

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 3 May 2007

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

## AFFORDABLE HOUSING

The **Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Minister for Housing)**: I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The **Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL**: In my ministerial statement to the house on 15 March 2007 relating to the Affordable Homes program, I stated:

Our social housing system has a \$700 million debt to the federal government, which is costing the housing system \$70 million a year to pay off.

The sentence should have read as follows:

Our social housing system has an \$880 million debt, comprising \$663 million to the federal government and the balance to the state, which is costing the housing system \$70 million per year to pay off.

## JULIA FARR SERVICES (TRUSTS) BILL

The **Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Minister for Disability)** obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to construe certain testamentary dispositions, trusts and gifts in favour of the Home for Incurables, the Julia Farr Centre or Julia Farr Services in favour of Julia Farr Association; and for other purposes. Read a first time.

The **Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL**: I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

In June 2006 disability reforms were announced involving the dissolution of the Intellectual Disability Council, the Independent Living Centre and Julia Farr Services and the establishment of Disability SA.

The board of Julia Farr Services ("JFS") passed a resolution on 26 June 2006 to dissolve on 30 June 2007 or such later date as the Minister may consider administratively convenient. In accordance with Section 48(6) of the *South Australian Health Commission Act 1976*, JFS will voluntarily dissolve, with a transfer of staff and Government owned assets to the Department for Families and Communities.

The JFS board was invited to establish a new incorporated body under the *Associations Incorporation Act 1985* to manage the non-Government owned assets. The Julia Farr Association ("JFA") was incorporated on 15 September 2006 and operates on a not-for-profit basis as a non-government organisation. The JFA is governed by a board of management.

In working through the due diligence process it came to light that charitable income has been forthcoming since the inception of JFS (formerly the Home for Incurables Inc. and the Julia Farr Centre Incorporated) and is expected into the future. The issue of the charitable income needs to be addressed and there are intricacies associated with the trusts and estates of which JFS is a beneficiary.

JFS as trustee of the JFC Benefactors Endowment Fund intends to appoint the JFA as the new trustee of the Fund prior to dissolution of JFS. The Fund has a current balance of \$470 000.

JFS manages a Residents Trust Fund which is a holding account for residents who choose to nominate the account for Disability Support Pension payments and to deposit personal funds. Each resident has their own trust account within the fund and can make withdrawals and deposits at the Centre as they desire. Less than 50% of current residents utilise the fund.

The Residents Trust Fund existed in some form prior to the incorporation of the Julia Farr Centre in 1982 but was not reported separately in financial statements until 1983. Each resident had their

own account. The interest accruing on small individual accounts was minimal and it was decided in September 1983 to consolidate them into one bank account to maximise the interest. It was also decided to deposit the interest that had accrued into a single account called the Residents Benefit Fund which could be accessed by needy residents.

A protocol was then developed to distribute subsequent interest that accrued on the Residents Trust Fund each quarter to the individual residents who use the Residents Trust Fund as their holding account.

Apart from the initial interest transferred to establish the Residents Benefit Fund the fund has grown through annual interest, specific donations and income from sale of craft items which have been deposited over time. The Residents Benefit Fund currently has a balance of \$845 000 and is intended for the ongoing benefit of adults with acquired brain injury, physical or neurological conditions who are former clients of JFS and/or current tenants of the Julia Farr Housing Association. A formal application process is in place for residents to access funds for specific purposes. The approval and allocation of funds is overseen by a Residents Benefit Fund Committee.

JFS also manages an account established with past donations to the value of \$52 000.

It is intended that the Residents Benefit Fund and the donation account will transfer to the JFA.

Disability SA is a Government agency and cannot receive gifts, bequests and donations in the future nor is it likely or appropriate for Disability SA to be nominated as a beneficiary of trusts or estates.

This Bill establishes the JFA as the legal successor to JFS following the proposed dissolution of JFS on 30 June 2007 specifically for the purpose of future gifts, bequests and donations. The Bill will ensure the ongoing benefit of gifts, bequests and donations for people with disabilities in South Australia and will alleviate any uncertainty as to who should benefit from testamentary bequests nominating JFS as the benefactor. The JFA will be required to meet the objects of any trusts or bequests and will not be able to use the funds for any other purpose.

I commend the Bill to Members.

## EXPLANATION OF CLAUSES

## 1—Short title

## 2—Commencement

These clauses are formal.

## 3—Interpretation

This clause defines terms used in the measure.

## 4—Application of Act

This clause provides that this measure applies to a testamentary disposition, trust or gift made or created before or after the commencement of this Act. Furthermore, the provisions of the measure are additional to the provisions of the *Trustee Act 1936*, other than section 69B (which will not apply to a charitable trust to which this measure is to apply).

## 5—Dispositions, gifts and related powers to vest in JFA

This clause provides that certain specified dispositions of property in favour of a designated entity (as defined in clause 3), or in favour of the residents etc of a designated entity, will be taken to have been a disposition in favour of the Julia Farr Association Incorporated or the residents etc of a nominee of the Association (as the case requires), in effect placing the Association in the shoes of the designated entity. This clause will also allow other references to a designated entity as a trustee to be taken to be references to JFA. However, the relevant provision will not allow JFA to disturb the appointment of a new or substitute trustee made before the commencement of the measure.

In addition, if it was the intention of a testator etc that, should the beneficiary cease to exist, the testamentary disposition, trust or gift was to lapse or was to be in favour of some other person or body, then the measure will not override that intention.

The clause also makes consequential procedural provisions.

## 6—Variation of terms of trust

This clause enables the Julia Farr Association Incorporated to vary the terms of a trust in the circumstances specified in proposed subsection (1). Application for such variation is made to the Attorney-General, who may refer an application to the Supreme Court in certain circumstances.

The clause makes provision for costs and related procedural matters.

## 7—Alteration of rules of JFA

This clause provides that Julia Farr Association must not alter certain critical rules unless such an alteration is approved by the Attorney-General. This is to provide security in terms of the disposal of trust property etc deemed to have been in favour of the Association by force of this measure.

**Ms CHAPMAN** secured the adjournment of the debate.

### ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.  
(Continued from 2 May. Page 119.)

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport):** As always, I would like to place on record my thanks to both the Lieutenant-Governor and the Governor for the way they conduct themselves in office and also for their contribution in relation to the speech made to which we are now applying the debate. The good thing about Address in Reply contributions is that you get the opportunity to talk about a wide range of matters and can often talk about complex matters you do not get the opportunity to discuss in some other forums. Unlike some who consider the Address in Reply a waste of time, I think it has some value, particularly to members of the opposition, who do not always get the same forum as does the government. I am not of the view that it is a waste of time: I think that, properly used, it can be of some value.

I want to touch on a couple of matters in relation to education, a portfolio I have just been allocated as shadow minister. I guess there are only three issues I wish to raise at this stage. One is the attempt by the government to put the new super school in the north-western suburbs onto the site of the Kilburn Football Club. It seems to me that it makes no sense.

**The Hon. M.J. Atkinson:** Phil Martin's always been a great Liberal supporter.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** The Attorney interjects, but I was only out at Kilburn last week and I am there again this week watching football. The Attorney might want to do it one day.

**The Hon. M.J. Atkinson:** I do it every weekend.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** Not at Kilburn.

**The Hon. M.J. Atkinson:** No, not at Kilburn.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** It seems to me a nonsense that the government would even consider putting a school next to a football club with poker machines on the same site. Why the government would even consider it makes no sense to me. If you asked the parents, 'Would you want your teenaged children next to a licensed premises with poker machines collocated on the same site?' I think that most parents would say 'No, that is not the concept'—

**The Hon. M.J. Atkinson:** Are you reflecting on the supporters of the Kilburn Football Club?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** I am supporting the Kilburn Football Club in its attempts not to have the school take over its site.

**The Hon. M.J. Atkinson:** But a responsible parent would not let their children near the Kilburn Football Club: that is what you are saying.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** I did not say that at all. I am saying that I do not think it is good education policy. The Attorney might have the view that no responsible parent would let their child next to the Kilburn Football Club but that is not the view of the Liberal opposition. Our view is that it is poor education policy even to be considering putting a school on the same site as a licensed venue and poker machines. The second concern I have with it is this: who

would then manage the oval? Would it be DECS or would it be the Kilburn Football Club? If members want an example of why this is a problem, I draw the house's attention to the new recreation centre being built at Heathfield High School.

The money for that project was given to the school in 2000 or 2001, and any day now the building will be finished. It has taken nearly six years for DECS to get its mind around how it can build a \$3 million recreation centre. Even then, they built it on an oval, so the community now has one less oval available to it.

**The Hon. M.J. Atkinson:** One fewer.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** One fewer, one less—take your pick. There are not as many as there were. The reality is that I do not think that Kilburn Football Club would want DECS managing its oval, I would encourage the club to oppose the government's suggestion of its taking over their ground for the purpose of a super school.

The other issue is that Kilburn Football Club claims that the government is looking at relocating it to grounds at Islington, in the railway yards. They claim that it will cost \$8 million to \$10 million to relocate them. Let us hear the government deny that cost and also deny that it is considering moving them to the Islington rail yards; and is this part of the budget the government has announced for the super schools project? The Liberal opposition supports Kilburn Football Club and the sports club community (it was originally known as 'Chicago' when it won the premiership in the 1920s) in their bid to keep open their football club and not have the school—

**The Hon. M.J. Atkinson:** Everyone supports them in that.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** Since the Attorney continually interjects, does he rule out putting a super school on the site? *Hansard* records that he does not rule it out. For the first time in 16 years, the Attorney is silent, and that gives the indication that the government is considering seriously at cabinet level putting the super school at the Kilburn site. I am sure that Ralph Clarke, who is always a strong supporter of the Attorney and who is chairing the public meeting on Sunday, will be pleased to know the Attorney's view on that point.

Another issue I want to raise relates to some guidance officers, a small number of whom have been having a running battle with the education department in relation to some back pay owed to them. This issue has been going on for a number of years, and the history is very simple. In 1991-92, restructuring occurred throughout the education department, and there was award restructuring in relation to the position of Guidance Officer 2. Applications were called for reclassification to PSO3, and these were submitted in September 1992. In September 1993, the Chair of the Department Classification Committee, Mr David George, advised that the reclassification would not be adopted, so a review was requested by the guidance officers. In a letter dated 21 September, the then commissioner for public employment, Mr Graham Foreman, stated that he proposed to establish a review panel to hear the application as a group because:

It is our understanding that at the time of lodging your application, each of you was engaged in work of a similar nature, albeit in different locations.

So, the government recognised all these guidance officers as a group. Ultimately, they were not reclassified, and an appeal was lodged. As it turned out, those who lodged the appeal won reclassification and back pay. A number of guidance officers, who were at level 2 when the original process started, have been denied back pay. They have been engaged

in this matter with the government over a number of years, but all to no avail. It seems to me that, if the government originally said that all these people would be considered as a group, as all of them were doing the same work, if it decides that some in the group deserve reclassification and therefore back pay, then everyone in the group deserves reclassification and back pay. A number of guidance officers have been denied back pay and, indeed, superannuation.

The guidance officers contend that the recommendations accepted and acted upon by the department should apply to all former guidance officers at level GO2 as at 1 October 1991, including those who have retired, as well as to the appellants. So, it has been established through the appeal process that part of this group deserved to be reclassified and receive back payments. A small number have not received their back payments. It is not big money for the government, but it is certainly big money for the individuals concerned. I submit that these people are entitled to back pay for the period from 1 October 1991 to the date of each individual separation and adjustment to each individual's superannuation payment, including back pay for the amount that each has been underpaid since becoming eligible for the superannuation. This issue is not new to the minister, and I will certainly be taking it up with her on behalf of those guidance officers concerned.

Another issue I wish to raise in relation to the education portfolio is what I think is the unfortunate cancellation of the Be Active physical activity program, which cost around \$4 million a year. A \$16 million program has been replaced by a \$1.8 million program over four years. Children are encouraged to be physically active over a 10-week period, and then the program is cut off. I do not think that the new program will do much at all for obesity or for kids' physical activity levels, or that a 10-week program will go anywhere near replacing the Let's Go—Be Active program. The physical activity teachers I have spoken to over the last year since the announcement of the cuts all indicate that the new program will fall well short of the old one.

I want to raise a few issues relating to my electorate of Davenport, and one in particular shows how out of touch the Minister for Emergency Services is. If this is what she sincerely believes, I do not think that she should hold that portfolio. The story is something like this: in January this year the authorities decided to close two railway crossings in my electorate. There are three railway crossings in my electorate where traffic can cross the main Adelaide-Melbourne railway line. The government decided to close two of them that are close together. A number of constituents contacted me to ask, 'What are they doing closing these two railway crossings to traffic for four-day periods—in the middle of January, in the middle of the fire season and in what is meant to be one our worst droughts—in a bushfire-prone area?' The electorate was concerned about evacuation. How could they evacuate the area if two of the main road corridors were closed for four days because they were doing maintenance on the railway line? I wrote to the minister saying that in my view closing those two railway crossings for four days in the middle of summer in the bushfire season was both dumb and dangerous. The minister eventually wrote back to me on 23 April. What the minister says astounds me. The letter states:

Each site [each of the crossings that were closed] could have been made available for fire truck and other vehicle access if the need had arisen. This would have involved filling in any excavation using the

available earthmoving equipment at the site. Once concrete had been poured vehicle traffic over these two sites could have occurred.

I understand the view of the Minister for Emergency Services is as follows: they closed the two railway crossings for four days in the middle of summer in the Adelaide Hills. If a bushfire had occurred, while people were trying to evacuate they would have backfilled the earthworks, poured concrete and then allowed vehicle access. That is a nonsense. Anyone who has fought an Ash Wednesday or a major bushfire through the Adelaide Hills knows that if a major fire starts at the bottom of Belair Road in Shepherd's Hill Reserve or the Brownhill Creek area and it is fanned by a north wind, there will not be more than about 15 or 20 minutes before it is well over the top and into Blackwood. Possibly thousands of people would be trying to evacuate (if that is their choice) rather than stay to fight the fire.

Does the Minister for Emergency Services seriously believe that the transport authorities would have enough time to (a) work out the fire is occurring, (b) work out it is coming their way, (c) work out that people will evacuate down the corridor on which they are working, (d) have enough nous to realise they would have to backfill whatever they are digging, (e) have the capacity to pour concrete—which is what the minister's letter states—and then (f) allow evacuation to occur—all within 20 to 30 minutes? I think that is a nonsense. The minister having read and signed this letter and sent it out as an answer, it shows that she is not fit to hold that particular portfolio. I do not believe it is possible to do what the minister says the authorities would do. I am in the process of writing another letter to her, asking her to review that total process. I think it is a flawed process which is dangerous. Another 600 homes are going into the Blackwood Park area, with only one or two exits out of the whole development. When it is finished there will be 1 200 homes in the area.

If a fire comes along the wrong way, then the capacity to evacuate the whole Mitcham Hills area is important. It is dangerous for the authorities to allow that maintenance to occur and to close two of the three main traffic corridors in the middle of summer. The minister having obtained advice from the department, and then having written a letter saying, 'Don't worry; they will simply fill in the earthworks and re-concrete it to allow traffic to go over it in the middle of a fire,' shows that she is out of touch in relation to her own portfolio area.

Regarding the railway line, I think it is time the authorities—both state and federal—looked at picking up the freight line out of the Adelaide Hills and swinging it north of the city. A number of studies have been done over the past 15 or 20 years. There are some benefits for South Australia in doing this. In particular, moving the freight line out of the Adelaide Hills and swinging it north of the city opens up the capacity to double-stack rail freight between Adelaide and Melbourne. Currently, we cannot do that, one of the reasons being the tunnel infrastructure through the Adelaide Hills. Moving the railway line north of the city opens up the capacity to double-stack the rail freight in order to make it a more efficient rail corridor and provide a competitive base against road transport.

Of course, the rail infrastructure would be upgraded throughout the Barossa Valley. This would provide the opportunity for the Melbourne Express—or the Overlander, as I call it—to swing north of the city to provide a rail service to the Barossa Valley. It could provide an overnight-stop service to the Barossa Valley, which would give the tourism

industry and tourists in South Australia another reason to stop in the Barossa Valley. Instead of going direct Adelaide-Melbourne, they could go Adelaide-Barossa Valley overnight and then onto Melbourne; or Melbourne-Barossa Valley overnight and then into Adelaide. I think that would be a good thing for the Barossa Valley and Adelaide.

In addition, if we took away the freight line from the Adelaide-Melbourne corridor through the Adelaide Hills, it leaves that rail access corridor for other purposes. We could then look at running an O-Bahn service or another public transport service in that rail corridor which might be more efficient. I suspect it would be more efficient than the current train service. We all know that, with the Belair train service, something like 20 per cent of the trains are late, so there are certainly some big efficiencies to be made there. One of the problems is that we have freight and passenger services running on the same lines. The freight line, which is a national line, quite often has delays which interrupt the passenger service.

The other problem with the freight line through the Adelaide Hills is that the passing loops limit the length of the trains. There are a number of passing loops through the Adelaide Hills. They are limited to roughly 1½ to 2 kilometres in length. That limits the length of the train you can actually drag through from Melbourne; it limits our freight capacity. By moving the freight line north of the city, you could actually get rid of those passing loops and increase the length of the train and also double stack the train, and I think that would actually provide a far more efficient freight service for South Australia in the long-term.

We all know that freight will double over the next 15 years. This is before the pulp mill in the South-East is built. When that is built, my understanding is that they intend to bring the product back through the port of Adelaide. That means, essentially, that it will go through the Adelaide Hills, and that will increase the amount of freight going through the Adelaide Hills.

**The Hon. M.J. Atkinson:** Development under Labor. Development in the regions. A government for the regions.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** The Attorney says that it is a development under Labor. What the Attorney fails to say, of course, is that not one cent of government money is going into the development. The reality is that the government is sitting there doing nothing, and private enterprise is saying that, despite the government, it will develop. As the Attorney knows—

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

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** Well, there's no money. If the minister wants to tell me—

**The Hon. R.J. McEwen:** There's money going in.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** There's no government money going into this.

**The Hon. R.J. McEwen:** Yes there is.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** Only for the rail upgrade but not for the development.

**The Hon. R.J. McEwen:** We're talking about rail.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** But not for the development. My understanding is that there is no government money going into the pulp mill, but, because of the pulp mill, the government might commit to upgrading the railway line to provide a freight service so that it can run the freight back to the port of Adelaide.

**The Hon. M.J. Atkinson:** Well, that is a good thing isn't it?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** I'm not saying—

**The Hon. M.J. Atkinson:** Oh, you're not saying; you're agnostic about it.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** No, not at all. I am not saying it's a bad thing. The Attorney says that the pulp mill is happening because of government investment. I am not saying that that is not right. I am saying that there is no money in the pulp mill. My argument is that moving the railway line north of the city will bring some big advantages to Adelaide in the long-term. The other issue that it addresses, Madam Chair—

**The Hon. M.J. Atkinson:** How much would it cost?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** About \$400 million.

**The Hon. M.J. Atkinson:** We will just add that to your promises.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** No. It is something that I think should be investigated; that is what I am saying.

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

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** I know the Attorney—

**The Hon. M.J. Atkinson:** You're cutting taxes as well, are you?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** I do pay tax, actually; not as much as I once did. The Attorney criticises me for daring to suggest that we investigate a transport issue. His government, of course, has had a lot of inquiries into things like the electrification of the train network. The government is currently investigating whether it should extend the railway line farther south from Noarlunga through, I think from memory, Christies or Aldinga—

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

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** That's right. There are investigations occurring. All I am saying is that, while you are doing some investigations, if you are looking at a 20 or 25 year window, then look at moving the railway line north of the city because I think that has some advantages. The other thing that it gets rid of—and this affects my electorate—is the shocking train noise that goes right throughout the Mitcham Hills area, which is causing residents a lot of grief. However, it is an extraordinarily complex problem to solve. The other issue that I want to touch on quickly—

**The Hon. M.J. Atkinson:** I seem to recall that from staying at my aunty's at Blackwood in the 1960s.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** Was that before or after you attended the Liberal Party fundraiser there, Michael?

**The Hon. M.J. Atkinson:** That was your dad's testimonial; of course I went to that. I was a speaker.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** We even gave you a receipt for your donation so that you could claim it off your tax.

**The Hon. M.J. Atkinson:** I did no such thing.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** I have a copy of the receipt if you want it. The other issue that I want to raise quickly relates to water. It seems that desalination is part of the answer for South Australia's water problem. As you know, the Liberal Party has announced that in government it would build a desalination plant. The government has announced that it will continue to look into it, and it has three years to come up with its own policy.

