we need more rural counsellors out there. Kay Matthias from Rural Financial Counselling said that we certainly do need support. We do not want to see again what happened in Murray Bridge and the lower swamps in relation to rehabilitation and people leaving farming because they did not have the mental health backup. One man from Murray Bridge went missing for a week and, thankfully, we found him.

Another big issue in the area is the Mallee Wells and Peake area groundwater supplies. These supplies are a great resource for stock and domestic use, as well as irrigation, in the seat of Hammond. I have in my possession a letter from the environment minister in another place, written to stakeholders in irrigation. It states:

As you are no doubt aware, the current drought is significantly impacting on South Australia's water supplies. Consequently, users of mains water (supplied by SA Water) and River Murray water users are currently subject to water restrictions to preserve our water supply.

Obviously, measures such as this can place additional pressure on our other water resources. As the Minister for Environment and Conservation, I have responsibility for ensuring that all water resources are managed sustainably. Therefore, I am writing to you as part of a consultation process about placing either permanent water conservation measures or water restrictions on non-mains water supplies, such as ground water extracted from bores.

I quote part of an answer from a stakeholder in the irrigation industry as follows:

We believe that each water system must be regulated according to its own set of criteria. This is precisely why water allocation plans exist in all of the main irrigating areas. The sustainability criteria for each irrigation area are carefully considered in each plan. Trying to bring in one rule . . . all will not fit and will only cause further hardships in horticultural industries. The proposal is not practical.

To restrict irrigation from the Murray River because one of the aquifers in the South-East, for instance, is under stress would be nonsensical and *visé [sic] versa*, to restrict irrigation in the South-East because the river is low is equally floored [sic]. . . Some of our growers irrigating in areas that rely on river water are doing it tough at the moment with current water restrictions in place. Denying other growers in areas that irrigate from underground aquifers would then see the other portion of our state's growers doing it tough as well with absolutely no benefit to those, already struggling, who rely on the river system and production losses through the state.

Whilst the . . . industry is concerned with the current water situation in this state, we do not support your current proposal as there has been no evidence presented of how reducing already regulated underground water users will in any way assist those growers who rely on SA Water or River Murray water to alleviate the current water crisis.

I believe that, if such a restriction was brought in, it would decimate the already stressed horticultural industry in this state, which is essentially relying on the great bulk of its horticulture produce to come out of the Mallee Wells area at the moment.

I mentioned mining at Mindarie and Strathalbyn, both in my electorate. Both Terramin and Strathalbyn have opened their new lead, silver and zinc mine. Operation of the Australian zircon mine at Mindarie commenced the other day. They have two D11R bulldozers costing \$2.7 million each, so they have made a great investment. As long as we get the right outcomes for everyone, including rehabilitation, it will bring great employment to both areas.

The Police Prosecution Unit has been relocated to Mount Barker but, after a bit of action by myself and others, that will be brought back to Murray Bridge. In the context of new

goals coming to the area in coming years, I could not get my head around that matter.

*Mr Pengilly interjecting:*

**Mr PEDERICK:** Yes, that is right. The new prisons at Mobilong will bring thousands of jobs into the community, with plenty of construction and plenty of growth in an already booming Murray Bridge. However, we have to manage any negatives that may arise. The Murray Bridge railway precinct is a valuable project that I have negotiated with the minister, Patrick Conlon, and the Murray Bridge council. That project is going ahead and involves a five-star development overlooking the river, with a convention centre and a hotel facility.

From modest beginnings, the Murray Mallee Strategic Task Force came to be a pace-setter in local rural assistance, pioneering some valuable and widely applicable programs. Most of its work was done by local volunteers who gave their time and expertise to help their neighbours and others. However, the funding carpet was pulled from under their feet, resulting in a miserable amount of money by state budget standards covering only office and administration costs. Suddenly, in the middle of a drought crisis, with a difficult future and new challenges ahead, the wizards in this government have pulled the mat on them, and this worthwhile and inexpensive service looks doomed for the want of a few shekels.

This seems to be typical of this government's approach to country South Australia: centralising health services, facilities, equipment, administration and governance, taking funding away from small schools (which often form the backbone of small country communities), trimming emergency services to the barest minimum and shifting the load onto volunteers, and allowing important arterial roads to deteriorate. The list goes on.

A case in point is the deplorable state of major roads around the Pinnaroo, Lameroo and Loxton regions. These roads are vital transport routes for rural commerce and for cross-border trade. The condition of the region's roads has been the subject of much previous discussion and concern. Complaints from local transport operators, bus drivers and residents are supported by concerns expressed by local councils. Perhaps the most concerning cries come from ambulance personnel, local volunteers who provide the critical link between wider communities and the increasingly distant health facilities. Road conditions are so bad that the ambulance is forced to travel slowly over much of the road between Pinnaroo and Loxton in order not to magnify the patient's discomfort as the vehicle bumps and jolts over the poor surface.

Previous requests for attention have drawn the response that the government has other road maintenance priorities and that the Mallee will have to wait. How long? What does it take to get some priority for the roads in the region? How much do they expect the community to contribute through its volunteers and their employers because of unnecessarily wasted time? How much extra expense is borne by the taxpayer as emergency vehicle maintenance costs are unnecessarily increased?

The fabric of Australian life is stretched thinnest across the country, the very feature of Australia that makes us unique and gives us the charm and character we are known for around the world—ask any traveller. They visit the 'must sees'—the Sydney Harbor Bridge and the Gold Coast—but what they really come for, and return to, is the bush—the Outback, the Rock, the wide open spaces and the endless blue

skies. What travellers remember most about their Australian trip is the special people they meet in the country, the tough but friendly people who run the services and give the country its character. Yet this government seems hell-bent on breaking down these communities that make Australia what it is. Look at this government's short and questionable record of achievements: it is all about the city and the coastal fringe. The heart of Australians is in the heart of Australia, where Labor fears to tread.

This season has highlighted the lack of attention to and investment in the state's infrastructure. The number of broken pipes, the awful stories of delay in repairs and the frequent indifference of staff underline how low the priority of maintaining infrastructure has become. True vision and forward planning rarely seem to make it past the Premier's announcements, which are always carefully managed events with all the bells and whistles and with maximum media coverage. However, when the fireworks stop and the coloured streamers cease to flutter, everyone goes home to watch the evening news, and that is the last of it—unless you are into great tram trips of the world. The people of the River Murray face a huge threat from the trials of this current drought. The Premier appears at a local school to give an award; that is all—nothing else and no promise of assistance or support.

When the locals responded in great numbers to my invitation to attend a rural business forum to consider how we might deal with the drought, Mike Rann dismissed it as a publicity stunt. That meeting, which no government representative attended, spawned a successful application for exceptional circumstances assistance, which is a real and positive step to supporting rural communities. Two months later, in January, a huge storm hit the north of the state, and record rains caused widespread damage to farms, fences and stock. Within 24 hours, guess whose face popped up on TV and in the press, grinning at the cameras and promising government support to repair fences and roads? 'Count on me boys. I'm your mate'! What a difference! These were both natural disasters, one offering a spectacular front-page story and the other underlining the government's inaction and immobility on an event that was looming and inevitable—the drought. As it happens, the promise of support to the people of the north was shallow, with many complaining months later that promises were still unfulfilled. Their new best friend, Mike Rann, is nowhere to be seen.

I am privileged to have the opportunity to play a significant part in the vital areas of the River Murray, sustainability and climate change. All these matters are bound to have a governing influence on future policies for almost everything we do, and none more so than resolving the longstanding problem of the control and governance of the Murray-Darling Basin. They are also vital to the plans of the future growth of South Australia's population and economy. In the immediate future, I will make it my mission to pursue this government on feasible and acceptable alternatives to the state's water needs and to remove once and for all the need for weir No. 3 501 in the Murray-Darling Basin.

**The Hon. L. STEVENS (Little Para):** I begin by acknowledging both Lieutenant-Governor Bruno Kruminis and, of course, Her Excellency the Governor, Marjorie Jackson-Nelson, for the very good work they continue to do in our state. In his speech, the Lieutenant-Governor outlined the government's program for the coming year. I must say that, as the member for Little Para, and as one of the representatives of the northern suburbs of Adelaide, it is certainly

an exciting time, with new industry and new jobs continuing to be developed; new housing developments, including, of course, the terrific Playford Partnership, which will begin very shortly; new Defence Force families coming to live locally; new super schools and early childhood development centres on the way; the final stage of the Lyell McEwin Health Service development (costing about \$120 million), which will be under way within days; the new mental health recovery centre about to be built in Elizabeth East; the Northern Expressway coming online; and world-class work on water conservation and flood mitigation measures. I have probably not mentioned them all, but certainly the north is the place to be. It is going ahead and going great guns.

However, there are still many challenges which particularly relate to ensuring that the health and prosperity that I have been talking about extends to all our citizens. This goes for better health outcomes, better education outcomes and better job outcomes for everybody. This morning, when I was driving into the city, I heard an economist on the radio say that the median income for Australians today is \$27 000. I must say, I was quite staggered to hear such a low amount being the median—the middle person in our population—\$27 000. That was a nationwide figure. I therefore expect that the median figure for South Australia would be lower than that. It just goes to show that many people—the majority of people in this country—are really struggling to own a home, to educate their kids and to live a decent life. I think that we must never forget that. Of course, as a member representing the northern suburbs of Adelaide, I am aware that it is well-known and well-evidenced that there are many people of all ages who are struggling financially.