There are other issues that the government could look at in relation to water. One is the investigation into linking all the metropolitan reservoirs so that when one reservoir is low and the other is high we can pump water in and create greater storage. Better sharing of water amongst the reservoirs may actually produce some water storage benefits for South Australia. A series of pipes that allows the water to be interconnected between reservoirs so that it could be swapped from reservoir to reservoir might be something to be looked at.

**The Hon. M.J. Atkinson:** How much?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** That's why it should be investigated, Attorney, so we can establish how much. Another issue that South Australia has faced this year is the lack of storage capacity. We could look at building reservoirs, not as in damming a creek or river, but essentially for storage capacity on the eastern side of the Mount Lofty Ranges. When the Murray River is flowing in excess in the good years, we could put water into those storage facilities and keep it stored for the bad years. It would not block existing rivers—there are really no rivers of any substance to block on the eastern side of the Mount Lofty Ranges—but you could actually block steep valleys, and use those simply as storage facilities in the really good years so that we have water capacity in the really bad years.

Yesterday, I noted that the Minister for Water Security mentioned using recycled water in the Parklands. I have always had the view that, rather than pump sewerage all the way to Glenelg to treat it then pump it all the way back, one option for the government is to look at installing small treatment plants underground in the Parklands. For example, it could go down Greenhill Road where mains sewerage is run. You could have small sewerage plants—and they are readily available in the commercial market today—that go underground, that link into the main system and re-treat the sewerage water right there for use on the Parklands. Instead of having to pump it all the way to Glenelg to be treated then all the way back, which is a huge cost, it might actually be better to invest in capital to put underground sewerage treatment facilities in the Parklands where it is out of the people's eye and the water can be reused there. I think that might be a cheaper way to get around the same issue.

The last issue I will touch on is time zones. I note that the government announced yesterday that it will have a one month period of consultation on whether we should extend daylight saving. One issue I think the government should consult on is whether we should actually broaden the debate to consider whether we should move South Australia's time back by half an hour so that we have a one hour difference between South Australia and Victoria and a one hour difference between South Australia and Western Australia, then you would not have to worry so much about the daylight saving argument because the adjustment would be made on a permanent basis. So, rather than have—

**The Hon. M.J. Atkinson:** How did that go in your party room?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** It was actually Liberal Party policy—

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

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** You could broaden the argument. It was actually Liberal Party policy some years ago. I am surprised that the Attorney, given that he is a student of history, did not recognise that. I think the government could look at broadening the debate to see whether there would be some benefits for South Australia in the long term. With those few comments, I congratulate and thank the Lieutenant-Governor on the outstanding work he does on behalf of South Australians and the way he conducts himself in office.

**Ms BREUER (Giles):** Sitting here over the past couple of days and listening to the doom and gloom from the Liberal members I wondered whether I was living in the same state, because we have heard nothing but bad news from that part of the chamber. However, I have to say that life has never been as good in my part of the state, particularly in Whyalla,

as it has been in the past 12 months. Five years ago at the end of the Liberal government's term we were at an all-time low in Whyalla. We were seriously in trouble. We had people leaving, families leaving, our population had dropped; there was nothing on the horizon, we had no prospects—we were absolutely desperate.

I can now report that we are going through a boom in Whyalla. OneSteel has really taken off, and this is reflected in the community. There are numerous jobs for people; our young people are being employed. People are no longer leaving. Our retail market is absolutely booming. Recently, some 900 allotments were released, most of which I believe have gone already, and housing is selling really well in the community. Of course, this is because OneSteel is thriving, but it is also because of the spin-off from the Olympic Dam expansion, which has been incredible for my part of the state, and the other mining projects that have happened there, including the PACE program, which has been excellent for my part of the state. It offers great prospects for the future for us in rural and remote Outback South Australia.

It is not just Whyalla that is booming. Coober Pedy is on the cusp of a great boom. In the past, Coober Pedy has been reliant on tourism and opal mining. The opal mining is not real flash; however, the establishment of Prominent Hill nearby will do wonders for Coober Pedy. On my last visit there I could pick up the difference in the community—there is certainly a lot more hope. The real estate market is starting to take off, people are getting jobs and contracts at the mine, and it will be a great future for Coober Pedy through Prominent Hill.

We do not need to talk about Roxby Downs, of course, because it is booming. It is quite mind-boggling what will happen there over the next few years. There are spin-offs, of course. Andamooka, which has been a very quiet little town in the past, will get a huge spin-off from Roxby Downs. In fact, I believe there are some problems there because they are panicking about their future and how they will manage it. I will be working with them over the next few months.

However, it is not all bright prospects in my part of the state. Unfortunately, the people of Hawker have had a big blow this year from the rains that came. While the rains meant some good crops and pastoral land developing, they were badly hit by the floods. I am working with them now and with the state government to look at what sort of relief can be provided to them, particularly in relation to fencing. They lost hundreds of kilometres of fencing. You cannot insure fencing against floods, so many people are in dire straits. I hope we are able to assist them in the very near future.

Yesterday, the Premier was talking about putting a desalination plant near Whyalla. This will be wonderful for Whyalla (as we will get water from there) and Roxby Downs, and I think eventually it will be wonderful for Eyre Peninsula. It is absolutely essential because we cannot rely on the River Murray to provide our water anymore. We cannot keep taking out of the basin; desalination is the way to go.

I was interested to see comment and criticism from the Conservation Council about the desalination plant. Those criticisms and concerns are being taken into account in the environmental impact statement that is being prepared for the desalination plant. My understanding is that they are completely unfounded and that the desalination plant will have a minimal effect on the marine environment. There have been criticisms about the desalination plant from other quarters. My belief is that those criticisms are more about the expan-

sion of the Roxby Downs mine going ahead rather than about any effect a desalination plant might have on the marine environment in Spencer Gulf. We are very hopeful that it will go ahead; we believe it will and we look forward to that.

Other areas are expanding around the Spencer Gulf area—particularly the aquaculture industry at Whyalla. The aquaculture industry was certainly an answer to all our prayers on Eyre Peninsula in the way it has taken off in the past few years. We are very pleased with the expansion in Whyalla. Recently, Clean Seas (Hagen Stehr) took over our big aquaculture company, and it seems to be all go. We are very happy with what is happening. I saw his operations in Arno Bay a few weeks ago and particularly his attempts to breed tuna, and I think if anyone can do this Hagen will manage to do it, and I look forward to that happening in the very near future.

We are certainly looking to value add to the kingfish from Fitzgerald Bay, and that has now opened up markets everywhere. It is a very popular fish and incredible to eat. I hope we can value add, and get all the processing of the kingfish from Arno Bay in Spencer Gulf done there. We can process them and ship them out, which makes sense, because we are so much closer to Adelaide than is Port Lincoln.

I just arrived back from South Africa. I was very privileged last week to lead a delegation from South Australia to the Fourth World Congress of Rural Women. South Africa, through the Ministry of Agriculture and Land Affairs, hosted the Fourth World Congress at the International Convention Centre in Durban from 23 to 26 April, and I was very pleased that the Minister for Primary Industries and Resources allowed me to lead this delegation. We took a number of women from South Australia. The World Congress of Rural Women is an international gathering of rural women, and occurs at four-year intervals. This was the fourth congress, set up as a continuation of the previous three international congresses. The first was held in Melbourne, Australia, in 1994; the second was in Washington, USA, in 1998; and the third congress was held in Spain in 2002.

The first congress held in Melbourne was conceived as a forum for rural women where they could share their experiences, the most positive way of running their farms, and different farm business techniques. It was founded by a woman named Mrs Mary Scale (she was the convenor), a farm businesswoman and a member of the organising committee. This has continued; we have had our fourth congress and, certainly, hopes are that it will continue in the future. The purpose of the forum in this case was to bring rural women together before the United Nations Fourth World Congress in Beijing in 1995, and that led to Australia's hosting the first congress. The second congress held in Washington focused on practical solutions and different strategies rural women could implement when they returned to their communities; and the participants were able to exchange their own personal experiences, listen to experts from different countries and, most importantly, develop networks to enable them to handle the new challenges that face farming communities.

The congress in Spain focused on tackling and analysing issues that confront women's social and professional situations in the rural environment, and the relationships between women. Topics included farms, access to land ownership, environmental problems, fishing, gender in public policy design, and certainly exchange of experiences by women from the different continents. More than 1 500 rural women from over 80 countries attended that congress.

The common thread throughout the congress that I attended was the recommendation that investing in rural women is fundamental to alleviating poverty and the social inequalities that have crippled many countries today. The Fourth World Congress was based on the deliberations and the proposed theme of the previous congress in Spain, and it was proposed that South Africa, with its leading role on issues of gender transformation and recognition of human rights, would be considered as the next host for the fourth congress, and certainly universal and wide-ranging issues confronting rural women were discussed including, amongst others, globalisation, sustainable development (including social, economic and environmental), gender equality, food security, the impact of new technologies, and the empowerment and public policies supporting rural women. This congress was attended by about 2 500 women. It was certainly a very memorable event.

Basically, this conference was attended by African women. There were women from other countries in the world but there were thousands of African women, and it was wonderful to see. We appreciate the excitement that they felt at being with all these women and learning from other countries, learning from each other and, again, setting up networks. The delegation from Australia was extremely well received. South Australians were very recognisable. We were the ones with hats and brightly coloured scarves, and were recognised straight away as Australians. We were very popular at the conference and, indeed, on the last day we were able to sing, and 2 000 other women joined us in singing some Australian songs. Some of the voices left a bit to be desired, but it was a wonderful experience for all. I certainly appreciated being there and I know that the other women from South Australia also appreciated being there, and we will be at the next congress which will be held in India in four years' time.

Madam Deputy Speaker, when you hold a child in your arms who is dying from AIDS, who is being cared for by her grandmother along with her three siblings because her parents have died from AIDS, your life changes forever, and I had that experience two weeks ago in Africa. During my time in South Africa I was privileged and honoured to visit an incredible community in Limpopo in the north of South Africa, and I spent three days with Sister Sally Duigan of the Diocese of Tzaneen. Sister Sally is a South Australian nun who has worked in the community for many years, and I pay tribute to her today for the incredible work that she and her community are doing. She is the diocesan coordinator of programs working with people who are HIV positive or who have AIDS. The diocese is headed by Bishop Hugh Slattery, and I met him—a very charming, softly spoken and compassionate man who has been there for many years, working very hard in that area. The Tzaneen diocese is a relatively small church in the area, with about 50 000 Catholics out of a total population of more than 2.5 million people in the area.

Their involvement in the AIDS ministry is absolutely unsurpassed and it must be acknowledged and recognised. The terrible disease of HIV/AIDS was first diagnosed over 26 years ago and, since then, 65 million people have been infected by the disease and 25 million have already died. Each year adds to the number of infections and deaths. For example, in 2005, there were 4.1 million new cases and 2.8 million deaths because of AIDS-related diseases around the world. The great concentration of the HIV/AIDS pandemic is in sub-Saharan Africa, with South Africa having the highest number of people living with disease of any country

in the world. Estimates range from 5.5 million to 6.5 million people with AIDS. The number of deaths because of AIDS is about 1 000 per day and the number of new infections is nearly double that figure, with about 2 000 cases every day.

If members compare this number with South Australia—and yesterday, the Minister for Health told me that approximately 990 people have been diagnosed with AIDS in South Australia since it was first diagnosed over 26 years ago—it puts it into perspective. We have not even had 1 000 people die, but they have 10 000 die every day. Members can understand the extent of the problem in South Africa. I was particularly interested in visiting this area because, being responsible for the electorate of Giles and the number of Aboriginal communities in my electorate, I was interested to see what was happening in other areas. It is not an issue in Aboriginal communities or in our communities in South Australia, but certainly, in the future, I believe that this could be a possibility. I was interested to see how it was being handled over there. The numbers were mind-boggling.

South Africa is facing a national disaster. The Diocese of Tzaneen is certainly doing what it can to deal with this. The diocese is not about abstract things such as statistics, figures, projections or using politically correct language. They are concerned about the awful suffering, the increasing number of funerals, the widespread bereavement and especially the terrible feelings of confusion, ignorance, helplessness and hopelessness that is so prevalent in the villages throughout the diocese because of HIV/AIDS. I was able to meet with and to talk to people in those communities and experience and understand some of these issues and some of these feelings. Today, I acknowledge the wonderful work being done by the priests, the lay people and the nuns who work in that parish and with the people in that community.

It is called Kurisanani, the Diocese of Tzaneen. They cover four main areas in their HIV/AIDS response. Those areas include prevention using the Education for Life programs. They have a home-base care program, a program which deals with orphans and vulnerable children—and, of course, the number of orphans is increasing incredibly. We have 10-year olds looking after their younger siblings because their mum, dad and grandparents have died. They are now also particularly working with antiretroviral therapy, which is making some great changes in people's lives in that, although they are HIV positive, they are able to live and enjoy much better health. The real answer is the Education for Life program that they are running. This involves talking particularly to young people and educating them about AIDS and the prevention of AIDS.

Studies indicate that over 6.29 million South Africans were HIV positive at the end of 2004. Of these figures, 3.3 million women and well over 100 000 babies were HIV positive. I believe that approximately 34 per cent of all pregnant women are HIV positive. More than 85 per cent of men are likely to be infected than women. The alarming projections were that: by the year 2010, three million South Africans will have died of AIDS; 1.75 million have already died of AIDS-related diseases; and 19.3 per cent of those people infected with HIV were actually found in the Limpopo Province, which is where I was. Their focus is on changing behaviour because it is seen as the most essential strategy in overcoming the pandemic. A young woman called Jhandi Hadebe is the Education for Life coordinator. She runs a number of programs training young facilitators, conducting HIV/AIDS awareness programs in the various parishes and schools, training people for what they call the Youth Alive

Clubs and running these Youth Alive Clubs, and publicly having programs in which young people can get involved and understand.

The South African government has the ABC policy, which is abstinence, being faithful and then what is called 'condomise', which is using condoms. This program promoted by the South African government certainly is promoted through this Education for Life program. There are some issues around the use of condoms, particularly its being a Catholic parish. They concentrate more on abstinence and being faithful. I believe that in Botswana, which has the highest incidence of AIDS in Africa, condoms are rife. They are everywhere, but they are not working. They still have the highest incidence of AIDS in South Africa. I must say that, at the end of my time with this community, my feelings had changed. I went there thinking that condoms were the answer, but I truly do not believe that they are the answer now.

I think abstinence and the be faithful philosophy certainly has to be promoted to make people understand that sex causes AIDS, not witchcraft, which, apparently, many of them believe. They believe that they have been bewitched if they contract HIV. This is a very difficult problem to overcome. They also run a home-base care program. I was interested in this, having recently been involved in caring for my mother at home and understanding the issues for carers. I was very interested in their home-base care program. They train many volunteers who help friends, families and neighbours affected by the disease.

They have a 59-day training program which many of them undertake, and they are able to work and support people in their communities. As an example of the things they do: they visit homes and talk to people and, as in any community, one of the problems with being HIV positive is the stigma associated with it, and people are often very ashamed to admit they are HIV positive. Often they do not get treatment because of that; they are too ashamed to admit they are HIV positive, and certainly do not pursue the antiviral drugs that are available that can make their lives so much better. They visit homes and talk to people in their homes. They hand out food parcels, visit sick people, give out medicines, look after the children in the family and make sure they are getting the support they need. They spend a lot of their time identifying new orphans, of course, and applying for government grants for the communities, and certainly do referrals to clinics, hospitals, social workers, etc. So their home-based care is a very, very important program that is operating in that diocese.

It is interesting that the South African government seems to have some problems with the antiretroviral therapy, and believes that the side effects are worse than the disease. I am not too sure I can agree with them on this. Certainly, the people that we met who are on the antiviral drugs were living much better lives than they had previously. HIV positive patients who show their blood tests have a CD count below 200 qualify to receive these antiviral drugs. They get counselling—family members are counselled also—and the patients are put into the regimen of three antiviral drugs. I spoke to one of the doctors at the clinic. I asked him what were their chances with these drugs, and he said they can then lead a relatively normal lifestyle if the drugs are working well, until something else kills them. That was interesting, and it is certainly an improvement in health. Of course, a lot of these people also contract TB because of their low immunity. However, their lives have certainly significantly improved and it was good to see.

In relation to the antiviral therapy, there are two clinics they run in that area: one in the St Joseph community. People who go there often live in fairly remote villages, and a lot of people have to be transported to the site for their treatment because they are very weak, and there are roughly three times more female patients than male patients who go to that one. We did not visit that community but went to the Holy Family Care Centre and sat and talked to people all day and worked with people there. The Daughters of Our Lady of the Sacred Heart are responsible for the Holy Family Care Centre. It is a very rural part of the diocese of Tzaneen. Sister Lee Davison is the coordinator of that site. There is also a care centre for 48 children on that site, and a creche for about 24 children. It was opened in November 2004, and there is also a satellite clinic operating nearby. Patients live in very rural areas, of course, and again they often have to be transported to the area.

The majority who go there are females, but there has been an increase in the number of males in recent times. The ages of people attending there range from three to about 45 years. The team reports indicate that they have seen people's lives changing, with people starting to feel good about themselves, and they want to share their stories. They were very open in sharing their stories with me, and I felt very privileged to be there and listen to those stories. One in particular that broke my heart while I was there concerned the program for orphans and vulnerable children. They have an orphanage for children and there are about 80 children living there. The orphanage is run by Sister Dain Inglis, and she is assisted by a number of other sisters, workers and volunteers who come in.

Family spirit is certainly very characteristic in this Holy Family Care Centre. They keep the spirit alive, certainly. There are two groups. One group is the older children who play a major role in helping with the little children as well. It is heartbreaking to see these children there, but they do get wonderful care, and it is very much a home environment. They are able to attend school in the area. A lot of them, when they come there, have had very limited schooling, but they are able to do schooling there and they are passing their exams well and going on. The orphanage makes sure they can go on to tertiary education if needs be at a later stage.

Most of the children there are now on antiviral treatment, and that has changed their lives considerably. As you would realise, these children are orphans because of AIDS, but many of them—probably more than 70 per cent—are HIV positive themselves. For example, I saw one of the sisters carrying a child who had just got back from hospital; a tiny little child on antiviral, and they said that she was much, much better than she was. I looked at her and thought she was probably about two years old. I found out she was actually six years old. I could not believe it. But their lives are better because of the antiviral treatments that they are receiving, and the wonderful care and attention. I thought it was amazing, and I will certainly be doing what I can in the future to help out with some funding and taking an interest in what is happening there. So that is certainly to be congratulated.

I could not believe the work these people are doing there. A lot of the Australian nuns are working there, and it was wonderful to meet them. They do all sorts of things. They work in the villages; they have got the orphanage running; and they work in these other programs. They do incredible work, so far from home. They only come home every two years. I was just amazed at what happens there. In South Australia we are doing really so well. We can think we are

poor here, until we see what happens in those countries. We forget the poverty that exists in the rest of the world. My life was certainly touched and changed because of my visit there, and I felt very privileged and honoured to be allowed to visit there and to talk to them and see the work that was going on.

They are very much part of the global village. The issue of AIDS has affected us all, and will certainly continue to affect us all in the future. As I said before, I am particularly concerned, having regard to the size of the area that I cover, and I think it could be an issue for us in the future. I want to thank Sister Sally Duigan and the other nuns there for the open invitation that they gave me in allowing me to share in the privilege of visiting there, and I certainly congratulate them and send my love to them for the work that they are doing. Certainly, they are a credit, and it is an incredible job that they are doing.

Mr Speaker, I thank you for the opportunity to speak today in the Address in Reply. I think we are doing extremely well in South Australia and I am very happy in my part of the state. I will continue to make noise when I believe that we have a need there and I look forward to the next 12 months, and look forward to responding in about 12 months with some more good news from my electorate.

**The Hon. R.G. KERIN (Frome):** Like everyone else, I congratulate and thank the Governor and the Lieutenant-Governor for their contributions. This being the last time that they will be involved in an opening of parliament, I think it is important that people acknowledge the terrific job these two people have done. Marjorie Jackson-Nelson has been an amazing Governor since I had the honour of swearing her in back in 2001. She has been a great friend of many of us in this place and has always made us welcome and at ease in Government House. She is a very natural lady, very caring and very devoted to her task as Governor and to her family, which she cares for deeply, and she is much admired in the community.