I look forward to seeing the results of the latest census when they are released. That should not be too long now. I am sure that they will make instructive reading, and they should be instructive in terms of the policies that we put in place. Our increasing economic prosperity, particularly with exciting developments in the mining sector, is fantastic, but that prosperity must be accessed by all our citizens. Quite frankly, it is only the Labor Party that will seriously address this matter.

I move now to the topic of obesity and childhood obesity. I noted in the Lieutenant-Governor's speech the government's intention to ban junk food in schools this year, and, of course, to begin the Be Active challenge program. These two initiatives come none too soon. With statistics showing that up to two-thirds of our young people are overweight and up to 10 per cent are medically obese, there is little doubt that childhood obesity is one of the most serious public health issues that we face today. A recent study found that almost one in five children in kindergarten, that is, ages three to five years, are overweight or obese. Given that a large proportion of obese children go on to become obese adults, it does not bode well for the future health of our society, and, clearly, urgent intervention is required.

Work done by Child and Youth Health (as it was called) released in 2003 also found higher rates of overweight and obesity in preschool children. That was local South Australian work. It also concurred with the other information that I mentioned. That study by child and youth health also showed that the likelihood of being classified as being overweight or obese is associated with an area's socioeconomic status for children in the Adelaide region. It was noted that there was no such association apparent in rural South Australia, but a definite link was found between socioeconomic status and obesity in the suburbs of Adelaide. I know that

to be the case in the northern suburbs, where we have a greater proportion of people who are overweight and obese.

Many reasons for the current obesity epidemic have been cited. Poor food choices, lack of physical activity, snack foods laced with sugar, and the marketing of junk food during children's viewing hours on television have long been singled out as the major culprits. Clever food manufacturers have honed in on the consumer driven demand for low-fat foods, and are marketing many of these products as healthy alternatives in spite of the fact that they often contain unhealthy levels of sugar. It may surprise people to know that Australia has the greatest number of junk food ads per hour of television than any other country in the world. In children's viewing hours in particular, about 30 per cent of all ads are for food or drinks.

Most of these products are high in fat, sugar and salt, and are marketed in a way that makes them specifically attractive to children, such as offering competitions, collecting sets of toys, and using cartoon characters and sporting heroes to advertise the products. The link between this sort of advertising and children's ultimate food choices is undeniable. Food manufacturers and advertisers know full well that their images and offers appeal to children and that children will in turn use their pester power to get what they want. The failure of the federal health minister, Tony Abbott, to show leadership on this issue by regulating advertising aimed at children just goes to show how woefully out of touch he is with the average Australian family. It is very easy for him to say that it is the responsibility of the parents to monitor these things. But, when both parents are working, children are not in their care during the times when they are likely to be bombarded with unhealthy but invariably attractive images.

When that level of advertising is combined with the sponsorship of children's sport by fast food chains, the use of chocolate and lollies by some schools and children's sporting clubs in fundraising, the practical upshot is that children are constantly surrounded by images of food, and unhealthy food at that. It is no wonder that our children have a problem with obesity. Whilst it is true that it is the parents who are ultimately responsible for what their children eat, many (including me) find it hard to fight against 'pester power'. I am getting pester power from grandchildren now. When the parent is tired or pushed for time when out shopping or rushing from one weekend event to another, it can be very easy to give in. Parents are, after all, human. But it is also interesting—

*Dr McFetridge interjecting:*

**The Hon. L. STEVENS:** And grandparents are human as well. It is also an interesting and surprising element to consider the cost associated with making healthy choices. For example, low-fat skinny milk is more expensive than full cream milk. It is cheaper to buy Coke than fruit juice. It is much cheaper to buy a box of high-fat, high sugar, high salt cream cheese and crackers snack than to buy a bunch of bananas. For a family with more than one school-age child the issue can be forced by finances, rather than an indifference to their child's health. Often, the only choice is about which is the least worst thing to get.

I believe it is up to all of us—governments, as well as teachers, doctors, food manufacturers and advertisers—to support parents in their efforts to educate their children about making healthy life choices, to eat well, to play well and to live well, as the slogan goes. The state government's healthy eating in schools guidelines have proved to be a roaring success, with many schools providing healthy alternatives to



traditional canteen food such as pies, pasties and chips. We have also seen schools withdraw lollies and soft drinks from sale. In my own electorate of Little Para, the participating schools my office spoke with reported tangible benefits in terms of students' ability to concentrate in class and their overall energy levels. Whilst there were some initial grumbles (mostly from the students) students have discovered that they can live without lollies, chips and soft drink as daily fare after all.

In terms of the promotion of physical activity, the Premier's Be Active Challenge, which has just started, will encourage children to reach daily physical activity goals both at school and at home. I will certainly be encouraging all the schools in my electorate to participate. I know that some of the schools in my electorate were concerned about the ceasing of a previous program of physical activity, but I am sure that the Premier's Be Active Challenge will be a worthy substitute and something that children will readily respond to. I know how enthusiastic they are in relation to the Premier's Reading Challenge. That has been a masterstroke in terms of children's interest in getting through the reading of books, and I am sure this one will be just as successful. Certainly, I will be keeping in close contact with my school communities in relation to that.

I was interested to see recently that the Victorian Labor state government has introduced a school kitchen garden program called Go for Your Life. This program, the brainchild of chef Stephanie Alexander, teaches children how to grow a variety of food and, in turn, learn to harvest, cook and then, best of all, eat it. Through this, the children discover the many different varieties of plants that we use for food and they also learn about the many different ways it can be prepared. Through this, hopefully, they discover that even food that is good for you can be fun as well. I saw earlier this week some footage of that program in Victoria which I will follow up on myself where—and I think there are some 20 or 30 schools in Victoria doing this—the students have a double session a week out in the garden and then they have another session that is a bit longer where they actually cook and eat the food. It is going very well.

It seems to me to be the perfect way of introducing children who are so eager to learn and participate in things like this to learn about a whole range of foods and to teach them how to cook them and experience the joy of eating tasty food. Nutritionists say that it is no coincidence that children who take an active and wide-ranging interest in food from a young age very rarely have problems with obesity. It makes sense. It is obvious really that children with a higher level of health literacy, and children who understand about what goes into food—what it is healthy and what is not—are better equipped to make informed choices.

Like all complex problems, childhood obesity needs a variety of approaches. We all need to teach children about good food and the benefits of regular exercise. We need to model it ourselves. In particular, schools need to provide good health education and opportunities for children to be active. Food manufacturers and advertisers need to approach marketing to children with greater responsibility. Governments—local, state and federal—need to promote, encourage and support healthy living across the board for all ages through community awareness programs, greater opportunities for people of all ages to engage in safe physical activities and, finally, by providing leadership through appropriate regulation and legislation.

For parents, though, the most important things are for them to be strong in the face of pester power and to be role models for their children. 'Do what I say, not as I do' no longer cuts the mustard with our savvy kids. It is up to parents to take the lead with support. Most of us can afford to lose a bit of weight and, even if you do not need to, it is good modelling for your children to see you eating healthy food and exercising regularly.

I now want to speak a little about some of the comments that I have heard other members make during this debate. It is difficult, as a former minister for health, not to have something to say when certain comments are made, particularly by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, which show that she has absolutely no understanding of the facts of the matter or, it seems, any desire to actually approach the issues on the basis of fact, rather than political point scoring.

There were certain comments that she made that I just cannot leave on the record without some reply. In her speech yesterday she made a complaint about nearly 50 000 adults waiting for dental treatment in this state, and asked what the government did about it. I would like to point out to her, and also to the member for Kavel who made a similar comment during his speech, that when we came to government in 2002 nearly 100 000 people were waiting for almost four years, on average, to be seen under the public dental scheme. This whole scheme fell into this crisis by the actions of the Hon. Michael Wooldridge, federal minister for health, some years previously when he made a wholesale cut to the commonwealth dental program. Under the former Liberal state government, some effort was made to do something about this, but not nearly enough, and if the deputy leader would like to check with the former member for Finniss she might get a straight answer, although probably not.

**The Hon. R.J. McEwen:** It wasn't his forte.

**The Hon. L. STEVENS:** It was not his forte. If she actually looked at the facts, she would know that the waiting list continued to blow out under him, and the number was at 100 000. The Labor government has halved that over its last term. I think we put in more than \$15 million extra to do that, so let us just put things in the proper context.

She also talked about the Margaret Tobin Centre, and she made the point that the former member for Finniss was not even invited to the opening of that centre. Let me tell members about that, too. The former member for Finniss announced the building of that centre in 1998 but, unfortunately, he was never able to get the money. You actually have to do more than just announce something; you actually have to get the money from the Treasurer and spend it. That happened during the first term of the Rann Labor government, for both the Margaret Tobin Centre and the Repatriation General Hospital. It was about \$30 million, I think, for both those facilities, and they are now up and running. So it is probably understandable that the former member for Finniss was not invited to the opening.