She certainly is a lady who has achieved an enormous amount but who has absolutely zero ego. What she achieved in her earlier life is well chronicled, and she will go down as one of the great Governors and one of the best-loved Governors of this state. Her contribution has been above and beyond the call. It has been difficult for her healthwise quite often, but she always bounces back. While it has been difficult, it has been incredibly worthwhile for South Australia that she has done the job. It has meant a lot to many people, and we wish her all the best in the future. I know that she will love having more time to spend with her family, particularly with her grandchildren.

Turning to Bruno Krumins, Bruno is a terrific fellow who has performed his task totally respectful of the position. No task was ever too much to ask of Bruno. He and his good wife Dagmar are great South Australians, and I appreciate the job that they have done. These two fine people epitomise the contribution made to South Australia by people who immigrated from Europe, for which we should be eternally grateful. I wish Bruno and Dagmar all the best for the years ahead and say a huge thank you for their friendship at countless functions and for their contribution to the state. I would also like to add a thank you to the Queen for her kind message to the parliament as read at the opening. In 2002, in rather unique circumstances, I was fortunate to host Her Majesty's visit to South Australia, and over a couple of days I received a rare insight into how this wonderful lady has, for



50-plus years, held one of the world's most important positions.

I found her very intelligent and considerate, and had the honour of her company for several hours and on several occasions. She was fascinating to speak to, and I will always remember our conversations. Her contribution to the British Commonwealth and Australia has been amazing. It has been her life, and she has meant so much to hundreds of millions of people of several generations. One memory that I will always keep from that visit was that she did a walk by the corner of King William Street and North Terrace, where people were behind barricades. As she stopped and spoke and shook hands with many, the look in the eyes of those people summed up to me just how many people absolutely love the lady and how much she is admired.

I was very surprised at how down to earth, witty and engaging she is. She is an amazing person and, again, I thank her for her words of congratulations and encouragement to the parliament. The opening speech gave an interesting account of the parliamentary history of South Australia. Unfortunately, beyond the historical component, the speech did not fill one with confidence that we are about to see a reversal of the most obvious trend that we have seen under this government. That trend is that South Australia is sadly missing out on the national prosperity that the Australian economy has been experiencing, particularly over the last five years. One of the great achievements of Liberal governments from 1993 to 2002 was to make the South Australian economy relevant in Australia. South Australia had suffered badly through the Bannon years and the State Bank debacle.

Between 1993 and 2002, we lifted exports from South Australia from \$3.8 million to \$9.1 million, which really led the economic revival of South Australia. Exports are a key to economic growth in this state. The Labor government recognised this in its rhetoric-ridden Strategic Plan. How often did we hear that there was a goal of tripling exports, and all the drive that went with that pledge. Sadly, absolutely nothing was done to make it happen. I will not go through the debacles of the last five years with exports, because that would be rather depressing for us all. The food industry was our rising star and a big part of our growth in the Liberal years, and that is typical of the disappointment that we have seen over the last five years in the export field.

If there is one figure that every member of this house should take real notice of, that is a figure that removes the two classic excuses of drought and the strength of the Australian dollar, which are used as excuses when export performance it is not what it perhaps should be. That figure is how we compare with the rest of the country. All the other states have to deal with the strength of the Australian dollar and, indeed, the other states have had worse droughts in recent years than South Australia has. But since March 2002, South Australia's share of Australia's exports has fallen from 7.42 per cent to 5.43 per cent.

As someone who has followed the export figures closely, I can assure the house that this is both a disaster and a disgrace. It basically means that South Australia is 26 per cent less relevant to the export-reliant Australian economy than it was five years ago. That is a drop of 26 per cent in relevance over five years. I think that something dramatic must be done to rescue the situation, because we are really becoming less and less relevant to what goes on in the Australian economy. I repeat those figures: we were responsible for 7.42 per cent of Australia's exports, but we are now down to 5.43 per cent. It is a huge drop. As to the 25 per cent

drop, that failure is reflected in South Australia's share of jobs compared with the rest of Australia, as well as in a wide range of other indicators, including retail sales and average income. I do not think that this should be ignored. What we have seen is that, when exports were going up, South Australia started to do very well. Certainly, since exports have fallen, when compared with the rest of Australia, all the other indicators, which were good, have also dipped. It just shows the absolute importance of exports to this state.

In recent times, we have heard much from the government about how mining exports will save the day. One thing it does not realise or understand is that there are exports and exports. There is a huge difference between exporting raw material and value adding to that material, and I do not think that this government will go far in relation to value adding to the enormous amount of uranium that could be dug up in this state. This is one of the reasons why our figures have gone up so much. In the 1990s, we saw a lot of value adding starting to occur. People think of value adding as something that happens in factories or as a sophisticated transformation of product. What we saw in the nineties was that for years South Australia had been exporting enormous amounts of feed barley, for example. It was a deliberate strategy. At that time, we saw a huge growth in the pork industry, and you were a lot better off sending containers of pork overseas for good money, rather than sending raw barley in bulk shipments. However, the government does not understand that.

We also see it in the food industry. We have heard the government talk about the Food Plan. The problem is that we set ambitious totals in the late nineties. In 2002, we were \$1 billion ahead of our target in the Food Plan; we are now \$1½ billion behind. There are a lot of very disappointed people out there. I know many of the state's exporters and walked the markets of Asia with them for five or six years. We took a lot of people there and worked out who was really serious about exporting and who could do it. Many of those people, who are still good friends of mine, are frustrated and angry that what was built during that period has been allowed to fall away, and with that there has been the big drop in exports and the flow-on effects to employment, income and the general good of the South Australian economy.

As the leader has said, this government loves to claim credit for the hard work and initiative of others. Members on this side have covered this issue at some length, so I will not bother to go through the many pages of examples of this government's attaching itself to things. However, I want to point out one example of how history in South Australia is currently being rewritten that occurred just last week. In a radio interview on Monday night with Matthew Pantelis, the Premier was asked how he would ensure that jobs created if the Roxby expansion went ahead would be filled by a good percentage of South Australians. The answer shows just how this government operates. In reply to the question, the Premier said:

... you will remember that when the Adelaide to Darwin railway, the Alice Springs to Darwin segment of that was being built, we said, as a government, that we were prepared to work to get the maximum number of jobs for South Australians. . . I think about 80 per cent of the contracts were let to South Australian companies. . .

Excuse me; I thought that Labor came into power in March-April in 2002 in somewhat dubious circumstances. Here is the Premier claiming that his government ensured that the contracts were let to South Australian companies. In relation to the railway, contractual close was in October 2000, and financial close was in April 2001. The first sod was turned in

July 2001. The first sleeper was produced in November 2001. The first rail arrived there in November 2001 and, as premier, I went to Whyalla to flag off that train. During that same trip, I visited EDI in Port Augusta, where the locomotives and the wagons had already been built. Track laying commenced at the same time as the change of government occurred. I repeat the Premier's answer in that interview:

... you will remember that when the Adelaide to Darwin railway, the Alice Springs to Darwin segment of that was being built, we said, as a government, that we were prepared to work to get the maximum number of jobs for South Australians. . . I think about 80 per cent of contracts were let to South Australian companies. . .

This just shows how history has been rewritten. There is absolutely no way in the world that the Rann government was in power when all those contracts were let. In fact, every contract had been let, every bridge had been built and the track was starting to be laid, yet last week this government claimed, as it has in the past, the full credit for the Alice Springs-Darwin railway and the fact that 80 per cent of the job flow-on came to South Australia.

We hear much about the mining boom, and we all want to see a mining boom in South Australia. Some have been advocating it longer than others, and the Labor Party has been a late convert. Much of what we hear about the mining boom, and the credit being claimed by this government, is again a rewrite of history. On Tuesday we heard the Premier talking about the PACE program. The PACE program is merely a rebranding of a budget cut to a previous Liberal program. I was minister for mines for several years, and back in those days we were flying all over the state to get all the data so that mining companies would have to find only the needles. We went out and found the haystack, so to speak, and gave the data internationally to any companies that were willing to come to South Australia to spend their money; and we now see that coming into effect. That did not happen overnight and it was not created during the Labor years, and their talking about it is a total rewrite.

We have to keep it in context. Compared with Western Australia we are a minnow. Compared with Western Australia our mining industry is incredibly small at present, and a lot of the figures which are quoted are well and truly inflated by the fact that the Roxby expansion is the big dollar figure at present. If there is to be a mining boom, we will have an infrastructure challenge in South Australia. If we have a mining boom, this government has done nothing to prepare itself. What will we do about infrastructure? We keep hearing the Premier and others make all sorts of claims about Roxby Downs. One thing about Roxby—which is probably worth pointing out—is that a decision has not yet been made about its expansion. We all need to take that into account and we all need to work hard to ensure it can go ahead. Despite things that have been said about a desalination plant and other things, BHP Billiton has not yet committed to that expansion. People need to remember that and factor it in because we need to work hard to ensure it does go ahead—and not go around claiming credit for everything to do with it.

The government needs to look ahead to the town of Roxby Downs itself. I have visited Roxby Downs several times in the past few years. We face some real challenges up there. The school is absolutely bursting at the seams. The special school part of the Roxby Downs Area School has about 15 children of all ages stuck in one classroom. There is no secure outdoor area for them. The school is bursting at the seams and there has been no planning ahead to cater for new arrivals. A similar situation exists with health and police

resources in that place. If one looks at the history of mining towns and mining booms over the years, unless the infrastructure is ready in Roxby Downs then they will not attract families to work there. They will not attract the sorts of people presently at Roxby Downs. Roxby Downs is a terrific town with an enormous number of young families—many of them from around the Mid North and Eyre Peninsula—but we need to have the facilities in Roxby Downs so that the next tranche of workers and people willing to go there are young families; otherwise, we will see the nature of Roxby Downs change forever and it will not be the place that it is currently. That is a challenge of which the government needs to be aware and about which it needs to do something.

Uranium has dominated the airwaves in the past couple of weeks. The transformation within Labor over the past six to 12 months has been amazing—and I welcome that. I think it is Labor catching up on 20 years of listening to the wrong people. Uranium is an enormous opportunity for South Australia. I well remember a lot of pressure from the Labor opposition in the years we battled to get the Beverley uranium mine up. Once we got it up the Labor Party used to exaggerate greatly any leaks of water, or whatever, as being some toxic nightmare. We worked very hard as a government to get the Beverley uranium mine up. Environmentally, Beverley uranium mine is a credit to Heathgate Resources. I would encourage members to go to Beverley to look at the uranium mine. The in situ leaching method is a terrific environmental bonus. Once they have been to one part of the minefield, they pump it out and shift on, and one would not know they have been there. There is no open cut at all. It is a terrific mine. As I said, it went ahead against opposition from the other side of the house.

In relation to a couple of other issues, I put on the record my absolute opposition to the trams. The trams are an absolute fiasco. Trams are somewhat outdated. A rubber tyre was invented a bit over 100 years ago and, once the rubber tyre was invented, there was no need to have rails on which to run hard-wheeled vehicles. There is a range of issues in relation to the trams. The government bought the wrong trams. They cannot be matched up, so that will create enormous traffic difficulties on the north-south corridor. Because of the bad purchase of trams, there will be increasing blockages at each of the level crossings on South Road, Marion Road and Morphett Road—because more trams will have to be run. When the trams could be coupled together, the road did not have to close as often. For instance, cars will travel over an overpass over Cross Road along South Road heading for a tunnel under Anzac Highway, but in the middle of that is a tram crossing that will close for a minute every four minutes. It makes absolutely no sense.

In relation to the extension along North Terrace, we hear that it is the wrong priority and \$31 million could be better used elsewhere; and I agree with that. My greatest opposition to the tram extension is the traffic chaos that will be caused. It will mean that, during peak hour, about 30 per cent less traffic will get through the major intersection of North Terrace and King William Street. We will see a flow over to virtually every other north-south and east-west street through the city. I would not be surprised if within four or five years we see the tramline either paved over or pulled up. We will face massive problems in getting traffic through the city in the future. It may well come right; let us wait and see.

Much has been said about the water crisis and there has been a lot of finger-pointing, and whatever. I am on the record as saying that restrictions have been badly mishandled.

The Attorney was a great one for dobbing in, which backfired on one of his colleagues, but we will leave that one alone. Restrictions are in place to reduce the amount of water that is being used. The huge failure of water restrictions, which was caused by a silly announcement five weeks from bringing in tougher restrictions, was that we had a waterfest in December. I ask every government member to go to the SA Water website, because, despite what the minister is saying, we have actually used more water this water year than we used last water year. That is absolute proof of—

**The Hon. M.J. Atkinson:** What part of ‘drought’ do you not understand?

**The Hon. R.G. KERIN:** That drought is out on the land. People do not flush their toilet more often because there is a drought. The Attorney might, but—

*Mr Venning interjecting:*

**The Hon. R.G. KERIN:** That is true. The restrictions have been a huge failure. I really want to foreshadow the challenge that we all face with the Riverland. In the Riverland there are nil allocations for July, and, unless something of biblical proportions happens—the irrigators will have restrictions—it will become a matter of whether they will get any water at all. We need to be conscious of the absolute devastation that we could see in the Riverland this year. The irrigation industry is vital to those towns. The Riverland is really reliant on two industries: one is irrigation, the horticulture industry; and the other is tourism. With the current situation that we face with the Murray River, I think that those towns are under huge risk.

If there is zero allocation for the irrigators, or even if there is less than, say, 50 per cent allocation, they face not taking on casual employment. Casual employment is enormous in the Riverland. If the jobs are not there, people will move elsewhere. The mining boom will probably take some of those people. For the towns of Renmark, Berri, Barmera and Loxton at the top end, in particular, and Waikerie—there is also a problem further down—I can see those towns going through a really tough time over the next few years. If you are a potato grower it is a little bit like drought on the land—you just miss out for that one year. The problem we face in the Riverland for people with vines, citrus and almonds, is that, if they cannot water in this next irrigation season, it will take years for them to recover. Some of the trees and whatever will die, but the others will lose productivity for a long time. It will take several years to come back. If they have to replant, they take years to come online.

We face a huge challenge in the Riverland, and a lot of that is no-one’s fault. A drought is a drought, and this is the grandmother of them all as far as the Riverland goes. There is a challenge there for all of us, the government in particular, as to how we handle the situation in the Riverland. I think it will perhaps be devastating for those communities. We all hope and pray that the skies open up and that it does not work out that way, but I think that that will be one of the real big challenges for the state over the next 12 months, in terms of how we handle that situation. With that, I again congratulate Marjorie Jackson-Nelson on her role and also Bruno Krumins, who has been a terrific deputy to her.

**Mr KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens):** I always like to follow the former premier of South Australia, the Hon. Rob Kerin, member for Frome, for whom I have a great deal of respect and affection. Recently, the Prime Minister asked us to pray for our farmers and for rain. I believe in the power of prayer; I always have, and I take it seriously. I think that the

Prime Minister is right to lead the nation in prayer. When the nation prays collectively for its brethren in the country and in other parts of our country who are suffering because of the drought, all of us should take that seriously. Even those who do not share the same Christian values or the same religious beliefs can understand that the Prime Minister is asking us to contemplate what those people are going through, and to do it respectfully.

Mr Speaker, this morning when you commenced proceedings by saying prayers, you prayed that this parliament should collectively work for the betterment of the people of South Australia, I saw something in this chamber that upset me, which I thought was disrespectful and unnecessary. The member for Unley stood with his hands in his pockets during prayer. When it was pointed out to him that what he was doing was disrespectful, he yelled out, ‘You don’t believe that rubbish’, or words to that effect, across the chamber. I have no problem with the member for Unley being an atheist—none at all. I have no problem with the member for Unley having certain views on same-sex relationships, euthanasia, and certain other topics like that. But I do have a problem with mocking others who do not share the same beliefs as his.

I think that it is completely inappropriate for the member for Unley to come in here and mock us when we are praying about working for the people of South Australia. I think that the member for Unley owes an apology to every Christian in this parliament and every other member in this parliament who takes that prayer not literally but at least seriously, and respects what we are trying to do here for the people of South Australia. For someone who calls himself a Liberal, and sits alongside good people, such as the former premier, and the honourable whip, I think the member for Unley has a lot to learn about sitting in this chamber and the people he represents. Perhaps the member for Unley can also consider all the Christians he represents in his electorate, and how he treated them with disdain today.

He is their voice in this parliament, their representative, and he needs to show some more respect for this institution. He is the one who nominated in the internal preselection and who threw someone else out of this chamber. He hounded him out of his seat through stacking. He wanted to come here so badly, but now that he is here, he disrespects the institution and its procedures, and I find that completely unacceptable. Be it not for me to comment on the internal Liberal Party matters; however—

**The Hon. M.J. Atkinson:** You’ll make an exception today.

**Mr KOUTSANTONIS:** —today I will make an exception. It should not be for me to comment on loyalty, treachery and dirty dealing in the middle of the night. I was privileged to share Good Friday with the Hon. Iain Evans, who was then leader of the opposition, at my local parish of St George. The then leader of the opposition attended with me at 6.30 p.m. and he stayed until 1 a.m.

**The Hon. M.J. Atkinson:** He obviously doesn’t know the Orthodox liturgy.

**Mr KOUTSANTONIS:** Yes. There were about 5 000 people at church. Some were standing outside. We had a procession around the neighbourhood. It was good to see the then leader of the opposition in Thebarton and we were glad to have him there. It showed real commitment from a leader who was out to rebuild his base. But while he was out working for the Liberal Party, paying tribute to immigrants

who have come to this great country of ours with a different religion—

**The Hon. M.J. Atkinson:** And offering his sacrifice to God.

**Mr KOUTSANTONIS:**—and offering his sacrifice to God, what were his colleagues doing, those busy little mice? My mother has always said to me that idle hands are the work of the devil. What were they doing, Mr Speaker? Let me tell you that they were busy little bees, indeed. The loyal deputy, whom I now call Tammy Wynette because she stands by her man, was very busy. It is important to remember that the member for Bragg will stand up to anything but pressure. When I first came to the parliament, the Labor Party had just enjoyed a 10 per cent swing to it in an election only four years after having received a 12 per cent swing against it. We had rebuilt after a devastating loss. How did we rebuild? We had a smooth transition from Lynn Arnold and Frank Blevins to Mike Rann and Ralph Clarke.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr KOUTSANTONIS:** Here is a lesson for you: if you are going to knock off anyone on the leadership team, it is not the leader you knock off, it is the deputy. It is always the deputy in opposition who goes: it is never the leader. So, we had a smooth transition. We gave the leadership to the Hon. Mike Rann, who is now the Premier. That leader then said, 'We are not going to be constantly standing behind you checking every poll. We are giving you a clear run.' That tactic worked because you had Dean Brown, who won the largest landslide in Australian political history—37 seats out of 47, in fact. It was an amazing political result.

I remember that night well because I remember Frank Blevins coming on television to be asked by a reporter, 'Mr Deputy Premier, this is a terrible result. You have only won 10 seats.' I remember Frank saying, 'What are you talking about? This is a great result. We won 10 seats. We should not have won any.' Then he made a prediction. He said, 'If you think that this lot are going to let Dean Brown govern for four years, you are kidding yourself.' Who was waiting to comment next? It was one John Wayne Olsen, and you could see the smile on his face. He knew what was going to happen; they all knew it was going to happen. So, my point is that, after the last state election, the Liberal Party was well and truly trounced, and these things happen.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mr KOUTSANTONIS:** That's right. You were ousted by 10 to one because you cannot raise money, because business has abandoned you. Why has business abandoned you? Because you have no policies that suit business. Now let's move on. I found it fascinating to see those who supported the new leader. Let me read out some of them: the members for Bragg, Flinders, Waite, Goyder, Unley and Finnis; and the upper house members the Hons Michelle Lensink, Robert Lawson—

**The Hon. M.J. Atkinson:** She called you a grub the other day.

**Mr KOUTSANTONIS:** Yes. The Hon. Mr Wade also supported the new leader. There are three names here I will read out that shocked me, because when you associate treachery, backstabbing and abandonment, and turning your back on those you have stood with for the past 25 years, I will tell you which name does not come to mind: Ivan Venning, the one name that I never associated with treachery. He is a man who I consider a close personal friend, who I think is a man of honesty and decency and who, I have to say, let me down. I was running a book on who would vote for MHS and

I could not believe these names: Pederick, Venning, Dawkins. Those three names are the important ones—the rest are just hacks. We know how people like Pisoni, Pengilly and Lensink are voting. The important ones are Pederick, Venning and Dawkins—champions of the right. These are people who have not only stood with the right: their families have stood with the right. It is tradition. It is in their blood, their DNA, their chromosomes—

**An honourable member:** They're bred for it.

**Mr KOUTSANTONIS:** They are bred for it. I remember a saying that former president Reagan used to have, which was, 'You dance with the one that brung ya.' Can I just say that the one who brung Ivan Venning is the former leader of the opposition, John Olsen. That group has been with Ivan Venning the entire time and, for him to walk away from them, I find it surprising.

**The Hon. M.J. Atkinson:** Then Olsen gave his seat to Goldie, but Goldie stuck.

**Mr KOUTSANTONIS:** Goldie stuck. Goldie is a sticker, and he has been rewarded. He has been rewarded without loyalty. They have stripped him of his portfolio and given him the stenographer title. He sits in shadow cabinet like the Hansard people who sit and take the notes. That is Goldie now. He sits there and says, 'What was that, Vickie? Say that again, Vickie; I couldn't hear you.' He is taking the notes of what is going on in shadow cabinet. And what is it like being in shadow cabinet during these conversations? Can you imagine the conversations in shadow cabinet now? 'G'day, Vickie, how are you?' 'I'm well, Goldie, how are you doing?' 'Great.' 'How's the family?' 'Excellent.' They are close!

But my message today to those three rats, Venning, Pederick and Dawkins, who betrayed everything they have ever believed, is this: the real winners are the people pulling the strings behind the scenes (Pyne, Moriarty, Martin Hamilton-Smith and, of course, the leader of that unholy trinity, Vickie Chapman). Ivan Venning has handed control of the Liberal Party to the daughter of Ted, and he knows it. The Chapmans are back! They are running the Liberal Party again. They are back, and this time they are serious.

**The Hon. M.J. Atkinson:** Who is going to get that senate vacancy?

**Mr KOUTSANTONIS:** Yes, I wonder who is going to get the senate vacancy. We just saw another model pick one up today; we saw Simon Birmingham get today's Senate vacancy. Who is going to be the next one? Is it going to be a dry? I bet you it is not. That is not part of the family. So, what has really happened here? You need a bit of history to understand how this began. There is a structure in the Liberal Party whereby members have branches. In one of those branches sits a very little-mentioned president, and his name is Mr Moriarty. Mr Moriarty is in a branch, and guess who runs that branch—Martin Hamilton-Smith. That is how it started. We were hearing stories in the paper about how Marty is a members' favourite, a favourite of the sub-branch members. Who is spreading these rumours? Slowly the clues start. There is a phone call, 'We can do it in March.'

**An honourable member:** The ides of March!

**Mr KOUTSANTONIS:** The ides of March! They are making phone calls, and branch members are talking. Meanwhile, Ivan is away on the farm thinking everything is okay, the Right is in the ascendancy. It is okay because John Howard is in the Lodge, Iain is running the party here, and the right is doing well. Everything is going well. But the phone calls are starting. Then Ivan's favourite politician, Chris Pyne, and his staffer (whose name I will not mention,

but he is on the state executive and Ivan can work it out) emerge. Did members notice the leaks coming to the paper—all the leaks? So, what Ivan, Pederick and Dawkins have done is reward leaking, treachery, deceit, back-stabbing and disunity and said, 'You do these five things and we'll make you leader.' He does not say, 'No, no more, stop it! What about winning the election? The reason we are going down in the polls is because our president is attacking our leader.' Do you know who should have gone? The president. Let me tell you something, Mr Speaker, if members opposite want to know this.

If someone within our party attacked our Premier, such as the president of our party, they would be gone in a second—sacked! The Premier does not go; the leader does not go—the party official goes. That is how it works. In the Liberal Party it is the other way around. So, Mr Speaker, what they have done is reward disunity, leaking, conniving, Machiavellian politics, and it is all done out of the member for Sturt's office, and Ivan Venning was right there next to Chris Pyne sinking the knife in. That is what has happened.

Of course, there is one casualty out of this war for whom I have shed many tears, and that is the Hon. Robert Ivan Lucas. I have to say this: what a pathetic end to a mediocre campaign, and what a pathetic end to a mediocre career. It is not for me to give him counsel but, if I had been humiliated so badly, I would not commit ritual suicide in the real sense but perhaps in the political sense. Perhaps it is time he paid honour to the gods, got on his knees, drank the sake, got the paper out and got a close personal friend to plunge the sword in, and quit. But, of course, he won't. And why won't he? Because they are waiting. Revenge! Let loose the dogs of war. Cry havoc, and let loose the dogs of war. I do not know Nick Minchin; I have met him only once. I do not know the conservatives in the Liberal Party very well.

**The Hon. M.J. Atkinson:** You don't know Alexander Downer very well? You haven't been invited up there by Nicky?

**Mr KOUTSANTONIS:** No, but I tell you this: I reckon they are pretty good operators in the Liberal Party. I think they are a little clever. I reckon they can see what is going on with this guy in Sturt pulling the strings and putting his bloke in the leadership position in South Australia, and I do not reckon it is going to last.

I do not reckon a political party can survive when it awards disunity and disloyalty. What it says then is that that type of behaviour is okay. Let me tell you this, member for Schubert, the first leadership challenge is always the hardest, but once you have done it—now that you have bloodied the water (and they have all done it now)—it is easy. It is not that hard; it is a lot easier now. They have done it once; they can do it again. The Liberal Party has a process whereby I think that they need six people to sign. I am not sure. Is it six signatures you need for a leadership challenge and 24 hours' notice in the middle of the night? How is it done? You have to wait for a public holiday and a funeral, do it in the middle of the night, and then turn your phones off. That is the plan.

It is like all good coups. The first things you do is shut down the telephones—shut down the telephones in the city; all right. You get the army out and you get the leadership team on a plane out of the city. It is a pushover. It is a good old fashion coup. Iain is in Canberra paying his respects to a fallen comrade—

**Mr Rau:** Meanwhile in the beer-hall.

**Mr KOUTSANTONIS:** Meanwhile in the beer-hall, all the Brownshirts were around. Of course, I have to say, looking at this list, this is who—

**Mr VENNING:** Mr Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I have sat here and listened to the honourable member all in good fun, but the member for West Torrens has 11 minutes left. This is the Address in Reply. I believe that there should be something in his speech to relate to the Address in Reply, rather than continue with this tirade.

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

**Mr KOUTSANTONIS:** Thank you, Mr Speaker; and member for Schubert, thank you for that break; I needed that. The honourable member has made me lose my place now. I was going to go through that list again. These are the loyal soldiers. These are the ones whom you can take to the bank. These are the people who have honour and no blood on them. Of course, the former leader himself, the former premier and a man of courage. The father of the house—he is no idiot, he is no fool, he knew what was going on; he supported Iain Evans. Isobel Redmond, now there is a girl to watch. She is someone to watch. The member for Bragg knows this. She knows two things about the member for Heysen: first, the member for Heysen is smarter than her; and, secondly, she is better liked—a dangerous combination.

**An honourable member:** And loyal!

**Mr KOUTSANTONIS:** And she's loyal. Mitch Williams, he stuck. I thought he had ratted—

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr KOUTSANTONIS:** No, he stuck.

**The Hon. K.O. Foley:** Did he?

**Mr KOUTSANTONIS:** Yes. David Ridgway, a man of honour and decency; Terry Stephens and Lucas out of pure self-interest. Trust me, Lucas would have voted either way, if it had suited him. It was out of pure self-interest. I will not include him in the gang of the honourable, but just pure self-interest. Of course, Caroline Schaefer, who knows that she is too old to rat. These are the band of brothers—the treacherous ones. Leading the charge, Vickie Chapman, of course. Then, surprisingly, Liz Penfold—she ratted. Of course, Marty himself—Captain Courageous! Future leader of the Liberal Party, Stephen Griffiths—he ratted. He is off to a bad start; he has gone off with the odds. Pengilly does whatever Vickie tells him, so, you know, it is either way.

Then, of course, it is Ivan, Pederick and Dawkins. Pisoni—this guy ratted just for the sake of being mean. He did not rat because he wanted a leadership change, he just voted for who it would hurt the most. That is why he voted against Iain. He just liked hurting someone. Then, of course, there are the great talents in the upper house—Lensink, Lawson and Wade. Members will be hearing from them. South Australia deserves a decent opposition. It deserves an opposition that will put the fight to the government. I can say the following about the Hon. Iain Evans. I have spoken to the many ministerial advisers who have had to brief members opposite regularly on bills, and the one person whom they were always worried about briefing was him, because he was the guy who would ask the questions about which they had not thought.

He is the guy who knows standing orders. He is the guy who knows directional strategy. But instead, they put a bloke in charge who thinks that he can do it all himself. Thank you very much, that is fine by me. I am quite happy about it. I have no real problems with the Liberal Party self-destructing—

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mr KOUTSANTONIS:** Vickie is a chess player; she is thinking four or five moves ahead. I think we will be getting more from that. Finally, can I say that I have recently returned from our national conference in Sydney at which the leader of the Labor Party and Mike Rann have changed the party's policy on uranium. To put it in perspective, Gough Whitlam was given life membership, along with his wife, Margaret. In talking about his time as leader, he mentioned three people who played a pivotal role, including Mick Young and Don Dunstan. South Australia was on a national stage in the 1970s and we are again. We are now finally punching above our weight again. The leader of the South Australian parliament, Premier Mike Rann, is now a national leader. He leads the way on water and uranium exploration. He is leading the way for a federal Labor government, and they do not like it one bit.

If you go to New South Wales and say, 'Vickie Chapman', they say, 'Who?' If you go to New South Wales and say 'Martin Hamilton-Smith', they say, 'Who?' Mike Rann is a national leader and, once again, he is treading the national stage. South Australia is yet again setting the national agenda. We have changed a 25 year old policy; we have made the Prime Minister compromise on his River Murray plan. We are now setting the agenda on climate change. We are leading the way on alternative uses of energy. This state is now punching above its weight again, while Liberal Party members fight amongst themselves. I wish it would not. I am here to help. If they need any advice, please come to see me. I am happy to help them straighten things out, especially Vickie. I would like to learn from her. She can give me a few hints on how to lie to someone's face and tell them, 'I'm right behind you for the duration, for the four years', and then turn around and stab them in the back. That is impressive stuff.

I really wonder how you do that. How does that conversation go? What do you say to them? 'G'day, Iain, it's Vickie here. By the way, you know what I told you 13 months ago—sorry.' How do you do that? Did you ever ring? No answer? Okay. Anyway, I will find out eventually because I am sure they will all be talking; they are talking already anyway. And can I just say to the member for Kavel: there are some great shorthand courses at TAFE, and I am sure that *Hansard* can direct you to some great places where you can learn that stenography course.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mr KOUTSANTONIS:** But I reckon he will be back—my gut feeling is that he will be back. I wish to congratulate the Lieutenant-Governor on an excellent address on our sesquicentenary. I think the parliament is set to do great things in the next session, and I look forward to participating in those debates, and I look forward to what is going to happen opposite over the next three years.

#### MATTER OF PRIVILEGE

**Ms CHAPMAN (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** I rise on a matter of privilege. On 3 April 2007, SA Housing Trust tenant, Mr Ray Lovell, contacted my office seeking information regarding the government's proposed sale of 8 000 properties. Both Mr Lovell and his wife are pensioners who had been in the same Housing Trust property for 20 years. He claimed they were afraid of being left homeless if their Housing Trust property is one of the properties to be sold off, as they could not afford to purchase the property, nor could they afford the private rent. Mr Speaker, for reasons that will shortly become clear, it is important to note that

Mr Lovell, prior to contacting my office, claims that he had already tried to contact the minister for information on three occasions, but to no avail.

On 16 April 2002, the federal member for Kingston and I met with Mr Lovell and his wife in their home to hear their concerns. On the same day after this meeting on 16 April 2007, I wrote to the Minister for Housing seeking an assurance that the elderly couple, who had been in their Housing Trust home for some 20 years, would not be forced to move from their home if it was one of the properties earmarked for sale. On 20 April 2007, at 11 a.m., the minister's office contacted my office and asked for the name and address of the tenants I had referred to in my letter. One of my staff—my policy adviser—immediately contacted Mr Lovell to ask his permission to pass on these details to the minister's office, and he agreed. At 11.15 a.m. my policy adviser then contacted the minister's office to pass on his details, adding that sometimes concerned residents wanted to remain anonymous due to fears of retribution.

At 1.15 p.m.—two hours later—Mr Ray Lovell received a phone call from a woman called Sue who said she was the Housing Trust's housing manager at Noarlunga. Mr Lovell claims, first, that he was told by Sue that she had been receiving phone calls from people telling her that he was telling people that their homes were under threat of being sold and that he was scaring people. Secondly, he claims he was told in a threatening tone that he should not go complaining to MPs or radio stations as they know nothing about the situation and that the housing department does. Thirdly, he claims he was so shocked to have received such a threatening phone call that he kept a record of the conversation. The record of conversations was typed and has been signed by Mr Lovell.

Mr Lovell further stated on 26 April 2007, in a media release:

I have no intention of shutting my mouth. I have been trying to arrange an appointment with minister Weatherill to check that we would not be forced out of our home for some time, but to no avail.

I further quote:

If I need to talk to an MP, I will. I know of many elderly couples who are seeking similar answers but are too scared to sign any petition. I am not afraid of minister Weatherill.

Mr Speaker, I believe, with or without instruction or authority from the minister or a member of his staff, a Housing SA officer contacted Mr Lovell in order to interfere with his privilege, protected by this parliament, to take a concern to a member of parliament. I believe telling constituents not to approach other members of parliament for information or assistance is a clear breach of privilege.

In view of the above, I ask that you rule that there is a prima facie case of breach of privilege. I believe that the truth of this matter can only be determined by the establishment of a privileges committee. It will be vitally important that Mr Lovell is interviewed in relation to the incident by you, and by a privileges committee. I also believe that the Minister for Housing, his personal staff and Sue—the Housing SA officer who contacted Mr Lovell—be interviewed. I also ask that my policy adviser, who initially gave the minister's office the contact details of the complainant, be interviewed and, Mr Speaker, I make available for your perusal and examination: a copy of my letter to the minister dated 16 April 2007; a signed record of the telephone conversations on 20 April 2007; a copy of a radio transcript of 26 April 2007; and a written media statement of 26 April 2007.

**The SPEAKER:** I will give consideration to the documents that the deputy leader has provided, and I will come back as soon as possible with a report to the house.

#### ADDRESS IN REPLY

Debate on motion for adoption resumed.  
(Continued from page 134.)

**Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop):** I, like all of my colleagues who have participated, am pleased to join the Address in Reply debate and, like many have said earlier, I congratulate the Governor and Lieutenant-Governor on the way they carry out their duties here in South Australia. In doing so, might I say that I am not necessarily a monarchist but the system we do have, I believe, works very well and comes at a relatively low cost to the taxpayer. It is unfortunate that some members take the opportunity in the Address in Reply to participate in the manner we have just heard from the attack puppy from the western suburbs. He comes in here, as is his wont, because there is not much else his party has for him to do.

He has been sitting in that same seat for a long time now and has not moved very far up the ladder, yet he has the temerity to have a go at everyone else in this place and offer advice to them. I suggest that the attack puppy from the western suburbs would be well advised to go home to his own place, do a little bit of navel gazing and wonder where his political future lies. In my experience, having been in here with him for almost the last 10 years, he has not gone very far and in reality has not learnt a hell of a lot, because I think he has made the same speech about 50 times now. He just changes the odd name every now and again but, by and large, it is the same speech.

I am sure that, when the Governor gets to the bit where the member for West Torrens takes his turn, she quickly turns the page and moves on to the next contribution. I presume that the member for West Torrens still lives in the western suburbs. As was pointed out the other day, most of his colleagues—

**Mr Venning:** He thinks he's Ralph Clarke, but he is not.

**Mr WILLIAMS:** He does think he is Ralph Clarke. He thinks that he is amusing. As I have conceded before, the member for Elder can be amusing at times, although he is nowhere near as amusing these days as he used to be. When he was in opposition he was quite amusing, and I acknowledged that at the time, but these days he is nowhere near as amusing. In fact, some of the things that he does in his administration of certain portfolio areas are not very funny at all. I assure the member for West Torrens that he is not amusing and not in the same league as the former member Ralph Clarke.

Today I take the opportunity first to address a couple of matters that were raised in the Lieutenant-Governor's address to the joint sitting and, quite importantly, I think, point out one of the omissions that the Lieutenant-Governor made. However, the address being written by the Premier, I can understand why the omission was made. The Lieutenant-Governor gave a very good synopsis of the political processes and history of this parliament over the last 150 years, with a couple of striking omissions. He came to the 1960s and 1970s and mentioned Don Dunstan—and I am sure that the Premier would hate to write a speech any time anywhere in which his mentor and hero, Don Dunstan, does not get a mention—but then skips through very quickly to today.

The only thing that was mentioned about the 1980s and 1990s was that 'thoughtful, sensible law-making continued throughout the 1980s and 1990s, resulting in even greater social and economic prosperity for South Australians.' I think that there is an omission there. My memory of the 1980s and 1990s in South Australia and the involvement of this parliament is somewhat different from what the Lieutenant-Governor said in his speech. Obviously, the 1980s saw the Bannon years, years when very little was achieved. South Australia spent most of the 1980s treading water, not unlike it is doing now. John Bannon decided that if you did nothing you could barely be accused of getting something wrong. That was basically the way he went about his business. However, he made one mistake.

He did recognise that you had to have some people do some things, so he outsourced a fair bit of the management of South Australia to the State Bank under the wonderful leadership of Tim Marcus Clark. We all know what happened there. At the end of the Bannon years in the early 1990s, South Australia was almost bankrupt. Technically, I suppose it is very hard to declare bankrupt a government that has an ongoing source of revenue, irrespective of what it has done to its clients, but South Australia was on its economic knees, there is no doubt about that, and I am very disappointed that the Lieutenant-Governor did not recognise that in his address to the joint sitting.

The other thing omitted was the incredible job of rebuilding the state's economic fortunes during the 1990s carried out by the Dean Brown, John Olsen and Rob Kerin governments in turning around a state that was basically on its knees: getting it up and believing in itself again, getting business happening, getting the economy working and money flowing through the economy of South Australia and back into the Treasury coffers, rebuilding the state. After five years, the current government again has modelled itself on the John Bannon government of the 1980s—and I am sure that the Premier probably has it hanging on his walls somewhere—that, if you do not do anything, you cannot be caught out. It is a bit like saying that a fish can only get caught if it opens its mouth. That is what this government is like.

It cannot get caught out doing something wrong if it does not do anything, and that is exactly what is happening. I thought that the analogy that the Leader of the Opposition made earlier in the week about the Premier being like a sucker fish was fantastic. I am not sure whether a sucker fish is actually regarded as a parasite, but there are plenty of parasites in nature; they are not uncommon. The Premier does like to live off others' good and hard work and there is very little happening now, even after five years of his Premiership, that does not go back to those years of the Brown/Olsen/Kerin governments. I think that those two matters need to be put on the record. I am sure that the Lieutenant-Governor would acknowledge that the losses incurred through the State Bank disaster, the SGIC disaster and all the other associated financial disasters that occurred under the Bannon regime were seminal in the history of South Australia.

I now move on to talk about some matters particularly pertaining to the portfolio areas that I am either responsible for now or have been responsible for until recent times, and again I refer to the Lieutenant Governor's address. He talked about mineral exploration being at a historic high in South Australia and noted that the successful Plan for Accelerated Exploration or PACE will be extended in order to further foster that boom. This is another brilliant illustration of the

Premier's suckerfish tendencies: he is always out there claiming that it is something he or his government did that fostered the huge boom in mineral exploration that we are experiencing in South Australia.

Let me put a couple of facts on the public record. I have to keep repeating this, because the Premier continually gets it wrong. He believes in the motto that, if you say something often enough, eventually everybody in the world will be dead and the new people coming along will believe that you are telling the truth. If you repeat it and repeat it, somebody might believe you. The reality is that I will continue to remind this house and South Australians about the mining industry in South Australia. The truth is that the PACE program is merely a rebadged TEISA (Targeted Exploration Initiative South Australia).

*Mr Kenyon interjecting:*

**Mr WILLIAMS:** The member for Newland knows very well about it.

*Mr Kenyon interjecting:*

**Mr WILLIAMS:** The member for Newland says that he has never looked at it. He should go back and look at the department's website, because all the TEISA documents are still there. The TEISA program went through a number of iterations during the 1990s. It grew and developed as we progressed. I will admit that the PACE program has progressed along the same lines, although there are some small changes.