Finally, she again made a comment about waiting lists in South Australia and about elective surgery. Let me just put this on the record, and people are free to look up the facts on this. In every year in the last term of the former Liberal government the amount of elective surgery done in this state decreased. On the other hand, in every year of the Rann Labor government in its first term the amount of elective surgery that was done in this state through the metropolitan hospitals increased. So, I think it is really important that, if you are seriously going to be a shadow minister, you should at least get your facts right.

**Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett):** I rise in this place to speak on the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply. People have said this debate is a waste of time but you only have to read what has been said in this place by members on both sides to understand that the time being spent here is valuable time. It is a debate in which each member as an individual can express their own opinions on how they think the state is going, how they think the parliament is being conducted, how they think the government is performing and how they think the opposition is performing. It is good to see that range of full and frank opinions being expressed and I, for one, would be very hesitant to see the Address in Reply debate disappear. Talking on the Supply Bill is another opportunity for us all to speak on a broad range of issues.

The first traditional part of this debate, however, is to congratulate Her Excellency Marjorie Jackson-Nelson and, in this particular case, her deputy, His Excellency Bruno Krumins. Both will be retiring this year, and I pass on my congratulations for a job well done by each of them. They will be difficult positions to fill, and it will be interesting to see who fills them.

The Lieutenant-Governor said on page 3 of his speech that the job for this parliament was to advance the interests of the state and bring about the common good. I was elected to this place as the member for Morphett to do what I possibly could and, while my two hours and 55 minutes on the government benches is far better than the nearly six years—heading into the sixth year—of being in opposition, I am still trying very hard. I must admit that I would not wish opposition upon anyone, because it is a tough life.

Greg Kelton described me as a terrier in a recent article in the newspaper when he was looking at the personalities of people on this side and the reshuffle. I would like to think I am more like a Staffordshire bull terrier than some little Fokie, because I have had staffies and, although some of them are pretty thick, some are very intelligent dogs, and I would like to think I am at the higher end of the intelligence range. Staffies have a trait that they want to be liked and want to please, but their downfall is that they take any slight personally, and I wish I did not take the argy-bargy and occasional viciousness that occurs in this arena as personally as I do. I wish I had the ability to switch off, and I do not. At 2.35 this morning I was wide awake thinking about what is happening and what I am meant to be doing. It takes a toll on everyone. There is no-one in this place who does not work exceptionally hard.

As regards people in the media and out in the community who say that we do not work hard, I invite them to come with any of us at any time. You watch the Premier and the ministers: you can see them ageing before your eyes, and I am not being disparaging. They just work so hard, and I know that everybody in this place works very hard, and it can take a real toll, not only personally but on your family. We see marriage break-ups, we see personal issues often being aired in public, which is just so unfair.

It is said that members of parliament have huge egos. You need to have an ego to be in this place; you need some want to achieve something. What people do not realise is that in most cases those egos are very fragile. It is interesting to watch the personalities in this place and how they cover up for those fragile egos, their insecurities and their inferiority complexes. Some people might say this is a place where you are overcompensated for an inferiority complex, and I think that may be the case.

There is not one person in this place who should not be rewarded with the pay rates and, should I say, the superannuation rates they receive. If Mark Latham and John Howard had had the courage to stand up to the public opinion out there and not drop the superannuation rate, we would not be working in one workplace here with three workplace agreements. There is not one person in this place who does not deserve the remuneration they receive. It is an atrocious attitude of the public and the media to keep lambasting the politicians for being lazy and overpaid; it really does depress me. I have been reading two books lately. One is called *What the Media is Doing To Politics*, and I lent it to Michael Jacobs of the *Independent* and *The Review*. He has not done anything with it yet, but any journalist—I have two copies of it—is welcome to borrow it and read about what they have done to politicians—

*Mr Griffiths interjecting:*

**Dr McFETRIDGE:** The member for Goyder says they do not care, and that is true. Just ask David Kelly—you can't, he's dead; he killed himself in England. Ask Greg Maddock in Queensland—you can't; he killed himself. Ask Penny Easton in Western Australia—you can't; she killed herself. Ask what the media does to people. Ask John Brogden or Geoff Gallop what the media does to people. Ask members in this place what the media does to people.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Dr McFETRIDGE:** It is not 'poor me'. This is just the realities of working in this place, and I get so fed up with the daily grind of having to overcome that public opinion. The Premier, Mike Rann, said in his letter to delegates at the last ALP conference:

Being in government means having the maturity to make difficult decisions. It means having the courage to make hard decisions based on facts and science, not emotions.

But, what do we see from the media, what do we see as the public opinion? We see just an emotional outburst all the time. One of my favourite sayings which I used in my maiden speech and which I will repeat today is as follows:

The most totalitarian despot is public opinion in a democracy.

That is what we are up against. Every time we look at *The Advertiser*, the newspapers or we turn on the tabloid TV—as it is now—you are up against it. It is not 'poor me'. This is the fact: it is about selling papers, it is about getting ratings; it is not about having the truth out there. In this place the need to tell the truth is absolutely paramount, and it is no wonder that people do get down and depressed.

The second book I have brought with me and to which I refer is *Working With Monsters*. This book is about how to identify and protect yourself from the workplace psychopath. Because of the viciousness that goes on in this place I thought, well, perhaps there is a clue here. I am not an adversarial sort of guy; I like to know the enemy so that I can at least protect myself a little bit. When you read some of the psychological traits of these occupational psychopaths, they are in here. Fortunately, there are not very many of them, but there are a few people in this place, I am convinced, who are certifiable psychopaths, and they really do need help. I do know of people in this place who are seeking counselling, and sometimes I think I should go and have counselling myself for coming into this place, because you sometimes wonder what it is all about.

Geoff Gallop's article in today's *Australian* is interesting. He is one of those out there with Brogden and Jeff Kennett who is fighting the black dog, as they call it, depression. I do

not think it is depression. It is perhaps obsession that brings about the depression because you are obsessed with trying to achieve the ultimate, to please, to get the job done. In this article Geoff Gallop says that 6 to 16 per cent of respondents from the professions indicated moderate to severe symptoms of depression, and it is really quite sad that that is the case, and I would be interested to see what the figures are for politics. Geoff Gallop goes on:

The guilt that depressives feel in the face of their world and the world's many imperfections also works against their own liberation. They want to please and they feel everything that happens is exclusively their responsibility. The more they do, the more they feel they have to do. They act for others and they work beyond reason to achieve at the highest levels. To do otherwise, to put themselves and their wellbeing first, is to fail the test of life that has been created in their minds. Herein lies the problem for many of our professions and high achievers. They have lost control. That which drives them also has the potential to destroy them, and tragically all too often it does.

There is another quote:

These personality traits are very socially and professionally valuable but personally very expensive.

Geoff Gallop's article goes on:

Life is full of suffering and contradiction, yet we complicate matters further with dysfunctional relationships and unrealisable aspirations. This can mean that individuals are locked up inside themselves, their minds hammering away 24 hours a day.

I must admit I read that this morning and thought, well, perhaps that does describe some of the issues I face in not being able to switch off from this place; and not taking it so personally is an issue I do have. I will do my best to do that because I do enjoy serving the people of Morphett; I enjoy the opportunity to be in here. The question that keeps me in this place, and for which I do not have an answer, is: where else could I try to achieve the outcomes that I want to achieve—a fair go for the people of South Australia, and the benefits of living in what is without question one of the best places in the world to live?

Despite what is said in the media about the poor performances of governments in the past, and governments even now, South Australia really is a very decent place to live. I have 15 pages here of a speech that I could go through, and talk about things such as the trams and the scandal that I think is surrounding the trams. It talks about roads, and it talks about the way that the South Australian economy is lagging behind the nation. But I am not going to do that today, because I do not think I need to do that. My colleagues have done that. It will come out over the next three years—because there are lost opportunities in this state.

What I do need to emphasise is the fact that this Address in Reply is a good example of where members in this place can put on record, for every one of their constituents, the issues that they are coping with and the issues that this place is coping with. I hope that the standard of behaviour in this place improves and that the viciousness that is evident and the psychopathic behaviour that we see is something that does disappear.

**An honourable member:** And that's on your side.

**Dr McFETRIDGE:** Unfortunately it is on both sides of this house, and probably in the other place as well. It is quite tragic, and I do not want anybody to feel sorry in any way, shape or form for me, having spoken the way I have today. I do not want anybody to feel sorry for politicians being in the position that they are in, because it is our choice; we should know what we are up against. Poor Nicole Cornes, who is a constituent of mine, perhaps got thrown in off the deep end, and she should speak to some of the other Labor

ladies to see how to cope with the world. But the need to improve the outcomes and the opportunities, and bearing in mind the privileges of being in this place, is something that I do feel a very strong need to emphasise, and in the short time I have spoken that is all I need to say. I hope that members will think about it, think about where we are going, think about what is happening, and I hope, certainly with the privileges of power, that the power is going to be used in a wise way and is not going to corrupt—and certainly absolute power does corrupt absolutely.

With those words, I congratulate the Governor and the Lieutenant-Governor on the work they have done. I wish the government well in the future, because considering the track record over six years there is certainly some improvement required. I look forward to working with the new Leader of the Opposition, Martin Hamilton-Smith. Certainly, Martin has a job ahead of him, against overwhelming odds and influence on the other side. It is going to be an interesting time for us all. It is going to be tough, it is going to be wearying, but it is going to be a time during which I know everybody on this side will be determined to make sure that the government does have to perform and be held accountable—and so it should, because the people of South Australia certainly deserve a government of the highest calibre.