When the Premier came to power, for the first 18 months in government he ignored the mining sector, TEISA and everything about it. At the end of that period, he announced PACE, which was just a rebadged TEISA. About the only difference I can discern between PACE and the TEISA program, as it applies directly to the mining industry on the ground, is that the drilling program in TEISA has been modified: instead of the department drilling the hole and paying for all the data from those core samples and bore holes, it now leverages that money by going shares with private enterprise. So, more holes are drilled and, as a consequence, more data is logged onto the publicly available database. That is the difference, and I congratulate the government for doing it. As I say, it is an iteration of and improvement on the same program, but not one about which I think the Premier can claim all that he does with respect to the mining sector and its improvement in recent years.

The reality is that the mining sector has been sponsored by South Australian governments for a long time, with not much change except, as I said, a slow iteration of and building on previous experience. The sector has been supported quite well by governments. However, the Premier has also picked up the target, which was set and adopted by the former Liberal government, of \$100 million worth of exploration in a 12-month period. It was our target to achieve that by 2007. The Premier let it go for that 18-month period and, when he picked it up in, I think, April 2004, when the PACE program was announced, he picked up that target and the \$4 billion target we had set for 2020 for the mining sector. He picked up exactly the same targets. In fact, the other day one of my colleagues read a press release issued by the Minister for Resources Development, and it contains paragraphs that are exactly same (word for word) as paragraphs in press releases issued by our government four or five years before. The member for Newland might know about that, as he might well have copied it.

The Premier and his government keep claiming that they have crashed through that target and did so early. The reality

is that, when we adopted it, we assumed that it would be about exploration for new mineral wealth in South Australia—what the industry refers to as greenfields exploration. When companies prospect for minerals, generally they look at the data available, such as the maps and the work that has been done over previous years and say, 'This looks prospective.' They get an exploration tenement and do some drilling. That is what we are talking about. We wanted to get \$100 million a year spent on that sort of work.

A fair bit of it has been done in South Australia, but I tell the house that, up until 31 December 2006, the amount of money spent in South Australia on greenfields exploration was \$33 million, which is a long way from the target we set for exploration of new mineral wealth. Where is the \$160 million or \$170 million coming from which the Premier talks about? Well over \$100 million has been spent on the Roxby Downs mine site—a mine that has been operating since the early 1980s, yet the Premier is crowing about how much exploration is being done. BHP Billiton is spending \$450 million on a feasibility study to allow its board to sign off on its \$5 billion expansion. That is not a silly thing for it to do, but what is silly is for the Premier to stand up and claim that that money should be counted as exploration in South Australia and wave the flag that that proves that the mining industry in South Australia is taking off.

**Mr Venning:** It's dishonest.

**Mr WILLIAMS:** It is dishonest, but I am talking about the Premier here; what do you expect? The reality is that \$33 million has been spent on greenfields exploration, which is a long way away from the target which we set and which I believe we could have achieved by now. However, this government, particularly through the 18-month period when it ignored the industry, did South Australia a great disservice. I believe that it is doing South Australia a great disservice by misrepresenting the truth now.

I continue to talk to a number of people in the industry and they are concerned. What will happen in a couple of years, when BHP Billiton has finished its feasibility study, is that that expenditure will no longer appear in the ABS figures. All of a sudden, people wondering where they might invest in exploration will say, 'What's happening in South Australia? Some \$170 million a year used to be spent there; now it is \$30 million. Obviously, there is something wrong there. We won't bother looking there any more. We will continue to spend in Queensland and Western Australia.'

That is the dilemma, but of course this Premier does not worry about the long-term future of South Australia; he worries about the election date every four years—and that is all he concentrates on. I believe that is a serious problem, and that is why in the urgency motion (which the opposition initiated two days ago in this house) we went down that path. We need to reinforce, not only to members of the government who are wasting opportunities but also to all South Australians, that the reality and the truth is that, relative to the other states in this nation, South Australia, once again, is slipping. I am pleased to put that on the record.

The other thing the Lieutenant-Governor talked about was management of the River Murray. The Premier hails his success at going to Canberra, beating John Howard around the head and getting the River Murray to be managed by an independent commission. The Minister for Water Security said that we want an independent commission like the Reserve Bank. I remember her saying, 'We want to get the politics out of it. We don't want it to be run by politicians.'



We want to get the politics out of it and have a totally autonomous and independent commission of experts.'

I have had a fair bit to do with experts in the water area, particularly those involved in the bureaucracy over the 10 years I have been in this place—and a few years before that. There is not too much I would charge them with running, if I had my say. I do not share the Premier's or the minister's feelings about how good some of these supposed experts are. Notwithstanding that, my point is that the Premier actually lost that battle. He stood up this week and claimed that he had won the battle and that he was a hero.

The reality is that he lost the battle. He came back from Canberra with his tail tucked firmly between his legs. He might be able to tell people here in South Australia and stand up in this house and say, 'I won it and we will have the Murray managed by the independent commission.' The reality is that the Murray will be managed by the federal government. It will be managed by a minister of the federal government. That is what is happening. That is the truth; that is the reality. The Premier might be able to get away with it here in Adelaide, but he certainly would not get away with it in Canberra, Sydney, Melbourne or Brisbane—because they know the truth and they know what is happening. South Australians need to know what is happening.

The Lieutenant-Governor talked about the government wanting to increase the school leaving age to 17. We all know that this government has a serious problem with unemployment. The rest of Australia is going along very well. Since August last year to the last quarter where the ABS is recording unemployment statistics, South Australia's unemployment rate has been rising steadily month after month. It stayed static for two months and then it started to rise again. During the same period in the rest of Australia the unemployment rate was going down. Off the top of my head, the official figures at present show the Australian average at 4.5 per cent unemployment and South Australia at 5.5 per cent. Again from memory, I think it was well under 5 per cent—I think it might have been 4.6 per cent—last August. Unemployment is on the rise.

The really bad figure in the unemployment data is youth unemployment—our young people—which is anywhere from 20 per cent to a bit of over 30 per cent. In one quarter it hit 39 per cent. That figure is probably a slight aberration, but it is hovering up around the high 20s or low 30s. Any government responsible for that mess would want to keep more kids at school. The best way to keep more kids at school is to legislate to make them stay there. Those aged 17 years who are now leaving school will be a great asset. They will be a great asset, particularly those who do not want to be there! They will do wonderful things to help those young South Australians who want to stay in school, who want to learn, who want to get on and make a better life and future for themselves. I think it is a huge nonsense to suggest that increasing the school leaving age to 17 will be of any benefit to South Australia. Because there is another issue that I particularly want to spend a bit of time speaking about, I will leave the Governor's speech temporarily.

I want to talk again about the mining industry, particularly about industrial relations matters and the serious threat that a federal Labor government would be to South Australia. Last Saturday we saw the Labor Party at its national conference release its IR policy for the upcoming federal election. We had some delegates there from South Australia, including the Premier. The Premier was out there championing this, yet he told the house only yesterday that he is chummy with BHP

Billiton, that he is looking after them, and that never has a government done more to help a company. Well, I am not too sure that BHP Billiton is overly enamoured with this Premier and his antics at the ALP national conference.

I think that BHP probably feels a little bit more comfortable with his colleague in the west. Alan Carpenter has done the right thing. He has come out and questioned the impact of banning AWAs. He told his federal colleagues how important AWAs are in Western Australia, where the mining sector provides about 30 per cent of the gross state product. I believe that the mining sector will be big in South Australia. I believe that our future will be determined by how good we are in achieving our potential in the mining sector. If this Premier does not have the guts to tell his federal colleagues to butt out and to leave our mining industry alone and let it get on with the way that it needs to work, he will undermine the future prosperity of the state.

The reality is that the mining sector relies on AWAs. The mining sector can compete worldwide because of AWAs. Without them, the expected growth will evaporate, and we will be stuck wondering where all the potential investment went and why major companies are investing in other parts of the world—in South America, Africa and other places—rather than investing in Australia. Some years ago, BHP Iron Ore Pty Ltd (which was involved in this) and Rio Tinto Hamersley Iron Pty Ltd were looking at a joint venture in the north of Western Australia. They decided that the only way they could move forward through their due diligence was to open their books and look at how each other performed in the industry. I am told that, when BHP saw what Hamersley was doing, it decided that it had to walk away from the proposal. Why was that? Because at that time in that part of the world BHP was working under a unionised collective bargaining system. Rio Tinto Hamersley Iron was working under an individual common law contract system.

When they threw open both sets of books, they saw that, under the individual contract system, Hamersley iron was achieving efficiencies of between 25 per cent and 30 per cent better than BHP. When I asked people in the industry why that was, what created such a huge efficiency dividend, they said it was simply because the management actually ran the mine, not the unions. When something happened on the mine site, and management said, 'Right, from now on we are going to use this way; we are going to change the way we operate,' it actually happened. But on the other site, which was run by the unions, if they did achieve that change, it might have taken six months. The people they were supplying overseas said, 'We want to change the grade of the iron ore you are supplying to us and we would like you to change it straight-away. We are hoping that the next shipload that arrives here in three months' time will have a different grade on it.' When the management went back to the workforce and said, 'Right. We are going to operate a bit differently with the way we mine this site. We are going to do this over here and we are going to do that over there and we are going to change the grade that we ship out of the port.' What did the unions say? 'Go to hell. Why didn't you come and talk to us? We are running this site, not you.' It was 25 to 30 per cent. Nobody is going to invest in a country where that sort of thing happens. That is what we got rid of with AWAs. That is what John Howard got rid of in 1996—

**Mrs Geraghty:** And now you want more—leave loading, public holidays.

**Mr WILLIAMS:** Here we go. Have you ever been on a mine site? Have you ever talked to people? Have you ever

been to Roxby Downs and talked to the workers up there? Have you ever been on a mine site and talked to people who want to work 12-hour days and 10-day or nine-day shifts? Because that is what they do.

**Mr O'Brien:** Her father is a coal miner.

**Mr WILLIAMS:** The coal mines across Australia are still very unionised. We are not talking about the coal industry. It is an old industry and a lot of your mates would like to close it down, to be quite honest. Federal Labor has a rabid lefty as its deputy leader who is putting out federal Labor's IR policy, a policy that was not even run through the shadow cabinet. It is a policy that has been signed off by Julia Gillard and Greg Combet. Greg Combet has told his mates in Canberra, 'If I don't get the IR policy that I want, do not expect me to come into the parliament.' He has been parachuted in because he has got what he wants, and now what have we got? We have Kevin Rudd and Julia Gillard running around the country saying, 'No, we have not worked out the transition.' Let me tell everybody that it does not matter what the transition clauses are, it is where we end.

Where are we going to end? We are going to end with unions running the mines and with a loss. The mining sector in Australia says that going back to those days could lose it \$6 billion a year. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition in Canberra is running around saying, 'Whoops, sorry, I might have got a few things wrong, but we are going to work through some transitional things.' That is not going to help. The other amazing thing was that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition said to business, 'And you keep out of it. If you are running a business, keep out of it because you might get injured.' I have not heard that sort of talk, even from the union thugs in this country, for 20 years. Now we have the person who wants to be the deputy prime minister of this country running around threatening business that, if it stands up for itself, it will get injured. It is an outrageous thing.

The best thing about your federal deputy leader is that I think she has sealed Kevin Rudd's fate. There is no happier man this week in Australia than John Howard, because Julia Gillard has let the cat out of the bag. She has let everybody know exactly what they will get under Labor.

*Members interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. R.J. McEWEN** secured the adjournment of the debate.

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

### SENATOR, ELECTION

**The SPEAKER:** I lay on the table the minutes of the proceedings of the joint sitting of members of the two houses held today for the choosing of a senator to hold the place rendered vacant by the death of Senator Jeannie Ferris, to which vacancy Mr Simon Birmingham was appointed.

### HOUSING TRUST TENANTS

A petition signed by 352 residents of South Australia, requesting the house to urge the government to ensure that no law-abiding tenant of the South Australian Housing Trust will be given notice to vacate their home in the event that they are unable or unwilling to purchase the property, was presented by Ms Chapman.

Petition received.

### SCHOOLS, INSTRUMENTAL MUSIC PROGRAMS

A petition signed by 126 residents of South Australia, requesting the house to call on the government to maintain funding to the Instrumental Music Service program and other school music programs, was presented by Dr McFetridge.

Petition received.

### GIFTED EDUCATION POLICY OFFICER

A petition signed by 90 residents of South Australia, requesting the house to call on the government to maintain funding for a policy officer position dedicated to gifted education within the Department of Education and Children's Services, was presented by Dr McFetridge.

Petition received.

### SCHOOLS, AQUATICS PROGRAMS

A petition signed by 30 residents of South Australia, requesting the house to call on the government to maintain funding to school swimming and aquatics programs, was presented by Dr McFetridge.

Petition received.

### SCHOOLS, SPORTS PROGRAMS

A petition signed by 26 residents of South Australia, requesting the house to call on the government to maintain funding to school sports programs and continue the 'Be Active—Lets Go' school sports programs, was presented by Dr McFetridge.

Petition received.

### VICE-REGAL APPOINTMENTS

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

Leave granted.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** I am delighted to inform the house that Her Majesty the Queen has agreed to accept the nomination of Rear Admiral (Rtd) Kevin Scarce AO CSC as the next Governor of South Australia. I am also very pleased to announce that Mr Hieu Van Le will be the next Lieutenant-Governor. Hieu Van Le is the current Chairman of the South Australian Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs Commission. Rear Admiral (Rtd) Kevin Scarce will be sworn in and begin his commission on 8 August this year, following the retirement of Governor Marjorie Jackson-Nelson AC on 31 July. Lieutenant-Governor Bruno Krumins AM will retire on 31 August, the same day that Hieu Van Le is sworn in as the first Lieutenant-Governor in South Australia of Asian descent.

I was enormously saddened at the news of the death of the former agent general in London, Mr Maurice de Rohan AO, who died late last year, before Mr De Rohan had the opportunity to take up the Governor's position later this year. Since then, many South Australians have come forward suggesting very eminent people to replace Marjorie Jackson-Nelson. But of all the people who were considered, it was very difficult to look beyond Kevin Scarce, a man born in Adelaide, raised in Woomera and educated at Elizabeth East Primary School and Elizabeth High School, who went on to lead one of the most powerful defence organisations in the nation. Following Kevin Scarce's retirement as head of the Defence Materiel Organisation, following a very distinguished career with the

Royal Australian Navy, he returned to South Australia to lead the team that put together the bid that won our state the \$6 billion air warfare destroyer contract.

In a state that is considered the defence capital of the nation, I can think of no better ambassador for the next five years than Rear Admiral (Rtd) Kevin Scarce. He is a man of the utmost integrity and decency. He has a sharp intellect, is affable, good humoured and, like Marjorie Jackson-Nelson, has the ability to connect with people from all walks of life. Most importantly, he is enthusiastic about the future of South Australia. As Governor, he will continue to play a role in helping to develop our defence industry, given his excellent international, as well as national, contacts. I am delighted that he has agreed to continue to be a leader of our defence push and to travel overseas on negotiations, missions and so forth. I am delighted that Kevin Scarce has accepted the role, with the support of Elizabeth, his wife of 32 years, and their adult children, Kasha and Kingsley. I understand that Kingsley, following his father, is currently at sea as an officer with the Royal Australian Navy.

I am sure all members will agree that equally inspiring will be South Australia's new Lieutenant-Governor, Hieu Van Le, one of the first boat people from Vietnam who arrived on our shores as a refugee in 1977. His is a story of courage, bravery against all odds and an example of what can be achieved in the face of huge disadvantages and obstacles, which included language and cultural barriers. Hieu Van Le is a symbol of all that is best about our multicultural society in South Australia. He has overcome poverty and extraordinary hardship to become the Manager of Regulation with the Australian Securities and Investments Commission, and is the first person of Asian ethnic background to hold the chairman's position at the SA Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs Commission.

He is also a champion of the advancement of the Vietnamese community in South Australia. I am delighted that Mr Hieu Van Le has agreed to continue in the position of Chairman of the Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs Commission during the time that he is serving as our Lieutenant-Governor. Hieu Van Le has a degree in economics and accountancy and a master's degree in business administration from the University of Adelaide. He is a member of the Australian Certified Practising Accountants and a fellow member of the Financial Services Institute of Australasia. He is a lecturer at that institute and also at the Adelaide Institute of TAFE. Hieu Van Le is married to Lan, who came with him on a boat from Vietnam and who has since gone on to become a senior rehabilitation consultant. They have two children: Don, named after cricketer Don Bradman, and Kim, after cricketer Kim Hughes. He is a recipient of the 1996 Australia Day Medal for outstanding service and has been awarded the Centenary of Federation Medal for service to the advancement of multiculturalism.

In closing, I would like to pay tribute to Her Excellency Marjorie Jackson-Nelson. In Marjorie we have an outstanding people's Governor. An Olympian, a fundraiser for leukaemia research, a leading volunteer in so many areas, Marjorie Jackson-Nelson is greatly loved. She has built bridges between young and old, between city and country. She has opened up Government House to the people and has an extraordinary workload of meetings, engagements and events. I would also like to pay tribute to Bruno Krumins, another pioneering champion of multiculturalism, who continues to perform the role of Lieutenant-Governor with distinction.

## TRAM AIRCONDITIONING

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Minister for Families and Communities):** I seek leave to make a ministerial statement as Acting Minister for Transport.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** I rise to clarify allegations made by the member for Morphett this morning on ABC Radio concerning TransAdelaide's tram airconditioning. The member for Morphett made allegations that can only be described as scaremongering, attention-grabbing and incorrect. Shortly before samples were taken, tram 109 was taken out of service, following concerns from TransAdelaide's staff over a yellow substance forming in one of the ceiling panels. On 12 April, environmental scientists from Parsons Brinckerhoff were engaged to take samples for the presence of any bacteria. Parsons Brinckerhoff also took swabs from inside the airconditioning ducts of both trams, as well as air samples whilst the airconditioning system was running. Finally, swabs were taken on board tram 106 whilst it was in traffic, to take additional samples of the air whilst a tram was in service.

Due to the nature of the tests, results were not available for a week after samples were taken. During this time, neither 109 nor 107 was in service. On 19 April, Parsons Brinckerhoff provided results indicating the following:

- the substance forming on the light diffusers of tram 107 was dust;
- airconditioning ducts and air samples taken from trams 106, 107 and 109 showed no harmful bacteria;
- The sample taken of the yellow-coloured substance from the ceiling of tram 109 exhibited higher than normal levels of bacteria but lower than what Parsons Brinckerhoff considered to be of concern.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** Contrary to media reports, no coloured fungus has been found in the trams. Parsons Brinckerhoff also advised that, in their opinion, the yellow substance was the result of excess water from the airconditioner entering the duct and depositing onto the ceiling. Parsons Brinckerhoff have recommended that tram 109 be cleaned with an anti-bacterial cleaner and then placed back into service—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** Tram 107 was also cleaned and placed back into service. MooreAir, TransAdelaide's airconditioning supplier was contacted to provide an anti-bacterial cleaner suitable for the airconditioning systems. This cleaning additive will be placed in all airconditioning units on the rest of the fleet by the end of this week.

An alternative drainage system has been developed by MooreAir and will be delivered today and fitted to tram 109 over today and tomorrow to prevent the ingress of water into the ducting system. Should this prove successful, this modification will also be rolled out across the rest of the tram fleet over the next two weeks. The Department of Health has been asked to verify Parsons Brinckerhoff's advice.

### PAPER TABLED

The following paper was laid on the table:  
By the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education (Hon. P. Caica)—  
Further Education, Employment, Science and Technology,  
Department of—Report 2006.

### VISITORS TO PARLIAMENT

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

### QUESTION TIME

#### URANIUM MINING

**Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Leader of the Opposition):** My question is to the Premier.

**An honourable member:** Good luck!

**Mr HAMILTON-SMITH:** Let's see if we can get an answer. Is his premiership guided by principle? Does he stand by his principles; if so, how does he explain his position on uranium mining? In 1982, in a paper entitled 'Uranium: play it safe', the Premier opposed uranium mining at Roxby Downs, sought to block the development and claimed that the business case did not stack up. However, the Premier has spent the last week arguing to Labor's national conference that uranium mining is really good for business, good for the environment and global warming and good for South Australia.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN (Premier):** I am not quite sure how many hundreds of times this has been raised. It is obvious that people on that side of the house have exactly the same opinion as they had 28 years ago. That says more about their IQ than their principles.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** I guess my answer is: I changed my mind, because sometimes you have to admit you are wrong to do what is right.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

#### AUTOMOTIVE INDUSTRY

**The Hon. L. STEVENS (Little Para):** Will the Minister for Industry and Trade outline the trade opportunities that have opened up as a result of his recent trade mission to China?