**Ms BEDFORD (Florey):** I would like to acknowledge the traditional owners of the land where parliament meets, the Kaurna people. On behalf of the electors of Florey, I take this opportunity to thank the Lieutenant-Governor, Mr Bruno Krumins, for opening this session of parliament, in this our sesquicentenary year of responsible government, and to wish him and Dr Dagmara Krumins continuing health and happiness. They have made a wonderful contribution to the state. I would also like to thank and acknowledge the wonderful contribution of our Governor Her Excellency Marjorie Jackson-Nelson, who will soon retire. She has been a marvellous governor and has served this state so very well.

Her Excellency recently accompanied a group of students to various sites in Europe associated with the Great War and also to the dawn service at Anzac Cove, Gallipoli. Watching the telecast of the service, after attending the dawn service at Tea Tree Gully RSL's Memorial Garden, it was plain to see the impact of being at that special place on that special day, and that Her Excellency was greatly moved. The Tea Tree Gully RSL service becomes bigger each year and all involved with that branch deserve a special mention. The SES now provides the barbecue breakfast, which is a welcome addition to the usual milk coffee fortified by something a little stronger that has become synonymous with the dawn service in our part of the world, prepared, along with the delicious sandwiches and cakes, by the RSL Ladies Auxiliary.

Traditions are very important and parliament's 150th anniversary is an important milestone, one of the many of which this state can be justifiably proud, along with most notably dual suffrage for women. The recently held open day here at Parliament House was a great success and I hope the first of many. It was a great way to bring people into their house and to involve them further than simply casting a vote into representative democracy.

Florey residents are active in making their concerns and wishes known to me, but in my time today I can raise only a few. The future of the Modbury Public Hospital has until recently been one, and the announcement last week by the Premier and the Minister for Health, that the Modbury Hospital will again be back in public management, has been

very well received. The announcement ends what has been a failed experiment into trying to make a profit from sick people, and that is right up there with attempting to make a profit from looking after our children. Luckily in Florey we still have a couple of tremendously active community child care centres, providing exceptional care for both the children and their families.

Health is a major issue that affects everyone, and the future of the Modbury Public Hospital is again in the hands of the government, an action that will soon see major investment there. Importantly, staff retention and entitlements have been ensured in the negotiations, and I pay a tribute to the staff who have always made quality health care their priority. I pay a tribute, too, to the Modbury Hospital Local Action Group for their tenacious activities way back when the contract was first mooted and signed. Although quieter in past years, I am certain their work enabled a similar group at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital to hold off a similar contract, which, in turn, saved the public health system in this state. With the Modbury Public Hospital contract now ended it is apparent that the experiment was not a success and one can only wonder how things would have ended had hospitals all been outsourced.

Education is well served in our electorate. Many wonderful schools give their all to make sure our children have every opportunity. Shortly students at Modbury High School will travel to Mount Gambier for the annual Generations in Jazz competitions. Music and the performing and visual arts play an important part in all schools in Florey, and a music award bearing the electorate's name is in place in all schools. A science award will soon also be introduced to schools.

Another extra curricular activity is involvement in the Pedal Prix, and a team from The Heights School took part in a briefing session here today. Staff, students, parents and the wider school community contribute to make sure that students have the opportunity to participate in this fabulous event, and I commend the Australian International Pedal Prix's board and its chair Mr Andrew McLachlan and race director Gerry Geue for making sure the event has gone from strength to strength. Held over two six-hour rounds at Victoria Park and a final 24-hour endurance round at Murray Bridge, thousands of people are involved in the race and supporting teams, and I acknowledge the assistance of both the Adelaide City Council and the Rural City of Murray Bridge. Our schools also participate in the Rock'n'Roll Eisteddfod and the Wakakirri.

While on education I must mention the opening of the Tea Tree Gully University of the Third Age's new premises at the Modbury School campus. Made possible by a land swap involving the Education Department and the City of Tea Tree Gully, the University of the Third Age has moved from two weather-beaten transportables to a refurbished single storey building, providing 60 courses for over 500 people. This project took many years to bring to fruition, but it is the way of the future, allowing the resource of school buildings to contribute to all ages over more hours of the day.

Roads are a major issue. It has become a priority to see the stretch of Montague Road at Modbury North brought up to standard. Working collaboratively with all stakeholders, I hope to see major improvements in this term. Another sensitive issue is the safety of pedestrians in the Modbury regional centre. The roundabout adjacent to the Modbury Public Hospital and Tea Tree Plaza continues to create problems that could easily improve with better driver education and patience. It remains one of my priorities to

ensure a major review of all traffic movement in that area, particularly in light of the recent tragic death of a pedestrian on Reservoir Road. Our area is the home of the O-Bahn, and we look forward to improvements to the service, particularly new buses. We are proud of our bus drivers and the work they do in this very special arm of public transport.

Major private works in Florey have recently seen expansion of the facilities of the Sferas on the Park Centre, a thriving training establishment for hospitality students that also provides fine dining within our area. Our TAFE (the Tea Tree Gully TAFE campus at Torrens Valley) provides training for thousands of students over a myriad course areas and disciplines. We are served by emergency services, each of which enjoys new premises since my election. Proposed new boundaries will see the light industrial area of Ridgehaven return to the electorate, and also a portion of Redwood Park has recently become part of the electorate of Florey.

Regional offices of the South Australian Housing Trust and Department for Families and Communities continue to do their best to serve our community. Several groups work hard to raise the profile and contribution of indigenous people in Florey. Schools, particularly the Modbury and The Heights schools, lead the way. With the State Strategic Plan as the blueprint for the future, we are aware of the effort the Public Service contributes in ensuring that our needs are met. Water and energy needs, particularly the cost of petrol, remain a focus. Within Florey, we are well served by many sporting clubs and community groups which benefit from government initiatives, in particular grants which help them continue to provide facilities for the many activities people pursue for leisure and fitness.

We look forward to working with government to maintain and improve our share of government spending, and we will continue to raise issues for consideration in the budget as and when they arise. In the next exciting period for this state, we look forward to making sure that the north-eastern suburbs are an even better place to live.

**Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder):** I rise to confirm my support for the adoption of the Address in Reply to His Excellency's speech in opening this second session of the 51st parliament. I also pay tribute to Her Excellency Marjorie Jackson-Nelson. In a previous life, I had the opportunity to meet her several times when she visited Yorke Peninsula. She is a truly wonderful lady, and everyone who meets her thinks she is lovely. She is so welcoming and open to all who meet her. She is a truly inspirational South Australian who very much inspires other people.

I also want to take a moment to reflect on the celebrations that marked the 150th anniversary of a bicameral representative parliament in South Australia. Accompanied by my wife and two teenage children and along with other members on both sides of the house, I attended this place for the open day on Sunday 22 April. I came here expecting to see probably only a couple of hundred people walking through Parliament House, with guided tours being conducted by the staff and those members who chose to attend. I certainly got a surprise. While I acknowledge that many members from both sides attended the open day, I want to stress the fact that the member for Unley was here in the House of Assembly from 10 a.m. until 4 p.m. continually talking to people, which is a credit to him.

I think it is wonderful that something like 2 500 people toured the ground floor of parliament that day. It transformed

what was intended to be an orderly series of tours into something I would describe more as rambling, individual tours, with MPs and staff strategically located, providing information when requested. I was in the house probably for only about 2½ hours, walking amongst the people and asking them whether they had any questions and then trying to relay the history of parliament to some very inquiring minds. Many people were at first a bit apprehensive to ask questions, but when I started to tell them about this magnificent building and how parliament runs, the questions certainly started to flow. No doubt, all those members who were there that day could recount similar stories. However, when I reflect on it now, I am more proud of the fact that I believe I am one of only about 700 people over the past 150 years who have been given the honour of representing their community in this place. Every time I walk into this place, I reflect upon how lucky I am, and I am sure the majority of other members in this place do as well.

The parliamentary open day was a proud day for South Australia. It provided many South Australians who had never been into this place with an opportunity to know that their building—and I stress the fact that it is their building—is where the laws that influence their life are debated and passed. In his speech at the sesquicentenary opening of parliament, His Excellency Mr Bruno Kruminis AM, the Governor's Deputy, talked about a number of different issues. Today I want to talk about a few of those issues.

The 60 years following the end of World War II have involved lengthy leadership roles for both major political parties. His Excellency's speech referred to the 'extraordinary premiership of Sir Thomas Playford'. As a relatively younger person in this place, I have no personal memory of the performance of Sir Thomas Playford—

*Mr Venning interjecting:*

**Mr GRIFFITHS:** No, I haven't; I'm not old enough—but everything I have read leads me to the conclusion that he was a true statesman, a man for all South Australians and the man who led the team that transformed the South Australian economy into a modern, nationally competitive economy. As a taxpayer for the last 28 years, however, I do have a knowledge of the impression the premiership of John Bannon left upon South Australia. No matter what else he did in this place, he will be remembered for the State Bank debacle, which left South Australians with an enormous debt—a debt that made it nearly impossible to invest in infrastructure, to provide services or to be proactive in creating a prosperous future for South Australians. Members will note that I say 'nearly impossible', because I do believe the Liberal government from 1993 to 2002 managed to achieve great things.

All of us in this place are judged by what we do and say. What did the then premier, as the then member for Briggs, say about the State Bank in the period approaching this financial debacle? On 13 April 1989, he said:

... this house condemns the opposition for its sustained and continuing campaign to undermine the vitally important role of the State Bank of South Australia in our community.

He went on to say:

The State Bank is one of South Australia's success stories. . . . The success of the new bank is, in a large part, due to the brilliance of its Managing Director, Mr Tim Marcus Clark.

I think it is fair to say that any South Australian over the age of 30 would describe the State Bank and Mr Marcus Clark with very different words. Many of those people would have lost their job, and many would have been business operators who would have immediately seen that their opportunity to

invest in South Australia and to grow their business was lost. I wonder how history will record the premiership of the member for Ramsay.

A question I asked was: what will be the impact of the unfunded WorkCover liability to his legacy? After inheriting a liability of \$67 million in 2002, this government has managed to increase the liability to \$694 million as at 30 June 2006, out to some \$723 million about a month ago, with a prediction of a possible blow-out to \$1 billion within a few years if nothing is done. When questions are asked of the minister, he continually refers to the new board, but this new board has been in place for five years. South Australians are sick of excuses being given. South Australians simply want it to be fixed. How much longer will it be before the minister takes charge of this matter? How much longer will it take the minister to ensure that South Australians are not left again with a financial debacle?

His Excellency's speech refers to the intention of the government to work closely with BHP Billiton, who are proposing to build a desalination plant in the Upper Spencer Gulf—a wonderful project, and I truly hope that it proceeds, and soon. However, what are the plans of the Rann government when it comes to ensuring that metropolitan Adelaide always has access to a water supply? We on this side of the house are proud of our January announcement stating our commitment to build a 45 gegalitre seawater desalination plant. A desalination plant of this size was commissioned late in 2006 in Perth. It creates 17 per cent of the water required by Perth. It cost \$387 million to build, it is more energy efficient than older desalination technology and it provides potable water at a very competitive price. What, however, has the Rann government done?

Following our announcement, the predictable occurred, and we had the then minister finally announcing that a desalination plant of this size would cost over a billion dollars. The question I ask is: how could he get it so wrong, or was he just trying to scare South Australians off desalination for their future water needs? Then we find that the minister is replaced and all of a sudden the announcement is made that the government has been investigating a seawater desalination plant for Adelaide. I thought it was fantastic, even if it was much later than it should have been, but still there is no action. The question I ask is: when will it happen?

I firmly believe that saltwater desalination needs to be part of the solution for South Australia's water needs. We cannot continue to rely, as we have, upon the River Murray, because it is obvious to us all that it has been abused. As a state, we must use the technology available to ensure that water is available, not just in the metropolitan area but also in the regions where possible. I urge the government to stop talking about desalination: I urge the government to get on with building it.

The extension of the tramline has been a hotly debated issue over the past 18 months. The government obviously believed that it was a priority project and, as such, it provided \$31 million for it. However, the absolute majority of people that I have spoken to have continually questioned why this money was not spent on infrastructure and services that South Australians really need. I firmly believe that higher priorities exist in South Australia for that \$31 million.

The speech of His Excellency highlights the efforts to develop Adelaide's status as Australia's 'university city of the future'. Personally, I commend the government on this vision, as it is a demonstration of our economy being based on a well-educated, intelligent society. However, the desire

to attract more overseas students—and my understanding is that we have some 19 000 students currently studying in Adelaide, with a vision of extending this to 30 000, which again I support, as overseas students are an enormous benefit to our economy—must not come at the cost of South Australians not being able to gain entry to university.

While at a function at Mallala on Sunday, I had an opportunity to speak to a visiting dentist who works in South Australia. He confirmed with me that plenty of dentist training places exist within our universities, but few of those people being trained ever have any intention of practising within South Australia. They all intend to go back to the state from which they came or overseas to the country from which they came. I hope that this situation is not symptomatic of other skill areas.

Over the past 12 months I have had the privilege of serving as the shadow minister for employment, training and further education. Over that period I have spoken to TAFE students, TAFE staff, employers, training providers, young staff and more mature staff. It is fair to say that some are supportive of what the government is doing, but it must also be pointed out that many people are upset. One key issue of concern over the last 12 months has been the decision in the 2006-07 budget to increase costs by reducing government support for staff and employers accessing certificate 2 training in retail and hospitality. I think it is fair to say that small business went ballistic about this decision, with the State Retailers Association executive, members and staff working hard to ensure that the public of South Australia was aware of this decision and what its impact would be upon the economy.

While the change may not mean much to many people, to small retail and hospitality businesses—and in many cases I think we would acknowledge that this is a traditional first job opportunity for young people—it made a significant difference, as it immediately made it more expensive to take on and give the required training to a young person. The natural result of this is that it becomes harder for young people to get a job. I have no doubt that this decision has contributed to the exceptionally high level of youth unemployment in South Australia, which is regularly between 25 per cent and 30 per cent. Two months ago, it was at the absolutely disgraceful level of 39 per cent. Sadly, this level has resulted in South Australia regularly having the highest or second highest youth unemployment rate in the nation.

Unemployment across all age ranges in South Australia has continually been on the increase over the past eight months. It has gone from 4.6 per cent to 5.6 per cent. While the percentages may not make much difference to many people, to me it does, because I know that it really relates to 41 600 people who are looking for a job in South Australia but who cannot find one. Amazingly, this has occurred while Australia has been experiencing record job growth, with 276 000 jobs created across the nation from March 2006 to March 2007. These jobs have also been created while the commonwealth government's WorkChoices industrial relations laws have been in place. Remember that these are the laws that the state government and the federal opposition—the Labor Party—constantly rebuke and criticise.

Getting back to jobs growth, given that South Australia has 7.6 per cent of the population of Australia, one would assume that, if the economic boom that the Premier, the Treasurer and the government ministers continually talk about had impacted here to the same degree, we would have seen 20 800 jobs created. However, the sad fact is that, over

that 12-month period, growth in South Australia was only 800 jobs. What does this mean? It means that 20 000 South Australians who should have a job, had our jobs growth equalled the national growth, do not have one. It also means that South Australia has experienced jobs growth of only 0.289 per cent of the nation. Frankly, I think it is a disgrace, and it must be a situation that governments and oppositions ensure does not continue. We have to make a change.

I want to talk about a few electorate issues. In Goyder, I am lucky enough to have four of the five private hospitals that exist in regional South Australia: Moonta, Hamley Bridge, Mallala and Ardrossan. I have tried to meet with all the hospital boards that administer those truly wonderful facilities, most of which focus on an aged care service. All have some degree of funding crisis, but Ardrossan has managed to turn it around to some degree. I thank the Minister for Health (who is in the chamber at the moment) for agreeing to meet with a delegation from that hospital next week. I hope that the argument they put to him for some increased financial support works—but we will see. It is a very worthy group, which has invested significantly over the past two years. I know that in the first stage of the extension of their aged care needs, they borrowed \$1 million themselves, and they are committed to paying it back. They have a community foundation that works exceptionally hard to try to raise dollars for their community.

*Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:*

**Mr GRIFFITHS:** No, I don't. Another issue I want to talk about is water infrastructure. A few communities are screaming out for support, of which Port Wakefield is one. It has had exceptional growth with the Primo facility and the chicken farms in the area, and we know now that the government has given major project status to the Wakefield Waters development of the Chapman family. It is intended that that will eventually become 3 000 allotments. I am pleased to see that some scoping studies have been undertaken for extension of the water main from the Auburn pipe across to Port Wakefield, which will benefit the agricultural industries and the town. I hope that the economic assessment of that project will stack up and that the pipe extension is put in, therefore ensuring that that region has access to a good water supply.

Another matter I want to talk about relates to Port Hughes and the Dunes development proposed by Peter Butterly. Peter is a very generous benefactor to the Copper Coast region. He has done numerous subdivisions and also supports many community groups. His development is intended to comprise 1 650 allotments, with an 18-hole watered golf course and a clubhouse, which I believe will hold about 200 people, and SA Water has provided a licence for the irrigation of the course of 1.5 megalitres per day. It has been a hotly discussed subject in my area because everybody knows how critical the issue of water is. They have questioned how 1½ million litres of water can be guaranteed per day to irrigate a golf course. Eventually, it will be irrigated via the water reused from the effluent scheme that will service the allotments, as well as, I hope, the Moonta township, when the effluent scheme is constructed. It is an emotional issue, and I hope that a reasonable solution is found.

Within the area of the District Council of Yorke Peninsula, 16 communities do not have access to a reticulated water supply, which makes their growth very difficult. One community in particular I want to talk about is Ardrossan, where SA Water has demanded that a combination of development proposals be established, which equals

100 blocks coming into existence within a reasonably short time, and that each of the allotments within that 100 pay an augmentation fee of \$14 000 up front before a 3.2-kilometre duplicate trunk main is extended to allow Ardrossan to grow.