**The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Minister for Industry and Trade):** I thank the honourable member for her question, particularly given that the member for Elizabeth—

**The Hon. L. Stevens:** Little Para.

**The Hon. K.O. FOLEY:**—Little Para, I should say—has the General Motors Holden plant and many component companies in her electorate. A couple of weeks ago, I undertook a nine-day visit to China, with representatives of some 13 South Australian companies, to have a look at not just what are the opportunities of China but equally to get an understanding of the potential threat our industry in South Australia faces from the rapidly expanding Chinese automotive industry.

Given the importance of manufacturing to our state, particularly the automotive sector, I think that what we found on this mission is extremely valuable and important information for all members. I was joined on that mission by some very important South Australian companies, which I would like to quickly acknowledge: Futuris Automotive Interiors, SAGE Automation; Multi Slide Industries; aiAutomotive; Fusion Business Solutions; Precision Components; Chioldi Enterprise; Robot Technology Systems; Digislide; Workright Australia, The Cooperative Research Centre for Advanced Automotive Technology; the University of South Australia; and Education Adelaide.

What we discovered is that the Chinese automotive industry is expanding at an incredibly rapid rate. We visited a number of plants of varying qualities, but there was one plant that was quite extraordinary—a company called Chery Automobile, representatives of which I first met about six or eight months ago here in South Australia. Only 10 years ago, the place where their factory is now was a swamp.

Today the plant, give or take a few thousand units, is producing 400 000 units. Within a matter of a few years—a very small number of years—they will reach production of one million cars a year; and it is expected that within seven years it will be three million cars. Chery Automobile has embarked already on an extensive export program, at this stage mainly to Eastern Europe, South America and parts of Africa. On the day I was there, one meeting was cancelled because the president of the company had to meet the CEO of Chrysler from the United States because Chrysler is about to sign a deal whereby Chery Automobile would make a particular vehicle and export it into the United States market. The quality was not quite there, but it is not that far behind. That company is now engaging Italian designers, who assist in the design of Maserati, Porsche and other high quality European cars—

**Mr Williams:** Your suits?

**The Hon. K.O. FOLEY:** No; that is Joseph Uzumco. Actually, this one is Turkish-Australian. I think there are a few Joseph Uzumco wearers in here. I think Marty is one of his clients, as well. Certainly, John Olsen was. Now members opposite have thrown me off my line. It was a very serious answer and a very good interjection, I might add; nothing wrong with style in this business.

Chery Automobile is looking at the west. We need to understand that it does not matter what our fears are of China or what we might like to think we can do to stop China emerging as a dominant player in the world automotive industry; we simply cannot.

*Mr Hamilton-Smith interjecting:*

**The Hon. K.O. FOLEY:** They are buying our resources, absolutely, but they are also about to send into our marketplace a large number of vehicles. The answer, in part, is what we do on this trade mission; that is, to take our component companies into China to see where they can build their balance sheets as companies by undertaking programs to enjoy the expansion of these companies.

**Mr Hamilton-Smith:** Do they have AWAs in China? What do they pay?

**The Hon. K.O. FOLEY:** About \$3 an hour.

**Mr Hamilton-Smith:** Are they more competitive than ours?

**The Hon. K.O. FOLEY:** The new Leader of the Opposition wants Chinese pay rates in South Australia. He just said he wants Chinese pay rates in South Australia. Well, I say to the Leader of the Opposition that, if he wants to see Aust-

ralian automotive workers earning the rates of Chinese workers, let him campaign on that. He has just asked, 'Do they have AWAs in China? What are their labour rates? Are they productive?' The Leader of the Opposition cannot now just throw phrases into the never, never and not have them picked up. He has advocated Chinese industrial relations here in South Australia. You have big L-plates on you as an opposition leader!

**Mr PISONI:** I have a point of order, sir. I believe that the Treasurer is misleading the house. China has a very regulated labour market.

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr PISONI:** China's labour market is—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Unley has to learn to respect the authority of the chair. He will learn it one way or another. The allegation of misleading is a serious one and can be made only by substantive motion. It is not a point of order, but I think it would be best if the Treasurer ignored the interjections of the opposition and continued on with the substance of the answer.

**Mr HAMILTON-SMITH:** I have a point of order, sir. This does raise an interesting issue and I seek your ruling. It is the practice of ministers to grab an interjection, misrepresent it and read it into *Hansard*, leaving little choice but a personal explanation—which must go at the end.

**The SPEAKER:** Indeed, the Leader of the Opposition raises a very good point and a very good reason for members not interjecting. Once a member interjects then it is the property of the person who is on his or her feet. The person on his or her feet can do with it whatever he or she wants. I suggest that, if the Leader of the Opposition does not like how a minister responds to interjections, he should not interject.

**Mr HAMILTON-SMITH:** I have a point of order, Mr Speaker. I seek your guidance. Ministers are in the habit of inventing their own interjections more often than not. There needs to be some control over the affairs of question time.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! If a member believes that he or she has been misrepresented in what he or she has said in an interjection, the way to address that is by seeking leave to make a personal statement. But, as I said, all interjections are, in fact, disorderly. It is only through time-honoured forbearance on the part of the chair that any interjections are allowed at all. Interjections have been getting out of hand to the point where they are no longer interjections, but simply an attempt to howl down the member on his or her feet. I repeat what I said: it is buyer beware. If you interject, you are taking the risk of how the member on his or her feet will deal with that interjection. The Deputy Premier has the call.

**The Hon. K.O. FOLEY:** I think it is clear that the Leader of the Opposition has a big L-plate firmly attached to the vehicle.

**Mr Koutsantonis:** To the back of his European car.

**The Hon. K.O. FOLEY:** Does he drive a European car? I think the member for Unley made reference to it being an innovative labour market in China, if I heard him correctly.

**Mr Pisoni:** A regulated labour market.

**The Hon. K.O. FOLEY:** Regulated? Yes, at about three bucks an hour. I find it extraordinary that, as I am trying to explain the competitive threat that is coming from China, the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Unley quite like the idea of Chinese labour rates in South Australia. That is the stark difference between us and them. The—

**Mr Hamilton-Smith:** We want to make South Australia more competitive.

**The Hon. K.O. FOLEY:** 'We have to make South Australia more competitive,' he just said. Well, he wants to make it more competitive by driving down wages.

**Mr Hamilton-Smith:** More innovative.

**The Hon. K.O. FOLEY:** More innovative—driving down wages. You have led with your chin. Driving down wages.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I think that it is time that the Deputy Premier ignored the interjections of members of the opposition and got to the substance of the question.

**The Hon. K.O. FOLEY:** We now have a distinct difference of policy opinion. In Labor, we do not believe the answer to compete with China is driving down wages. We believe the answer is integrating with the Chinese manufacturers, having companies like Futuris base themselves in China—

**Mr Hamilton-Smith:** Being smarter would be the answer.

**The Hon. K.O. FOLEY:** Being smarter. Well, sir, this side of politics will never argue that driving down wages is the answer to our economic future. In conclusion, I intend to visit China again with more delegations. I encourage all members of both houses of parliament to see first hand what is occurring in China. It is opening up the mindset of business, opening up the mindset of unions, and opening up the mindset of component companies that really have to get to China quickly, supply the Chinese marketplace with our innovation and technology, and support these companies from a position based in China.

**Mr Hamilton-Smith:** How will we compete against that?

**The Hon. K.O. FOLEY:** The member has not been listening to me. It will not be by driving down wages, which is what your leader would like us to do. China is an extraordinary country. It is brilliant in terms of how it is building wealth within that nation. But, the best piece of advice that I can give to any member, to any business person—

**Mr Pisoni:** How are their human rights?

**The Hon. K.O. FOLEY:** Very bad.

**Mr Koutsantonis:** What are you saying?

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. K.O. FOLEY:** We need to have strong market awareness, and I would encourage all business sectors in this state to look very closely at exactly where the opportunities lie in China.

## NUCLEAR ENERGY

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

On what basis of logic, principle or common sense is the Premier arguing that it is good for the global environment for nuclear power stations to be built in Taiwan, China, Europe and elsewhere using South Australian uranium, while he maintains that it is not equally good for the Australian environment to do so here? In his letter dated 24 April 2007 to delegates attending the ALP national conference last weekend, the Premier said:

Renewables will not and cannot be the full solution to global warming. Nations are demanding uranium to provide carbon-free energy. People who oppose uranium mining need to provide an answer to the number one environmental challenge of our time—global warming. I agree with him.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN (Premier):** This must be the autumn repeats. Let me just say that there is a clear policy difference between the opposition leader and the government,

because the opposition leader was—and we have to record that he was a minister, albeit briefly, in the former government—a minister and a member who strongly supported the privatisation of ETSA. Why did they support the privatisation of ETSA? Because they said if you bring in privatisation, market forces and competition would bring down the price of power, and what did we get? We got what we predicted, which was a giant leap in electricity prices. Now this is another clear policy difference between us, because the Liberal Party under this leader strongly supports nuclear reactors here in South Australia, even though—and you should listen to what Hugh Morgan said on *Stateline* the other night—it would massively force up the price of electricity again. So, people have a clear choice at the next election: if they want nuclear reactors here that are going to force up the price of power, vote Liberal. But please tell us where those reactors are going to be built, who is going to fund them and how much are they going to cost?

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** We can either have question time or we can sit here while members engage each other across the chamber.

#### SCHOOL SECURITY

**Mr RAU (Enfield):** My question is to the Minister for Education and Children's Services. What is the government doing to improve security at our state schools?

**The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH (Minister for Education and Children's Services):** I thank the member for Enfield for his very significant question about those wonderful assets and integral parts of our communities—our schools. He well knows that schools are key elements of not just infrastructure but places that should be safe, places of learning, places where we have high-quality teaching and places that we, as the government, have invested significant sums of money in since coming into government—38 per cent more funding, in fact—because we believe that education is such an important facet of our communities. But the safety of buildings is one of our great challenges, and there are too many episodes of arson and vandalism.

Since coming to government we have invested \$4 million in a strategy to upgrade security in our schools, and in 160 sites we have implemented a range of investments that have made our buildings safer. We are now about to embark on a further \$5 million strategy over the next five years that will build some very high-quality, designer fencing that will be attractive around some of our school grounds in order to discourage trespassing and vandalism out of hours. These sorts of fences are effective and they will be designed to keep legitimate activity on school grounds but to discourage the sort of vandalism and damage that is being done occasionally around the state.

I must say that this fencing has been effective in other states, and some schools that have trialled these programs in New South Wales have had a 73 per cent reduction overall in damage to their school grounds. We have trialled these programs in some of our schools which were experiencing two attacks within a month, and over the last nine months they have had no acts of vandalism whatsoever. So this will go into a broader program now, targeting those schools which are known to have been victims of vandalism in the past and implementing a design that is not, in any way, unattractive for

the school users. This is an important way of reducing crime in schools, but it is not our only mechanism. Certainly we have introduced crime reduction programs and strategies as part of the curriculum, and we expect that retaining the school fencing program will continue to protect our assets. I, for one, want to spend every single dollar in the education bucket—every single dollar in our portfolio—on employing teachers and providing better schools and better curriculum, but certainly not on maintenance work to repair vandalism and arson, and this will be a good investment in protecting our schools.

#### NUCLEAR ENERGY

**Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Leader of the Opposition):** My question is again to the Premier. Has the Premier now arrived at the position that nuclear power stations are good for climate change and for the environment wherever they are built? And, on that basis, what would the Premier rather have in his backyard: a nuclear power station or a dirty, brown coal-burning power station?

**The Hon. M.D. RANN (Premier):** Can I just say this—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** We are trying to work out where you are because, when we ask you where your nuclear reactors would be built, you will not say. You say, 'We're not building them.' So will the real policy person please stand up! We have a taxi meter going of the amount involved in the promises that the Leader of the Opposition has made since he has been a shadow minister and Leader of the Opposition. It is in the billions of dollars. But the fact of the matter is—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** Do you want to hear the answer or do you want to just—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** Do you want to hear the answer?

**Mr Williams:** The answer.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** The answer, okay. If you think it is appropriate to commit to building nuclear reactors in South Australia, even though it would double the price of electricity, then go out and tell the electorate and ask the people of this state to cast their ballot at the next election, because there will be a debate before the next election and that will be a key issue.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I warn the member for Schubert. When I call the house to order, I expect it to come to order. I should not need to shout.

#### DOMESTIC PARTNERS BILL

**Ms FOX (Bright):** My question is to the Attorney-General. Can the Attorney-General inform the house how much time members of the public have, and what they should do, to prepare for the new domestic partners laws?

*Members interjecting:*

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

I wish the deputy assistant shadow cabinet secretary would be quiet for a moment.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON:** Well, members of the opposition mock my T-shirt about Father Nguyen Van Ly and, if the Liberal Party wants to mock that cause, that is a

matter for them. The first day of June this year is also the first day that the domestic partners bill becomes law. With less than one month to go, there is much that South Australians in a non-marital domestic partnership should do to ensure that they know how the new laws may affect them. They are the new laws that the Leader of the Opposition voted against. Some are already aware of how their rights and responsibilities as a couple will be affected by these new laws. Indeed, I expect that the first day of June will be a day of celebration for many in same sex relationships.

*Mr Pisoni interjecting:*

**The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON:** I am not quite sure what the purport of the member for Unley's interjection is, but we have to—

**Mr Pisoni:** Well, thank you very much, Mr Attorney-General. They can't choose themselves when they have an anniversary?

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON:** I do not really understand where the Bill Heffernan of the South Australian Liberal Party is coming from on this. I was together with him in a city hotel to celebrate the passing of this legislation. There were only two MPs there. I was one and he was the other. He now appears to be criticising my bringing the legislation into effect. So I really do not know where he is coming from, unless of course—

*Mr Pisoni interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! This is not an opportunity for an exchange between the member for Unley and the Attorney, as interesting as it might be. The Attorney has been asked a question and he should ignore the interjections of the member for Unley.

**The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON:** I am just interested in hearing the advocacy for homosexual marriage coming from the Liberal Party benches. I just find that interesting. As I say, I expect that the first day of June will be a day of celebration for some.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON:** It is really a tower of Babel over there. They come from many different angles on this issue. It is my concern that some South Australians are yet to consider how they might be affected by this new law, and the member for Heysen nods in agreement. The new law will give new rights and responsibilities to both opposite sex and same sex de facto partners, and to other partners who may not be in a sexual relationship but live together on a genuine domestic basis, and these were the partners that the Liberal Party wanted to establish.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON:** It was Joe Scalzi, the lion of Hartley, who wanted these people to be recognised. The parliamentary Labor Party does not have a monopoly on wisdom. We considered the lion of Hartley's suggestion, and we made it law. On 26 March this year I launched a public information campaign on these new laws.

*Mrs Redmond interjecting:*

**The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON:** Well, thou saith. Members may have noticed the advertisements in the Messenger newspapers, *The Advertiser* and the rural press. Obviously, the member for Heysen has not seen them. Their bold headings read, 'Living together: The laws are changing', and they direct the reader to the Justice website, [www.justice.sa.gov.au](http://www.justice.sa.gov.au).

**Mrs Redmond:** What about those who do not use the web?

**The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON:** And, as the member for Heysen says, for those who are not internet literate, the Legal Services Commission hotline is 1300 366 424 for further information. I urge members of the public to take the time to access these resources and find out how they might be affected. Local libraries—

*Ms Chapman interjecting:*

**The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON:** I really do not know where the member for Bragg is coming from—because there wasn't a public meeting. Local libraries, community centres, local councils, electoral offices and regular information points have been supplied with promotional material, including brochures, postcards and posters, and I am sure the member for Stuart will pay careful attention to those, to know where he stands in all this.

*The Hon. G.M. Gunn interjecting:*

**The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON:** Thank you, member for Stuart.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON:** My friends and the member for Unley's friends. I urge members of the house to keep their constituents informed. With estimates of there being around—listen to this Gunny—100 000 people in South Australia in same sex or opposite sex de facto relationships, there will be many in your electorates who need to know how they will be affected, even the electorate of Stuart—

*Mr Williams interjecting:*

**The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON:** The member for MacKillop says that there are none of these people in the electorate of MacKillop, not one of these couples from Kingston all the way to Millicent through to Naracoorte, according to the member for MacKillop. In their parliament pigeonholes members will find samples of promotional materials that we are using to get the message about these new laws out to the public. Members of the other place have also been supplied with this material. Of course, the surest way to ensure that you are not caught by surprise under the new laws is to get formal legal advice. I urge affected members of the public to do just that.

## NUCLEAR ENERGY

**Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Leader of the Opposition):** My question is again to the Premier. Is the Premier's only remaining argument against nuclear energy investments in Australia his claim that the business case does not add up; and has he read and understood the Switkowski report which acknowledged that emissions trading (which he supports) will, in time, push up the cost of coal to a point 'that would enable nuclear electricity to compete on its commercial and environmental merits'. The Premier previously argued that the entire Roxby Downs mine proposition was unviable and that the business case did not stack up.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN (Premier):** I think it is really important for the Leader of the Opposition to now tell the people of South Australia whether the Liberal Party in this state is committed to nuclear power in South Australia. If so, who will pay for the construction of the reactor—\$2 billion? Will it be the public sector or the private sector; and then where will it be located? It is interesting. There is a clear policy difference here, and I am quite happy to go to the next election and the election after that—whoever the next leaders of the opposition are—with a clear policy difference. The fact is that I am in constant contact with people from the mining

industry, the uranium industry and the energy industry, and I cannot think of one of them who has said to me, 'Look, we believe it will be economically or financially viable to build a nuclear reactor in South Australia.' That is the point. You want a nuclear reactor built in Adelaide; we do not.

That is your right; it is a free country. However, the point is that the people of South Australia will have a clear policy difference at the election. There is a clear policy difference on privatisation: you want it. The Leader of the Opposition wanted to privatise ETSA. He was the greatest supporter of privatising ETSA, and up went the price of power. Now he wants a nuclear reactor, and up will go the price of power. If people want to vote for yet another big increase in the price of electricity, then vote for Martin Hamilton-Smith: it is as simple as that. However, as for the mix of the various sources of electricity and brown coal, the fact is that South Australia—and I ask you to remember how many wind turbines there were back when you were in office—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** Zero. We are now in a situation where about 47 per cent of the nation's wind power is in this state; about 47 per cent of the nation's grid connected solar power is in this state; and about 90 per cent of the nation's geothermal exploration is in this state. That was not the case before the last election. By 2014, I believe that we will have about 20 per cent of our power in South Australia coming from wind sources, which will put us in a world leadership position. We do not need a nuclear power station in South Australia and you will not get one while I am Premier of the state.

#### PRIVATISATION

**Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Leader of the Opposition):** My question is again to the Premier. Given his answer to the previous question and his championship of privatisation or the cause against it; given that the Premier opposed—

**The Hon. K.O. FOLEY:** Sir, I had difficulty understanding that question. I think it was contradicted mid-way. Could the honourable member start again, please?

**The SPEAKER:** I will ask the leader to start again.

**Mr HAMILTON-SMITH:** I just ask the Treasurer to stay calm and listen carefully. Given that the Premier opposed the outsourcing of Adelaide's bus services—

**The Hon. K.O. Foley:** That's not what you asked the first time.

**Mr HAMILTON-SMITH:** I will say it again, Mr Speaker. I will say it again because the Treasurer is having trouble—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The house will come to order. The Leader of the Opposition has the call.

**The Hon. K.O. FOLEY:** On a point of order, I asked the member to repeat his question. Unless I am having trouble hearing, it was a totally different question. The words 'privatisation' and 'outsourcing' were changed.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Deputy Premier will take his seat when the chair is on his feet. If the Leader of the Opposition wants to rephrase his question so it is clearer, that is entirely up to him.

**Mr HAMILTON-SMITH:** I will use very simple words for the Treasurer. Are we all listening? Can I ask my question, Mr Speaker?

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr HAMILTON-SMITH:** Thank you. Now, be good boys and girls. Here we go. Are you listening? Given that the Premier opposed the outsourcing of Adelaide's bus services to private contractors when he was Leader of the Opposition, based on his principles, why did he decide to renew those same contracts on 17 February 2005 and will this privatisation continue as long as he is Premier? On 13 August 2002, the then minister for administrative services (Hon. Jay Weatherill) told parliament the following:

I tried to meet as many people within the departments under my responsibility as possible. I was armed with a very important memorandum from the Premier that made it clear that, under this government, there would be no further privatisations and outsourcing of the sort that had gone on under the former government.

In the Premier's own media release of 3 February 2002, he said:

Privatisation in South Australia will end from day one of a Labor government.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN (Premier):** I hope that members of the fourth estate note that we have removed our right to ask questions. Why would we do that? Because we believe that this is much more fun! It is almost burlesque. When I was leader of the opposition we were entitled, some days, to five questions. The government would give massive answers to prevent us asking questions. We actually guarantee the opposition a minimum of 10, but what we will do is keep waiving questions from this side because I think it is really important for the Leader of the Opposition to define himself. Believe you me, opposition is a long haul. I know, having been there for 8½ years.

There is really just one important lesson: it is very important, if you are leader of the opposition, to under-promise and over-deliver as opposed to over-promising and under-delivering. The Leader of the Opposition keeps telling the media that this is going to be it. It was going to be last week. You have never seen anything like it: shock and awe. We were going to be reeling, but we basically sat there and thought, even though all the TV cameras were waiting, perhaps we would save that till next Tuesday: next Tuesday will be shock and awe. Next Tuesday we will prevail. I think the problem is that we have seen how puffed up the Leader of the Opposition is because his ego outstrips his ability.

#### HOUSING ASSETS

**Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite):** We will try to get an answer this time. Why did the Premier decide to break his pre-election promise not to sell Housing Trust assets? Was the pre-election promise a lie? On 3 February 2002, in a media release launching the ALP's election campaign, he said, 'There will be no sale of our Housing Trust,' but five years later—almost to the day—his government announced the sale of 8 000 Housing SA homes over 10 years.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN (Premier):** Okay. Well who is telling the lie now? We know that there were plans by the opposition to sell most things. We know, for instance, in what I regard as one of the most crooked deals ever done in the history of this state, that the TAB was sold for less than its yearly profit. Even people who believe in privatisation calculated what the profit would be over 10 years. In one of the most crooked deals done in the history of this state, the previous government sold the TAB for less than it actually made as a profit in one year. I would like to know the real reasons behind that, and I am sure that one day all will be revealed.



The fact of the matter is that what we said in the past is that we would not sell the Housing Trust. Housing Trust homes—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The house will come to order. The Premier has the call.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Premier has the call.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** Housing Trust homes under successive governments of both sides for many, many years have been sold and others have been built, and people who have lived in Housing Trust homes have bought them through sweat, equity and a range of other schemes. He knows that, and he knows that Housing Trust homes, individual homes, in a state with the largest Housing Trust stock in the nation, have been sold over many, many years. That is quite different from the whole of the Housing Trust being privatised, as was the case with what you did to ETSA and what you did to the TAB.

#### FAMILIES AND COMMUNITIES DEPARTMENT

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

I have given up trying to get a straight answer out of the Premier; I will try the Treasurer. Will the Treasurer confirm that his Treasury officials have inspected the ledgers of the Department for Families and Communities and that they have identified a budget blow-out of nearly \$30 million? Has he received a report on the matter?

**The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Treasurer):** Yes.

**Ms CHAPMAN (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):**

My question is to the Minister for Families and Communities. Has he directed or authorised Ms Sue Vardon, the CEO of the Department for Families and Communities, to transfer any budgeted funds or any proceeds of sale of assets from Housing SA or Disability SA to the department to meet its budget blow-out?

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Minister for Families and Communities):** Can I say that, in relation to the areas of responsibility under the Department for Families and Communities, in the area of disability services we have been managing a process of demand for those services which is facing and has faced this state for many years and which is confronting every single state in the same way—a massive demand for our services. The way in which it has been handled in the past is that the various statutory authorities that had responsibility for these areas, when they were faced with these demands, would simply spend.

It is not available for statutory authorities, when they are confronted with albeit massive needs, to simply go out and spend to meet those needs. Through the process of the Disability SA reforms, which I announced just under a year ago—where we have brought IDS, Julia Farr services and Independent Living Equipment Centre into a more central control of government—we are now finding that there are massive cost pressures in each of those agencies—which has vindicated our decision to make those changes. It is simply not available for a statutory authority to spend its way out of difficulty. Frankly, that is what has emerged as we have looked at the books of these various agencies; and I make no attempt to conceal that. I have raised that matter before in this place and mentioned that it is simply a budget discipline that we are now imposing on these agencies.

Another budget discipline—and members would have heard complaint from the unions and also the sector—is that we are seeking to manage the cost pressures within existing resources (as far as we can). That involves transferring resources from those areas of lower priority into areas of higher priority. There are no unworthy programs in government, and that involves making hard decisions. Hard decisions are being made to ensure that we can balance the budget in those areas. They are the decisions that have been made; and that is occurring within the portfolio budgets.

One thing I can completely rule out is the contention that the shadow minister has just made; that is, Housing SA money or the funds associated with the sale of any Housing SA assets are being transferred into other agencies to meet those cost overruns. I have not given a direction to do that and it would be impermissible to do that, because those moneys are held by the terms of the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement within the housing agency. I contrast that with the conduct of the previous Liberal government. When the department of human services, in particular the health part of that department, got into financial trouble and sought to manage its cost pressures, it did rob the housing portfolio. Dean Brown is the mentor of the member who comes in here and seeks to point the finger at me—and I would say a consciousness of guilt—reflecting on me conduct in which the previous Liberal government would engage. No moneys have been authorised to be transferred out of the housing system to prop up pressures in the disability budget or the Families SA budget. It is impermissible and it has not been authorised by me—but that very thing occurred under the previous Liberal government.

In fact, when we launched the housing plan (as we sought to set the new direction for the housing system in this state) we had to take a particular budget decision. I do not have the precise figures here but something in the order of over \$35 million had to be transferred back into the housing agency from the department of human services budget to remedy that little exercise of the previous Liberal government. The reason why we are actually seeing these pressures now is that we are actually telling the truth about the books. That is what we do now. When we account, we account properly. We do not hide them through moving things around. We account properly and we manage them responsibly within our budgets.

#### FAMILIES AND COMMUNITIES CHIEF EXECUTIVE

**Ms CHAPMAN (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** Will the Minister for Families and Communities explain why his chief executive, Ms Sue Vardon, had a salary increase of \$80 000 last year, being \$235 000 in 2004-05 and \$315 000 in 2005-06?

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Minister for Families and Communities):** I will have to check the factual basis for that.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** It is not a contract with me, but I will check the details.

#### LE CORNU SITE

**Ms CHAPMAN (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** My question is for the Minister for the City of Adelaide. Before declaring the Le Cornu site a major project, did the

government ascertain whether the Makris Group had ever made an application to the Adelaide City Council for the development of its site?

**The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Treasurer):** Cabinet's decision to provide major project status was undertaken with due probity and due process through the appropriate mechanisms available to government to make those decisions. Sometimes governments have to make hard decisions. That site remained vacant, disused and degraded under eight years of Liberal government: eight years of Liberal government, eight years of inaction. This Labor government has taken on this issue and given major project status to that development, just as we have done for a number of developments throughout South Australia, because we are a government that believes in development, we are a government that believes in action, we are a government that believes in results—unlike the last Liberal government, which shirked every difficult decision when it came to planning and development in the state. Otherwise, we would have had the Le Cornu site developed a year ago. It was not because the Liberals were not able to do it.

### PRAMS AND STROLLERS

**Ms SIMMONS (Morialta):** Can the Minister for Consumer Affairs advise the house of action that the Office of Consumer and Business Affairs is taking to ensure that prams and strollers offered for sale in South Australia are safe?

**The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Minister for Consumer Affairs):** I thank the member for Morialta for her question. As members would be aware, issues have been raised recently in relation to the safety of prams and strollers. I am sure that I speak on behalf of all members in this house in expressing heartfelt sympathy to the families who have experienced the most tragic of accidents.

There is an Australian standard for prams and strollers—standard AS2088 and 2000. This standard is voluntary throughout Australia and New Zealand. The Ministerial Council for Consumer Affairs has been dealing with the matter of whether or not this standard should become mandatory. The Australian Competition and Consumer Commission has been developing, as required by COAG, a regulatory impact statement aimed at determining if a mandatory standard should be introduced. This discussion paper is due to be released in July for public comment. This process has taken longer than initially indicated, and I have expressed my concern to the ACCC about this. I will also raise the matter of mandatory standards with my interstate and territory colleagues at our next ministerial council meeting on 18 May in Melbourne. In the meantime, I have asked the product safety section of Consumer Affairs to undertake a monitoring program to examine prams and strollers in South Australia. All major retailers and specialist retailers of baby goods are being included in this program. The aim of the program, among other things, is to determine the types of prams and strollers generally available in South Australia; to identify claims made about a product, particularly in relation to the Australian code; to identify the veracity of these claims; to identify any after-market safety items that may be available; to seek advice from stores about popular models and why they are purchased by consumers; and to obtain information regarding returns and warranty issues.

I have also asked the Commissioner for Consumer Affairs to develop a purchase guide for parents and prospective

parents to enable them to make suitable selections of prams and pushers, and I am hoping that retailers will be happy to make them available at the point of purchase. Despite the best safeguards, accidents can still occur if prams are overloaded with shopping, for example, or if young children are allowed to stand in them, if frames are not checked regularly for normal wear and tear, and if any adjustments are made to locking mechanisms without taking great care to avoid potential injuries to fingers and the like. Our babies and young children are precious, and I am keen to ensure that they are as protected and safe as possible.

On the topic of children or, more accurately, on the topic of not having children, let me express my horror and disbelief at the archaic, uneducated and irresponsible remarks about the federal Deputy Leader of the Opposition made by Senator Bill Heffernan. His demeaning and, frankly, outmoded comments have drawn condemnation from across the political spectrum. To her credit, the shadow minister for the status of women has apologised to all South Australians on behalf of the Liberal Party this morning in relation to his appalling and offensive remarks. For those who did not hear her, the honourable member said that she shared the outrage of many people in relation to his comments, and rightly so, I might add. She also said that the New South Wales Liberal Party should consider his position at his next preselection. We know he is best mates with the Prime Minister and, quite frankly, the Prime Minister should not leave it that long. This senator is a repeat offender. This was not a one-off remark. He reasserted an offensive remark made last year, and let's not—

**Mr VENNING:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker, the minister is debating.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The minister will take her seat. The member for Schubert has a point of order.

**Mr VENNING:** I believe the minister is debating.

**The SPEAKER:** I have not heard any debate, but I will listen carefully to what the minister is saying.

**The Hon. J.M. RANKINE:** I am agreeing, sir, with the Liberal Party's spokesperson on the status of women. I cannot see how that is debate.

**Mrs REDMOND:** Point of order, Mr Speaker.

**The SPEAKER:** The minister will take her seat. The member for Heysen has a point of order.

**Mrs REDMOND:** Sir, there must at least be a point of order in relation to relevance because the question was about pram safety.

**The SPEAKER:** I will listen more closely to what the minister is saying.

**The Hon. J.M. RANKINE:** The remark Senator Heffernan made was a reassertion of an offensive remark he made last year, and I remind the house about his disgraceful conduct and the events around Justice Kirby. Senator Heffernan was, again, up to his neck in the most appalling of events. I am sure my letter to the Prime Minister will only—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The minister is not answering the substance of the question.

### TOURISM COMMISSION

**Mr GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel):** Can the Minister for Tourism confirm that the Sydney office of the South Australian Tourism Commission will close on 30 June this year?

**The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH (Minister for Tourism):** I have no information on that. I do not believe it is, but I will find out and get back to the member.

### WELLINGTON WEIR

**Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop):** Did the Premier consult with his cabinet before the announcement on 7 November about a weir at Wellington? The Premier recently accused the Prime Minister of making an announcement about his \$10 billion Murray management plan without, according to the Premier, first consulting with his cabinet or obtaining accurate costings.

**The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Deputy Premier):** We will check the history, but my recollection is that I was the first person who was provided with advice on a weir. I will check that to make sure my memory is correct. At the time we had this crisis—the Premier may well have been overseas—I chaired a committee where we quickly got together the member for Chaffey and other ministers and we assembled a body of experts to give us a series of options from immediate crisis relief through to longer-term options, and I think I am right in saying that the body I chaired would have been the first body to have been advised by the experts on that as a proposal before it found its way to the Premier. But we will check that and come back to the member with a full answer.

**Mr WILLIAMS:** My question is to the Minister for Water Security. How does the government propose to stop the water held above the weir near Wellington from passing through the two metres of sand which lies beneath the 1.5 kilometres of reed marshes separating Pomanda Island from the mainland?

**The Hon. K.A. MAYWALD (Minister for Water Security):** As a result of the investigations that were undertaken by SA Water and the consultants appointed to develop a concept design for the weir, it was determined that the appropriate height for the spillway for the weir was 0.1 metres AHD, which is considerably lower than the level the lakes are currently now, and there is no water spilling across that waterway now.

**Mr WILLIAMS:** My question is again to the Minister for Water Security, because obviously I am very confused. I thought the weir was to stop the water running from the river into the lake. Is the minister telling me that it is to stop the water running from the lake back into the river?

**The Hon. K.A. MAYWALD:** No, it is not at all what I said. The weir will be set at the level of 0.1 metres AHD, which is considerably lower than the level of the lakes now. At the moment no water is spilling across that, so I fail to see how it could spill across that area at a lower level.

*The Hon. K.O. Foley interjecting:*

**Mr WILLIAMS:** I know a fair bit about physics, Kevin—a fair bit. Somebody is confused and I do not think it is me. Again my question is to the Minister for Water Security. How much of the temporary weir proposed for the site near Wellington will remain in the river indefinitely? Briefings to date have so far advised that options for the construction of at least 2.1 kilometres of the 2.6-kilometre weir will consist of rock, mud or steel, or a combination of these materials. The opposition has failed to understand how that can all be removed from the river.

**The Hon. K.A. MAYWALD:** Let me first make it very, very clear. The government has no intention of building this weir in the first instance unless we absolutely have to as an emergency measure; we do not want to build this weir.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. K.A. MAYWALD:** No, not at all. I think the member is somewhat confused about what this weir is all about and, if the member would like a full briefing on the concept design, I can provide that to him. There was a release of the information on the concept design of the weir, and I believe the member has not availed himself of actually reading that document or that information that is available. I will ensure that he gets a briefing on the concept design of the weir so he can be sure about the water and the level of the water that will be held behind the weir, the level of the spillway of the weir and the construction of the weir. It is the intention of this government, if the weir ever has to be built—the chance of which is less than 5 per cent, I might add—that there will be a removal of that part of the weir which can be removed which is entirely down to the bed. Anything that sinks below the riverbed will stay in the riverbed, but for anything down to the base of the riverbed, it is the intention, for the full length of the 2.6 kilometres of the weir, that it be removed. As to the previous question about the spilling of the water—

**Mr Williams:** No, it is soaking underneath.

**The Hon. K.A. MAYWALD:** The soaking underneath from the sand? I think when I explained the concept design of the weir, there is very little scope for that to happen at the low level at which the weir is going to be built.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

---

### MATTER OF PRIVILEGE

**The SPEAKER:** I refer to the matter raised earlier today by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition in relation to a Housing Trust tenant who has alleged that an officer of the South Australian Housing Trust had sought to intimidate him in an attempt to prevent the tenant from contacting a member of parliament in relation to his concerns about his ongoing tenancy. It is potentially contempt to attempt to prevent a constituent from seeking the assistance of any member of this place. It is an even greater concern if it is an action attempted by an officer of the Public Service.

In this case, from the material presented by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, it is clear that the deputy leader believes that the events as reported to her by the Housing Trust tenant constitute an attempt to dissuade the tenant from seeking her further assistance, or that of any other member. It is also clear from the statements that the deputy leader attributes to the tenant that he is not intimidated, as he is reported by the deputy leader to have said, 'I have no intention of shutting my mouth,' and 'If I need to talk to an MP, I will.' The chair does not doubt that the tenant was offended, if addressed by the Housing Trust officer in the manner he describes. This is a matter that the minister and his agency should attend to, without embarrassment to the tenant.

It would, in the chair's view, be regrettable if any inquiry established by the house was forced to make a judgment on the veracity of the statements of the tenant or the Housing Trust officer during a conversation to which only they were privy. This is unlikely to address the tenant's real concerns, which can only come from the minister and his agency. Accordingly, I do not propose to give the precedence which would enable any member to pursue this matter immediately

as a matter of privilege. This decision does not prevent the deputy leader, or any other member, proceeding with a motion on the specific matter by giving notice in the normal way.

## GRIEVANCE DEBATE

### CHILD SEX ABUSE

**Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett):** A couple of weeks ago I had the privilege of attending the independent retirees meeting at Glenelg where the guest speaker was Commissioner Ted Mullighan from the inquiry into the abuse of wards of state. It was interesting to listen to what Commissioner Mullighan had to say, and I was quite taken aback by his frankness and some of the facts that he relayed to that meeting, and I am sure that the members who attended that meeting were also taken aback by some of the revelations. The bottom line was that the Commissioner talked about the 800-plus cases that have been presented before the commission and he said that many of those were being passed on to the South Australia Police for investigation. So, the point that I initially want to make in this address is that it is up to the government to ensure that both the commission and the South Australia Police are well resourced to thoroughly investigate all the allegations and evidence that is put before them.

As I just mentioned, the Commissioner said that over 800 cases have been put before him, and I am sure there will be a lot more before he is finished. Some of the details of those cases were quite distressing for those who were there. The Commissioner also went on, and I thought this was something that was in some ways startling, to talk about the number of people involved and, also, something I thought would have stopped by now, that SAPOL (South Australia Police) recently conducted an intensive surveillance campaign of Veale Gardens. I cannot remember the exact number, but they identified over 700 men there. What they are involved in, I do not know, but obviously, for the Commissioner to mention that number, they were not involved in checking out the smell of the roses. I do not care whether those people were from any particular portion of society: if they are involved in lewd acts, crude acts or, worse still, the alleged paedophilia that we have heard about in this place, they must be prosecuted to the full extent of the law, and my understanding is there is a large representation of society being presented to this commission.

It will be interesting to see how far the government is prepared to go. I hope it goes all the way. I have every faith in the commission and I hope the government does its bit. This week we saw a bloke called Quentin Dohnt, a convicted paedophile, sentenced to two years' gaol, with a 14 month non-parole period. That bloke has been a real worry for me, because he lived near Warradale Primary School. He was convicted of having over 1 300 photographs of absolutely atrocious examples of child pornography, with children as young as 18 months old involved. This fellow needs to be taught a lesson, and I am not sure that 14 months in prison will be enough. I would like to see this bloke locked up for the rest of his life. As the psychologists involved in this case have said in the media recently, the chances of this bloke being rehabilitated are very slight.

Who is saying that this person will be okay to be released in 14 months' time? It is probably the same people who have been talking about the former New South Wales senior crown

prosecutor Patrick Power's obsession with child pornography. I hope that it will not be the case here, when some of the cases are being prosecuted by SAPOL, that we have the same numbers of people who, through some bizarre thought process, seem to think that the atrocious actions of the former New South Wales senior crown prosecutor, Patrick Power, are in some way acceptable, because 59 references were tendered to the Downing Centre Local Court this week to say that this person is an okay sort of a guy. How can he be an okay sort of a guy when he has 29 000 pictures of child pornography on his computer? He is really dumb to have been involved in that in the first place and then to hand his computer over to someone to fix it. That person is obviously unbalanced. It is something that we should not see in this state. We hope that the Mullighan inquiry gets all the support it deserves.

Time expired.

### KANGAROO ISLAND ROADS

**The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Minister for State/Local Government Relations):** Yesterday, we heard the member for Finnis waxing lyrical about what I had said or had not said during a radio interview in relation to Kangaroo Island. Not surprisingly, in each and every assertion he made he got it wrong. He claimed that he was astounded to receive telephone calls from the island reporting on my statement that Kangaroo Island gets something like \$550 000 a year through the commonwealth, that I was wrong and that these were financial assistance grants tied to administration (this is money for their roads). Well, he was wrong. Let me detail for the house the moneys received by Kangaroo Island for the 2006-07 financial year—and this comes straight from the Grants Commission: \$290 000 in local road grants, with an additional \$132 000 in top-up funds.

They also received funding from the commonwealth under the Roads to Recovery program: on average, \$250 000. On top of this, the Minister for Transport spent something like \$175 000 on road and infrastructure projects. In 2006-07, this totalled \$847 000. I apologise, I underestimated the spend by \$297 000. Sorry, that bit I got wrong. Kangaroo Island's financial assistance grants totalled \$1.3 million; that is, \$281.66 per capita. I know of many councils that would like to receive this per capita amount. The member for Finnis got it wrong. He claims the Mayor of Kangaroo Island said that we—that is, the council and I as Minister for State/Local Government Relations—were undertaking 'a study on roads on Kangaroo Island'. Wrong!