Another community in Goyder screaming out is Point Turton, which is serviced by a reticulated water supply fed by an underground basin. It probably services about only one third of the community and all the Warooka community, which adjoins it. A tavern is proposed, which will collect absolutely as much water as it can from the rains. It has an abundance of storage capacity, but it still finds that, based on its calculations of water consumption, it will be impossible to meet its own water needs. On behalf of the owners of the development, I have written to the minister asking that SA Water considers some form of supply, even if it is only a couple of litres per minute, to go into a storage tank to ensure that the development will access water.

Another issue in Goyder is the Point Pearce community. For those who are not aware, it is an Aboriginal community on the west coast of Yorke Peninsula. It has suffered tremendously in the last 10 years. Unfortunately, self-management has not been to the level it should have been. It has gone through the liquidation process twice: the first time about eight years ago, and the second time is currently occurring. Assets have gone but, importantly, what has been lost is a vision for the future of the community. The elders are special people who work as hard as they can to ensure that the younger people have a chance of a future; however, at the moment, they are not getting the support they need. I urge the state and commonwealth government to ensure that they do all they can. A lot of discussion needs to take place about self-government and self-determination but, importantly, the services and the support the community needs must be made available as soon as they can be.

The Kernewek Lowender will happen very soon on the Copper Coast. The member for Schubert smiles in appreciation, as he is one of its greatest supporters. It will take place in the middle of May, and about 80 000 people visit over the three days of festivities. The member for Schubert takes part in the Cavalcade of Cars, which happens on the Sunday morning, and he is in one of about 900 vehicles of various ages.

**Mr Venning:** We're first away.

**Mr GRIFFITHS:** The member for Schubert confirms that he and I have the right to be the first vehicle, so it will be an exciting day for me. It is a wonderful event that occurs every two years. It is a combined effort of the Kadina, Wallaroo and Moonta communities to ensure that not only do they get the most economic benefit they can but they also celebrate their Cornish heritage. An ecumenical church service is held on the Sunday, as well as the dressing of the graves, a variety of dinners, and the Furry Dance. You cannot help but be impressed, and full credit goes to everyone who organises it. In particular, I pay tribute to Mayor Paul Thomas, who is the president of the committee and a fantastic advocate for his region.

**Mr Venning:** And I'm Cornish.

**Mr GRIFFITHS:** The member for Schubert confirms that he is Cornish—and proud of it. That is why he attends and will continue to support the event even when he is no longer in this place.

I also want to talk briefly about the regional horseracing clubs and the strategic direction released in the last month by Thoroughbred Racing SA. I note on page 11 that, when referring to Balaklava which is in my electorate, it is quoted

as being surplus to requirements. Anyone in this place who has had the opportunity to attend the Balaklava Cup held in about the middle of August would have a very different opinion of that assessment. The most recent event that I attended was in 2005. It is hard not to be impressed when you see about 15 000 people and about 75 marquees all the way down the straight, and people having such a wonderful day. That is an example of the type of function that the Balaklava Racing Club can hold.

I was also there about two weeks ago at a veteran's day where there were a thousand people. They had a raffle for \$20 a ticket. It sounds a lot, I know, but first prize was a trip for two to Anzac Cove to attend Anzac Day in Gallipoli next year, plus \$2 000 spending money. The chap who won it was from Moonta Bay, so I had a good talk to him also. Balaklava Racing Club needs support. The community is very strong on the fact that it does not want to lose it: it will do whatever it has to do. Media support has been amazing in the last month, and Thoroughbred Racing SA will have a hard fight on its hands if it intends to stop Balaklava from operating.

In mid-February a tragedy occurred at Port Wakefield when the Primo Abattoir suffered from fire. This affected 368 employees, but the response from the business itself and the pork and small goods industries has been nothing but exceptional. Of the Primo staff, 55 are now working at Big River Pork in Murray Bridge. I believe that about 240 staff are working at Royal Park in the facility previously used by Conroy's, and some are still working at Port Wakefield. All up, unfortunately, I think about 40 people lost their jobs. Others chose to move away or to different fields. It is important that this business actually has the chance to continue operating, because it has some fantastic contracts in place. It is important to our region that it not only rebuilds but proceeds with its original intention of probably doubling the size of the investment.

Since Primo bought the business in 1999, it has invested \$32 million. Its intention over the next five years, without the fire having occurred, was to invest a similar amount and to double its workforce to about 750 people. Anybody who lives in the region knows that one particular business that has 750 employees has a major effect on the economy of that region. I commend minister McEwen on his response and that of his staff to the Primo fire. It was a combined effort, I believe, of several ministers of the government, but the response was immediate and proactive. They have been significant players in the effort to ensure that this business stays within the Port Wakefield area.

I also want to pay tribute to the member for Wakefield, David Fawcett. David was on the doorstep of Primo on Sunday morning and Monday morning when I also attended, when probably 600 people turned up. They were predominantly employees, but also their partners and families, and those people were concerned about their future. David reacted immediately. He stayed behind for that meeting, then jumped on a plane to Canberra and was in the Prime Minister's office talking about what Port Wakefield and Primo needed for their support. I commend him for that.

I briefly want to talk about aquatic centres. We all know about them and there has been a lot of debate in here. There are 11 in South Australia, and, as I understand it, eight are at some degree of risk apparently to save only \$2 million. Now, \$2 million is a lot of money, but in the scheme of an \$11.6 million budget it is relatively insignificant. The minister has announced the opportunity for the community to have input to review the potential closure of aquatic

centres. The consultation date closed, I think, at the end of February. The region which I represent is very much waiting with bated breath for the result.

Particularly for us, it is the Port Vincent Aquatic Centre. It operates for 30 weeks per year and thousands of students attend the centre. They do not just necessarily go there for a good time; they actually learn skills that will make a difference to their lives and those around them. It is learning about the marine ecology; it is learning about safe practices on the water; it is an all-inclusive thing. Please, minister, I urge you to reconsider your position on that, because not only will it take away the opportunity for those thousands of students each year and make it harder for them to go to other facilities but it will also put at risk 26 jobs in Port Vincent. Port Vincent also needs support.

I would not be in this place doing my job properly unless I mention the fact that regional infrastructure needs to be supported. Investment in the regions needs to be in roads, water, electricity, telecommunications, education, hospitals, aged care, social services, and supported accommodation for the disabled. That is not normally one that gets a guernsey from a lot of people when they talk in this place, but to me it is a special one. There is a proposal to build a facility at Minlaton. It has a tremendous amount of community support. My hope is that it eventually manages to grow to the 14 beds that it is intended to be, because there are probably about 35 people in that area ranging in ages up to their 50s (who have parents in their 80s) who are no longer able to be cared for at home. Society has not given them the support they needed in the past because the family has solely taken that role. Our challenge is for us and society to make a difference.

I also want to pay recognition to the minister responsible for primary industries in relation to what the government has done for exceptional circumstances applications across the state. It has been a really difficult time for all of regional South Australia. The drought has bitten into every person's life. You do not just need to be a farmer; you just need to be a person who lives in the community to understand what it has done. You can see it on people's faces. It has made a difference to businesses; it has resulted in employment levels dropping. It has resulted in the tantalising approach of mining opportunities; taking people from regions because they have skills and can probably earn three times as much in the mines.

The support that minister McEwen and the honourable member for Frome, our previous shadow minister for agriculture, and the support that federal minister McGauran has given to South Australia to exceptional circumstances applications deserves mention. The latest round has resulted in, initially, only Centrelink benefits being available, but we are hopeful that the full benefits of interest support subsidies will also come later.

When I talk to people in the Goyder electorate about the resources available to the Rann government and make them aware that this financial year the government has \$2.9 billion more available to it than the Liberal government of 2001-02 (33 per cent more), these people are truly amazed. The first question asked of me, however, is: where has it gone? What tangible benefits have we seen? Even after being in this place for about 12 months, I cannot give an easy answer.

Members on the other side no doubt would have lots of answers for that, but I cannot see the tangible benefits of it. That figure of \$2.9 billion sounds hard to believe, but the cumulative additional resources available to this government since 2001-02 actually amount to \$9.8 billion, if you consider what the last budget of 2001-02 was. That is equivalent to the

2002-03 state budget in itself. Tax collections continue to rise. Stamp duty is up, as is land tax and payroll tax, and all of these are making South Australia a less competitive place to do business. Also going up is the WorkCover liability that I spoke about previously and the unfunded superannuation liability of the public sector. After being reduced by a Liberal government to \$3.249 billion in 2001, it is now at a level of about \$6.5 billion, and it is predicted to remain at this level in current forecasts. I believe this is another example of the inability of the Labor governments to manage the finances of South Australia. Sadly, there have been far too many examples of this. With those few words, I support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply.

**Mr BIGNELL (Mawson):** I pass on my thanks to His Excellency Mr Bruno Kruminis AM, the Governor's Deputy, for his speech to mark the sesquicentenary opening of the Parliament of South Australia. As the Governor's Deputy retraced the history of this place, he touched on the extraordinary premiership of Sir Thomas Playford. He said the South Australian parliament at that time was involved in a wide range of state-building initiatives. They included housing, electricity, transport, agriculture, manufacturing, mining, defence, and urban and regional development. I hope that at the bicentennial celebrations of this place similar judgments will be made of the Rann government and the current parliament.

It is an exciting time to live in South Australia. This government is delivering infrastructure across the state. It is assisting the manufacturing industry and the agriculture sector. The Rann government is providing the first extension to our public transport infrastructure in more than two decades. Roads around the state are being upgraded and made safer. The member for Finnis yesterday said that he looked up at the portrait of Sir Thomas Playford in this chamber and shuddered at what he would think of what this government was doing. He may well be shuddering but it would not be at what this government is doing but at the legacy left to the people of South Australia by the backstabbing Liberal governments of Brown, Olsen and Kerin. The Liberals do not have a revolving door approach to leadership: it is more like a whipper-snipper approach of cutting down one Liberal leader and replacing them with another one, only to be, in turn, cut down and composted. I think Sir Thomas Playford, one of the greatest premiers of the state, a great socialist, would have turned in his grave when another generation of Liberals led by John Olsen sold off the Electricity Trust that he, with great foresight, had established to the great benefit of our state.

With our electricity generation, transmission and retail sectors now split among a number of different private entities operating in a national market, it is harder for the government to directly influence the market. But what we have done is bring down the price of electricity after the Liberals forced prices up through their privatisation of ETSA. The Rann government has attracted record levels of investment in wind and solar power, and we have gone from having no wind farms in 2002 to having more than half of our nation's wind power, either established or on the drawing board. The South Australian government is being seen as a world leader in its efforts to address global warming. Our Premier and energy minister were implementing measures to reduce CO<sub>2</sub> emissions at a time when Prime Minister John Howard and his coalition federal government was in denial about the existence of global warming. Premier Rann led the way when



it came to getting a national approach to fixing the damage done to our Murray-Darling system. He and our Minister for the River Murray, the member for Chaffey, are in there doing a good job in sticking up for South Australia in the Murray debate. This is one of the most pressing issues in our country at the moment and, in a state so reliant on a healthy Murray, we need more done in the upstream states to stop rice and cotton growers and to ease the strain on an overtaxed waterway.

South Australians can be grateful that the Liberal fire sale was finally brought to an end in 2002 with the election of an economically responsible Rann government that has delivered five consecutive budget surpluses. The Liberals broke an election promise when they sold ETSA. They sold the TAB for two-thirds of what it made us each year. Ask any cabbie or anyone in a pub or TAB, and they have not forgotten the economic vandalism of the Liberals. Compare that with what has been happening in the state in the past five years. We have record low unemployment and more police on the beat than at any other time in this state's history after the Liberals took police numbers to record lows. The rest of Australia for the past five years has been taking notice of South Australia and we have seen investment in our regions and in Adelaide from national and international companies.

The redevelopment of the GPO/Advertiser block has provided a once-in-a-generation opportunity to realise a development that will be one of Australia's greatest and most environmentally sustainable CBD precincts when it is completed. The development of the entire block would not have happened without the South Australian government getting behind the project by guaranteeing to take a tenancy in the first building. It is worth remembering that the Liberals criticised the government for taking this step. In fact, they have spent most of the past five years complaining about the things this government is doing to drive this great state forward. They are a whingeing, whining, carping opposition and their negativity has been at fever pitch this week.

This government has unashamedly gone after mining exploration and investment during the past five years, and we now have record investment in our mining sector. We are on the crest of a mining boom and everyone in the state from the wineries of McLaren Vale to the small businesses and manufacturers of Lonsdale and Hackham and the construction companies of the Iron Triangle and Eyre Peninsula are about to reap the benefits. I was in the Tumbly Bay Hotel last Friday with a very fine mine host in Joe Cross and some of the regulars I have met on previous visits to the famous old pub. The mood on Friday night could not have been more positive. It was not just the rain that was falling outside that had them salivating and getting ready to sow crops that hopefully will soon have ample follow-up rains.

The people of the Eyre Peninsula are excited about the investment in the mining sector and the massive building program under way in Whyalla and other parts of the region. Last Thursday I went out on a tuna feeding boat to witness first hand hundreds of tuna being fattened up in pens off Port Lincoln. Aquaculture, like mining, manufacturing and agriculture, forms the backbone of our economy. As someone who was born and bred on a dairy farm, I know how important the agriculture sector is to our economy. Governments can push and pull all the economic levers they like but, if Hughie does not send down the rain, our economy, exports and our rural and metropolitan communities suffer.

In McLaren Vale, an area I am proud to represent, we have not had the best of seasons with grape production down

because of the drought. While volumes are down, we are hoping the quality of this vintage will be of the same high standard that has made McLaren Vale—the winner of the past two Jimmy Watson Trophies—a world-leading wine region with a reputation for the highest quality wine.

There were smiles all around in McLaren Vale and Willunga over the weekend as the rain continued to fall. Parched dams were filling and thirsty vines were getting their first big drink for quite a while. We cannot expect our farmers, grape growers and vigneron to do it on their own, and this government continues to provide assistance and to remove bureaucratic barriers to help the development of these great sectors.

The prime reason I was on the Eyre Peninsula last week was for the wind-up of the Lower Eyre Peninsula Re-establishment Program at the Marble Range Community and Sports Club. Ministers Zollo and Gago were also there as the community came together to mark the end of another chapter following the devastating and deadly bushfires that hit the Eyre Peninsula on 11 January 2005. Although we do not hear any positive news in this house from the person who represents the vast majority of the Eyre Peninsula (the member for Flinders), I can report to the house that the people affected by the fire are grateful for the government's assistance. They were grateful for the fantastic contribution of the hundreds of public servants who chipped in and worked hard, long hours to help out the people who had lost so much in the fires.

These people included the legendary Vince Monterola, who headed the recovery task force, and Martin Brueker and Martin Chalmers, who set up the recovery centre and had \$10 000 cheques to people just three days after the fires, and who are still working hard for the future of Lower Eyre Peninsula. Public servants quite often get a bad wrap, but I have to say that what I saw in my six weeks in Port Lincoln immediately after the fire was nothing short of sensational. People from Primary Industries, emergency services, the police and correctional services worked with people from education, health, Treasury and the department of transport in a way that any business or corporation would have been proud of. It was great to work alongside them.

In particular, I thank Hilton Trigg and Helen Lamont from Primary Industries, whom I now count as good mates, and to this day they are still working hard for their community. They both spoke very well at last Friday's function, and their contributions were warmly recognised by locals. The locals also appreciate the fact that Premier Rann and Minister Conlon were there from day one, demanding that everything that could be done was being done, and a rotating duty minister was appointed with the authority of cabinet to instigate whatever measures were required. Ministers Conlon, Roberts, Stevens, McEwen, Lomax-Smith, Maywald, Key, Foley and Holloway all played an important role on the ground in those early days, and the people of South Australia can be guaranteed that, God forbid there is a disaster in their area, this government will be there for them as well.

The recovery process established after the 2005 fires is now the blueprint for other disasters in Australia. But don't just take my word for it. At last Friday's function two locals whose properties had been hit by the fires spoke of their experiences. This is part of what Rob McFarlane, a Wanilla farmer, had to say:

Tuesday 11th of January 2005 was a day that is indelibly etched in the minds of everyone who was involved in any way. It is amazing how we can witness disasters of any kind anywhere in the world and

feel compassion and sadness but it is not until we are involved personally that we truly understand what is involved both physically and mentally in dealing with these things and the recovery afterwards. It very soon became obvious that we weren't going to do this on our own.

Volunteers appeared as if by magic from all over the country and beyond to get the recovery started and I don't think we will ever be able to thank these people enough for their efforts. Some of the conditions they worked in, particularly in the first few days rolling up fences, was nothing short of horrendous with the dust and hot winds blowing over the scorched earth. They appeared to take it all in their stride, but it was probably a good job we couldn't hear the conversations out in the fields.

The state government's initial response was swift and decisive, with ministers and bureaucrats on the scene almost within hours. Their initial grants, delivered almost without fear or favour, were greatly appreciated and, when combined with the follow-up support from all levels of government, was a very real platform on which to build the financial recovery. We must pay tribute to the [Primary Industries] team for their efforts and particularly their patience which goes far above and beyond the call of duty, and thank them all sincerely for their support and assistance over the past 2½ years.

The team at the recovery centre, what an amazing job. Almost from day one they were on the case and to this day are still beavering away to tidy up the remaining loose ends. From the top down, their experience has been invaluable in helping us to see through the wildly fluctuating emotions and get on with the job at hand. All service clubs, churches and other agencies also played a huge role in the recovery. Thank you to anyone and everyone for their help.

That was part of the speech from farmer Rob McFarlane. What farmers found after the fires was that, through the Primary Industries program, they could sit down and map out a business model for their properties and operations. For many of the farmers, such as Heather Pope, it was the first time they had come up with a business plan. This is a section of her speech from last Friday:

Firstly, thank you Hilton and Helen for giving me the opportunity to thank the government and your team of dedicated consultants and staff for your assistance, guidance and support during the past 27-odd months. Our journey over the past 27 months has been an extraordinary one. For many, it has been a long and difficult journey and will continue in a similar manner for some time. Personally, yes, it was a struggle, the sleeplessness, stress, the sheer exhaustion each day to cope with stock. We were very fortunate to have about 95 per cent of our stock survive (close to 1 000 head of cattle and 1 900 sheep), so our primary concern was mustering and securing them, then feeding and watering them until we could truck them out for either sale or agistment. During those days we acted on automaton. Throughout this time there were a vast number of volunteers, businesses, agencies and organisations that assisted and supported all of the people in the fire footprint. Thank you.

Without going into too many details, the fire, although extreme, provided our farming enterprise with an opportunity to evaluate our whole farming enterprise in terms of productivity, structure and capacity of resources and the immediate, medium and long-term viability. The Bushfire Re-establishment Program provided us with means to help us achieve the change. The strategic planning workshops provided us with technical advice for coping with our immediate needs of finance, existing farm enterprises such as cropping and stock and caring for our families and ourselves.

Under our patriarch rule prior to the fire, we had no long-term plans or, if we did, they were in dad's head and he certainly did not share them. So the business planning grants certainly provided us with the opportunity to assess our existing structure and enterprise, and develop a plan for our future.

The result of the plan identified that we would be better suited to lease out our cropping land on a yearly rotational basis and for us to concentrate on what we know best—our sheep and cattle. The succession planning exercise resulted in the relinquishing of patriarchal control, to having our daughter return to the farm and take up an apprenticeship to undertake her certificate . . . in agriculture with a view to continuing with the family farm. We also utilised the sustainable agricultural grant and the biodiversity enhancement grant to assist with our long-term plans. On land that is more suited to stock, we established lucerne pastures to improve grazing capacity, and applied lime to areas of low pH to improve soils for increased productivity.

The biodiversity enhancement funds assisted us to re-establish fences, to protect remnant vegetation which will contribute to provide a link with the Wanilla Conservation Park and neighbouring properties. The pest and weed control program, I believe, did not reach its full potential due to lack of funding. However, as with our finances, I guess the 'piggy bank' can empty quite quickly. Is there any chance of the program resuming? Or even providing the mapping details for farmers to continue themselves when they can? Being amongst some of the first farms to access the grants, we did experience a delay receiving the funding. However, those early teething problems were overcome and things continued smoothly.

Is there going to be a summary/overview report produced so we can hear about other projects that farmers undertook through the grants, such as feedlotting, deep ripping or a desalination plant? Whether the projects are considered a success or need to be modified? I also trust that government ministers and heads of departments look after your staff. They go to extraordinary lengths to provide the assistance that we required, and we acknowledge and thank them for their dedication. Once again, Hilton and Helen, thank you for the opportunity to express my gratitude for the past two years.

That was part of Heather Hope's speech from last Friday. I think it is important to place on the record in this place the feelings of South Australians who were so badly affected by one of the darkest days in our state's history. The fire has long been extinguished and the inquiry into its cause and how it was fought is nearing an end, and people are still trying to get on with their lives. The day after the fire, the Premier told the people of the Eyre Peninsula that the government would be there for them in the short term and the longer term. He implored all of us involved to stick with the recovery for as long as it took to get people back on their feet, and so that work continues. Mrs Pope sent me an email on Friday night which included a message for the Premier. It said:

Leon, I was pleased to meet both you and minister Carmel Zollo today and have the opportunity to thank you as representatives of the state government for the prompt response following the January 11, 2005 bushfire. Please extend my gratitude to Premier Mike Rann and other members of parliament. Also, remind them that although we have been feeling all warm and fuzzy toward them, they need not rest on their laurels. 'There is always room for improvement' and someone else knocking at their door.

How true that is, and I am sure that whenever the need is there again we will step up to the plate, and that the experience we will take out of the Lower Eyre Peninsula will help us in our endeavours to help others.

I would also like to take this opportunity to thank some people opposite and acknowledge the cooperation and great sense of bipartisanship we received from them. I remember many phone conversations with the then Liberal leader, the member for Frome, Rob Kerin, who not only had a great view on what should be done on the primary industry front: he had also lost a good mate in the fire. And to Caroline Schaefer in another place, and the retired former leader, Dean Brown: thank you for your input and for the way you put politics to one side in the interests of helping those devastated by fire.

That is a great example of how members of this parliament, an institution celebrating its sesquicentenary, can work together to help people. However, there are some things that fall back on people taking personal responsibility. One of those is the care of our children. This government has done a lot through Families SA, the Department of Education and Children's Services, the health department and other agencies such as the police to make our state a safer place for children. However, every parent must take personal responsibility to ensure they are keeping their children safe from drugs and other threats to our society.

In January 1966 South Australia lost its innocence. Three young children—Jane, Arnna and Grant Beaumont—were

snatched during a trip to Glenelg beach. Of course, this unsolved crime is one of the state's most enduring mysteries, but it also changed the psyche of our state and the standards of our community in terms of how we look after our children. Who now, 41 years on, would allow their children aged nine, seven and four to catch a bus to the beach alone? But that heightened level of supervision that an entire nation took up after the abduction of the Beaumont children has not extended to our children's bedrooms and studies where predators now lie in wait to harm our children. I am talking now about the predators who use the internet to get into the safety of our homes to try to get some sick thrill out of communicating with our young loved ones—or, worse, those who would try to lure children out of our homes and into danger.

The South Australian police and our schools are doing an excellent job trying to stay ahead of these sick scum, and are trying to warn children of all ages just how vulnerable they are. I recently was privileged to meet a police officer who is doing an outstanding job with the younger members of the electorate of Mawson and the wider southern Adelaide community. Senior Constable Amanda Dawson and her team at the South Coast community program section visit schools and community groups in the south to get the message across to people about the dangers of the internet. The police discussed ways to use the internet as a window to the world in a safe, secure and fun way. Much of the material they use, both printed and in DVD form, is produced by the Australian government under its outstanding NetAlert program. The federal government should be congratulated on this initiative, and I urge all parents to go to the website [www.netalert.net.au](http://www.netalert.net.au) to find myriad methods to make the internet safer for your children.

I was shocked when Senior Constable Dawson showed us a DVD with re-enactments of real-life cases of predators approaching youngsters on line. One involved a young boy who thought he was having an online conversation with another young boy in a chatroom. The internet conversations continued for some time until the young boy was convinced to leave his home and travel interstate to visit the supposed other young boy who turned out to be a paedophile who was trying to groom his young victim and take advantage of him. In this case, thankfully, the deviate's plans were thwarted at the last minute, but the intent was clearly there.

If your children already know more about computers than you do, then the NetAlert site can take you to scores of other links that you can use to learn about the internet and its possible pitfalls. It has great programs and fact sheets online for parents, teachers and children of different ages. For the children, these programs are fun, with lots of noises, graphics and games, but the underlying message in the programs is safety on the net. There are some basic rules for any people who are communicating on the internet or in chatrooms. Never give away your real name or post any information that could lead people to finding your identity or where you live. Be very careful about posting pictures of yourself online and the best advice is not to post pictures, but if you have to, do not put your name or anything that could identify you near the picture.

The internet is a marvellous tool for organisations to market and show off what they have to offer. This includes

schools, but police are advising schools to be careful of the internet and, in particular, how they post images of students. Police warn that paedophiles have been known to take high resolution head shots of children off websites and use computer software to superimpose the pictures of the children's head on to pictures of naked bodies of other children. These sick human beings are often a part of paedophile rings that swap pictures of naked children who are sometimes involved in sexual acts. Imagine seeing your child's head superimposed onto one of these disgusting vile images. The police (who are doing a very good job in hunting down offenders) recommend that schools use low resolution pictures and put a fine white screen over the pictures so that they cannot be cut and pasted.

It is terrible that our society has come to this, but just as we have made adjustments to our way of life since 1966 after the Beaumont children disappeared, so we must do the same thing to keep our children safe and under supervision in the 21st century. The record number of police in South Australia means that we have more police than ever before on the hunt for online predators. It is a difficult job because of the worldwide web and the way it stretches across so many jurisdictions. We also have more police in our community spreading the word of the dangers and informing people how to make their computer use safer. However, as I said earlier, we cannot leave this job up to our hardworking police and our teachers alone. All of us who are parents must take it upon ourselves to learn about the internet, to be informed of the dangers and to sit down with our children to discuss using the internet in a safe and secure way. The internet is a great tool for our children. To ban them from using this modern marvel is to deny them an opportunity to travel the world and back into history from the comfort of the family home.

Before I finish, I pay tribute to our fantastic Governor, Marjorie Jackson-Nelson, who will retire soon. Marj (as she likes to be known) is a true national treasure—a wonderful athlete who dominated the world athletics scene in the 1950s, a fantastic fundraiser and community worker and, during the past six years, Marj has become one of South Australia's most loved and admired governors. I first met Marj about 20 years ago, and since then, in my role as a journalist and now a member of parliament, I have had the pleasure of regularly catching up with her. Marj has a great sense of humour and I have always enjoyed her jokes, even if they have largely been at my expense.

Last year, the Governor presented my uncle, Kevin Young, with an OAM at Government House. When my auntie and uncle were introduced to the Governor and the family connection to me was pointed out, she said, 'You poor things, that must be terrible!' Thank you, Marj, for the tireless work you have done for South Australia. Don't forget to take your torch, your medals and those wonderful photographs of your sporting glory when you move out—and I hope that you get your bond money back!

**The Hon. J.D. HILL** secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### ADJOURNMENT

At 5.57 p.m. the house adjourned until Thursday 3 May at 10.30 a.m.