The Mayor of Kangaroo Island asked me whether we could look at how state and local government, for example, could better share resources on the island and how we could work together to get better bang for buck for the money used on the island. We have been working with her to see how this might be done. If the member for Finnis knew what was happening in his electorate and in his own council, he would be aware of the integrated transport strategy project which was commissioned in 2006, involving the Kangaroo Island Development Board, the council, the South Australian Farmers Federation, the South Australian Freight Council, Great Southern Plantations, ABB and Private Forestry Kangaroo Island, Tourism SA and the Department for Transport. This project is well and truly under way, and I have no intention of duplicating it.

The member for Finnis got it wrong. He claimed that the Kangaroo Island council was falling apart at the seams. Well,

we all need to ask who was at the helm when this happened. I know the misinformation he is peddling could not possibly have come from the current mayor. She simply would not be this sloppy or this mischievous. Let me give the member for Finnis a little lesson. Members would think that he would know, after however many years as a mayor and a councillor, how local councils are funded. The federal government funds local councils and provides money for local roads; that is, roads the councils are responsible for. Here in South Australia—

*Mr Griffiths interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.M. RANKINE:** They have their rates, but the money comes from the federal government to the local government grants commission—

*Mr Griffiths interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.M. RANKINE:** The federal government funds local councils.

*Mr Griffiths interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.M. RANKINE:** Here in South Australia we have 11.6 per cent of the nation's roads but receive only 5.5 per cent of the federal funding for those roads. While we receive some top-up funds, as has been pointed out, they run out this year. The member for Finnis said that there are 'myriad roads that need money right across broad regional South Australia' and urged the government to get serious about it. What has the member for Finnis had to say about it? Absolutely nothing that I have seen. He might like to start taking up the issue with those responsible: his federal Liberal colleagues. Our councils deserve better and our communities deserve better. I told the member for Finnis yesterday that he was wrong. Has he asked for any details? No. I look forward to his comments retracting what he said yesterday, and his apology.

### QUESTIONS, UNANSWERED

**Mr VENNING (Schubert):** I have been coming into this house for nearly 17 years now. We have just had question time. What is the sense in having question time when your questions do not get answered? Time and again there are not even attempts to answer some of them. I just highlight a series of questions today. First, there are particular questions to the Premier. He does not answer questions and totally ignores the question. He gives an answer totally different from the question asked, particularly on his position on uranium mining. He has now done a full 360-degree turn to his former stance on that, and even his stance against digging it out of the ground. Now he says that it is okay for others to have nuclear power stations but we will stay with our dirty old coal stations.

I want to go back and recall what the Premier has said over the years and what has actually happened. First, we know well that he originally said no to uranium at all, which included no mining, nothing, and opposed totally the establishment of Roxby Downs. His 'no uranium' policy is well documented: in fact, he wrote a book on the subject. What happened? He changed his mind. He changed it to a three-mine policy. He then changed it for the third time. He is now in favour of no restriction on uranium mining, championing the cause at the ALP national conference just gone. He changed yet again, supporting other countries' use of our uranium for nuclear power generation—but not ours. He does not talk about our ever doing it. It is okay for us to keep on generating with our dirty old coal power stations that are also depleting gas supplies.

How long will it be before his next about-face, his next about-turn, in military terms? How long before he has the final change of heart and allows construction of a nuclear power plant here in South Australia? As he said today, he is pinning his hopes on wind turbines. It is a fool's paradise, because when the wind does not blow and the sun is not shining you cannot use wind turbines or photovoltaic cells. We really need a new base load of power and, right now, there is no option other than nuclear.

**The Hon. P. Caica:** Hot rocks.

**Mr VENNING:** Hot rocks, as the minister said, is an option, yes, but we have a long way to go before we go there. The huge problem is that the hot rocks are far too far away from the end users and we will lose so much power getting it there. I think it is high time that the Premier was shown up for the hypocrisy that he goes on with in this place. He comes in here with his strong policy, and why I am making this speech now is that he said, 'While I am Premier of South Australia there will be no nuclear power station here in South Australia.' All I have to say is that I can remember a statement just as emphatic when he said, 'There will be no mining of uranium at Roxby Downs.' Remember that? The mirage in the desert. All that drama! How can a person who is the number one citizen, the Premier of South Australia, be believed when he continually comes in here with a policy that we all know within six to 12 months he will change again?

It is total hypocrisy, and we are criticised because we are not highlighting it to the people of South Australia. It is high time our media actually took this on, because Blind Freddy can tell you that wind turbines, photovoltaic cells and hot rocks are not the alternative. Yes, you could say, as the Premier said, that there will be no nuclear power station while he is Premier, because I think he is being a bit smart because we know that, if he agreed today to actually build that power station, it would probably be seven to 10 years before it opened. I doubt whether he will be the Premier then, so that is probably his cunning, underlying thought. I get most annoyed that history seems to mean nothing. What of the word of the Premier? What of the word of the previous leader of the opposition? It seems to mean nothing. We come into this place and ask these questions, but what do we get? We are fobbed off and we get no answer, or we get an answer to a completely different question.

I just wonder why we have question time. In fact, we ought to have a jolly good look at it, because there ought to be some rules here that insist that an attempt is made to answer our questions in a proper way. It ought to be part of standing orders that ministers be accountable and do not just fob off answers. I do not mind if somebody gets up in the house and says, 'I've changed my mind. I did get it wrong.' It is high time we had a more accountable Premier.

Time expired.

### HORSESHOE REEF

**Ms THOMPSON (Reynell):** In commencing my contribution today, I first congratulate Rear Admiral Kevin Scarce on his appointment as Governor, and his wife, Elizabeth. I particularly congratulate Mr Hieu Van Le and his wife, Lan, on his appointment as Lieutenant-Governor and hers in support of him. I do not know Rear Admiral Scarce, but I have encountered Mr and Mrs Van Le on a couple of occasions and found them to be people with exceptional skills in recognising issues that face everyday South Australians from a broad range of backgrounds. My community is fairly

homogenous, yet I have found that, in talking to Mr and Mrs Van Le, they understand many of the issues faced by people in Reynell. I welcome the contribution they will make to this state.

The matter I want principally to address today relates to the Horseshoe Reef at Christies Beach. Late last year, the Hon. Dr Don Hopgood convened a public meeting, entitled, 'Christies: can its reef be saved?', in his role as the chair of the Christies Creek Task Force. The meeting was advertised in the local press, and I sent information to people in the southern community who I knew would be interested. As parliament was sitting, I was, unfortunately, unable to attend. However, my staff represented me and provided a comprehensive report on the evening, which I understand was well attended and informative.

In addition to a panel discussion, attendees heard from Professor Anthony Cheshire, a marine ecologist who is, amongst other things, chair of the Reef Health Scientific Steering Committee; and also from Steven Gatti, a geologist, who is currently the technical manager of the Adelaide Mount Lofty Ranges Natural Resources Management Board. Southern Australia has a diverse, important coastal ecosystem. We have four times as many types of coral as are found in the Great Barrier Reef. We have 1 100 species of seaweed, 60 per cent of which are endemic to the area.

The ecosystems are highly productive, too. Every single square metre of marine flora converts up to 6 grams of carbon each and every day. As important as our metropolitan reefs are, though, they are in danger of being lost for future generations. As populations increase, so do stormwater and wastewater. It is indeed fortunate that the Waterproofing the South strategy, drawing on the Waterproofing Adelaide strategy, was initiated some four years ago.

In the past 50 years, about 40 per cent of the seagrass coverage along metropolitan coastlines has been lost as the population impacts on our marine ecosystems. A survey of metropolitan reefs was carried out in 1996, which found that Horseshoe Reef was one of the best reefs along our city's coastline. By 2006, a significant loss of quality of habitat had taken place and, in the survey of that year, Horseshoe Reef was noted as one of the worst.

Christie Creek, which flows into Horseshoe Bay close to the reef, has an average yearly flow of 2.7 gigalitres. Some 60 per cent of the creek's catchment area is urbanised, with 33 per cent of the land being used for rural, grazing and residential purposes. The rest is made up of bushlands and horticultural use. Largely, the bushlands are severely degraded.

Suburban beaches along Adelaide have long been dredged, but the huge dredge of 1997 did immense damage to the reef. A large plume followed the dredge which, in turn, affected the reef. Until that point Horseshoe Reef had been able to withstand smaller plumes, but the damage of 1997 was a bridge too far. This indicates the need to be very careful about what we do around Horseshoe Reef and in Gulf St Vincent overall. The damage to Horseshoe Reef is an indicator for us to not immediately accede to the demands of people who want to see a desalination plant at Port Stanvac. There may be a desalination plant one day, but I want a complete, thorough and extensive study undertaken before any more damage is done to the valuable coastline in my electorate and nearby areas.

## GENERATIONAL HEALTH REVIEW

**Mr HANNA (Mitchell):** I raise two matters today. First, the generational health review was a centrepiece of Labor government reform about four years ago. It was brought up by the then minister for health, the Hon. Lea Stevens. The essential proposition was that a lot of money would be spent on community health and various means of treating medical conditions in the community so that hospital admissions would be reduced. There was another aspect to it which related to the governance of our public hospitals. I regret to record that the project has been a failure. A lot of thought was put into it and a lot of leadership was given by John Menadue, a very senior bureaucrat who had a lot to do with the review that led to the generational health review proposals. We have not seen the injection of funds necessary in community health care to reduce the hospital admission rate.

I will demonstrate the nature of the problem. I note that a report has been published by the University of Adelaide's Public Health Information Development Unit, which suggests that 9 per cent of hospital admissions in Australia should have been avoided. The report looks at data in the 2001-02 financial year. Nonetheless, if one thinks of 9 per cent of hospital admissions and the hundreds of thousands of admissions that we would have at each of our public hospitals each year, the potential for saving money is immense, yet it needs a very significant injection of, if not tens of millions, perhaps hundreds of millions of dollars initially to set up adequate community health facilities and practices.

A couple of good things have come out of it. First, a project, which I have long pushed for in the electorate of Mitchell—an improved community health centre to expand or replace the Inner Southern Community Health Service—has been achieved. Although I do not agree with the name GP Plus—which I think is a bit silly—we will have a community health centre on the domain Marion area adjacent to Centrelink and the cultural centre at that site. Some good has come of it. That will be a significant facility and it might help to relieve the pressure on Flinders Medical Centre, but it is nowhere near enough. It is really a drop in the ocean compared with what the generational health review promised.

The other aspect to it, which was originally a secondary aspect—that is, dispensing with hospital boards—has been achieved. I guess that was the easy aspect which did not require financial investment but, rather, a stroke of the pen and passage through parliament. We got rid of those boards, making accountability for public hospitals more directly in line with the minister but, I must say, at the expense of democracy, because there were members of the community as well as medical staff who had a valuable role to play on those hospital boards.

In my remaining time today I want to highlight an issue which has been bubbling along for some time in Old Reynella. I refer particularly to the need for better pick-up and set-down facilities for the Reynella Primary School. I have written to the minister and the council a number of times in relation to this issue. There are two possibilities for the school, one of which is a council reserve adjacent to the school—it seems that council is reluctant to develop that for a drop-off zone—and the other is basically a laneway at the side of the oval. What I have to report to the parliament today is that I have some correspondence from the Minister for Education and Children's Services suggesting in her letter of 21 December 2006 that she had agreed to fund, with the City

of Onkaparinga, a set-down area on council land and yet the council, in its letter of 1 March 2007—

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr HANNA:**—states that there has been no such offer of funding—

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! Member for Mitchell, your time has well expired.

**Mr HANNA:** I rise on a point of order, Madam Deputy Speaker. Normally it is the practice, is it not, to allow a member to finish the sentence at the conclusion of a five-minute grievance.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** A short sentence only, member for Mitchell, which is why I waited until you paused for breath. When you continued that was—

**Mr HANNA:** All right; play it your way. You have the numbers—fine.

### GLOBAL WARMING

**Mr O'BRIEN (Napier):** On 20 April, South Australian Liberal Senator Cory Bernardi made a staggering contribution to the climate change debate. He declared that human activity is not contributing to global warming. In fact, he went further and claimed that the scientific community was engaged in a massive international conspiracy to deceive what he described as the global public. Senator Bernardi, who was confirmed in his position exactly a year and one day ago by a joint sitting of both houses of this parliament, is supposedly a smart man, a rising star of the Liberal Party and widely tipped to be placed in first position on the Liberal Party's Senate ticket.

I wondered what was the basis for the senator's claims. Well, there was no basis other than some glib observations, which I quote as follows:

Man's industrial growth has certainly changed the way we live, but has it really caused our climate change?

or—

Climate change is the latest incarnation in a 30 year-long claim that mankind is destroying the planet. What began as the hole in the ozone layer became global warming caused by greenhouse gases, and is now a war on carbon emissions.

So, depletion of the ozone layer is also a figment of the scientific imagination and a global fraud perpetrated by way of a conspiracy by the international scientific community.

Now for some facts as opposed to flat earthisms. The reality that carbon dioxide in the atmosphere creates a greenhouse effect was first postulated by the Irish scientist John Tyndall in 1859. The fact that this was actually a problem has been known since the late 1970s. In 1979, US President Jimmy Carter asked the National Academy of Science to look into the question. The group reported that it had 'no reason to doubt that climate change will result and no reason to believe that these changes will be negligible.'

This year, the 250 scientists from over 130 countries who have contributed to the UN Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change Fourth Assessment reported that 'warming of the climate system is unequivocal', and they were as certain as scientists can be—90 to 95 per cent, in fact—that human activity was contributing to warming. This is the science that Senator Bernardi wishes to overturn. In fact, scientific certainty on the issue is even greater than reported in the media. In 2004, the renowned international journal *Science* audited 928 peer reviewed papers on the subject and found that 'none of the papers disagreed with the consensus position'. The ideology of balance in the media has led to

reporting on the other side of the argument when, among the mainstream of established scientists, there is simply no other side to the argument.

Returning to Senator Bernardi, it must be asked why he would put his name to such a ludicrous piece of work. It has been suggested by one pundit, Paul Starick of *The Advertiser*, that Bernardi has offered himself up as a sacrificial straw man in contrast to which John Howard and other members of the federal government can demonstrate their moderation on climate change. Three days after Senator Bernardi's essay was released, the Prime Minister gave his address to the Queensland Media Club where he underplayed the importance of climate change and recast the matter as a uniquely economic matter.

Senator Bernardi's essay served the purpose of placing the Prime Minister in a position of wise moderation between extreme scepticism and extreme environmentalism. By choosing to recast the issue as a purely economic one where he considers that he holds an advantage over his political opponents, the Prime Minister has demonstrated his willingness to make any sacrifice necessary to prolong his political career. The issue of climate change is a generation-defining issue that has the potential to adversely affect every single person on this planet. It is far more than a political problem that needs to be managed; it is an overwhelming moral problem that needs to be solved.

---

### ADDRESS IN REPLY

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

(Continued from page 138.)

**Mr VENNING (Schubert):** I, too, congratulate and thank His Excellency the Governor's Deputy, Mr Bruno Krumins AM, for his address in opening the second session of the 51st parliament, and I welcome the opportunity to participate in this debate. I also wish Mr Krumins all the best in his retirement and I thank him very much for his services to South Australia. I also send my best wishes to Mrs Krumins; she is indeed a lovely and charming lady.

The sesquicentennial landmark, as the Lieutenant-Governor capably said, is a very significant one, and he made appropriate recollections about it. It is an honour to be here during this significant, historic time in South Australia. I pay tribute to the outgoing Governor, Her Excellency Marjorie Jackson-Nelson, and, as we heard from the Premier today, the new Governor has been announced.

Our current Governor has done an excellent job, and she is extremely popular. I regret failing to convince her about how good it is to have a good red wine. To her credit, she was always consistent in her approach and she never had a glass of wine with me. She certainly had soft drink or water but never did she have wine, and I sort of regret that, although I respect and appreciate her decision. I wish her all the best of luck in retirement, and hope that she is able to stay here in Adelaide because we certainly enjoyed her company as Governor and hope that will continue, as we have experienced with previous Governors who have retired.

I also welcome the announcement today of Rear Admiral Kevin Scarce AO CSC as the next Governor of South

Australia. We in opposition certainly welcome that appointment, and I hope that he finds the office of Governor very fulfilling as, indeed, his predecessor has done. I am also very pleased with the announcement of Mr Hieu Van Le to be the next Lieutenant-Governor, and I, too, am very pleased to note that this is the first person of Asian descent to be elevated to this very high office. I wish him all the best in assuming this office. He brings to it great credit and, I think, a new direction, a new thought process, particularly as an Australian of Asian descent. Listening to Mr Van Le's curriculum vitae read out by the Premier today, I think he has much to give the position, and we certainly look forward to fraternising with him. I have no doubt that he would be pretty proud of his appointment: people who have come to Australia—particularly from Vietnam—value their new country, and there is no better time to be recognised, especially in terms of this position. All I can say to the two people concerned is: congratulations to both of you; you have been highly recognised and you have our greatest respect.

I also note the comment by the member for Heysen that she has had the honour of being a member of local government during its sesquicentenary, and now also as a member of the state parliament during its sesquicentenary. I am pleased to report to the parliament that I, too, have been so blessed, having served on the Crystal Brook council during the local government sesquicentenary in 1986; I served 10 years from 1980 to September 1990. In fact, I was both a state and local government member for six months. I also believe that the member for MacKillop and the member for Light have been so blessed. We are, indeed, very fortunate to have the opportunity to serve in this way.

I apologise for not being present on the open day celebrating the actual sesquicentenary day. I heard it was a great success. I intended to be here, but I regret to say that as my mother died at 11 o'clock that morning, I could not be here. However, I will always remember South Australia's sesquicentenary.

With the Barossa being the centrepiece of the Schubert electorate, I am fortunate to represent such a renowned region, comprising an area that makes such an important contribution to the South Australian economy through its wine and tourism industries. I never fail to marvel at what a wonderful place the Barossa is, and what terrific people we have there, but it has not been easy for the Barossa or other parts of my electorate in the past year. The grape glut, followed by the drought, has impacted on grape growers, and the drought has severely affected farmers, particularly dairy farmers in the Murray Plains area of Schubert, along the river near Mannum and Murray Bridge. Mannum's houseboat industry, and boating generally along the Murray, has seen a downturn because of the drought, some people wrongly perceiving that there was not enough water in the Murray for the boats to be operational.

However, this week we have been blessed with good rains in many areas of the state; indeed, with a bit of flooding in some instances. But the drought is far from over. New infrastructure is urgently needed for both drought-proofing and flood-proofing the state. We need action on a desalination plant, on better stormwater recycling storage and, yes, on flood mitigation. Where is the action on flood mitigation? Massive amounts of documentation are presented on a regular basis by the Gawler River Flood Management Board, but where is the action? We had questions asked of the Premier today and yesterday about what the government has done over the last five years.

What is there now? There has been a lot of rhetoric, talking about all sorts of things and wide-ranging reports, but what actually happens if the Murray catchment area does not get a large intake of water this year? It is indeed a very frightening prospect because, as I have said before, governments of all persuasions—for the last 25 years, I believe—have been derelict in their duty in this regard. We have known that this day would come when we would have a severe drought. This one being the worst on record, it beggars belief, and we do not want to think about what the worse case scenario could be. What are Adelaide's options if the unbelievable happens and we cannot take water from the river? How much time have we got in the reservoirs of Adelaide? I believe that governments have been derelict in their duty, because so much stormwater goes to the sea, just as it did the other day. Thousands of litres of it goes to the sea in a storm event, and it should have been addressed many years ago. There are plenty of countries in the world to show us how to do it, particularly Israel, and we should have been copying that technology 20 years ago, but we have not. Now what options do we have?

While the Rann government dallies and every day they just talk about this, the situation gets worse. I want to know what the crisis plan really is. When it gets to the crunch and there is not enough water to supply Adelaide even on category 5 water restrictions, what do we do then? Are we able to tap into the underground water in Adelaide? Can we bring in a portable desalination plant very quickly and get it operating? Can we cart water from somewhere else? How would we restrict households to minimum use, which would be basic ablutions and basic water intake? In other words, there would be no watering of gardens, no washing of cars, nothing extra at all.

I believe we at least should be discussing these things and, even if it does rain now and the drought breaks, we should use this occasion to say, 'Hang on, we have had a scare, and we should address these problems now.' That should be a high priority because, without water, we can do little. This city, above all cities, is reliant on one water source, and that is the River Murray, and of course there are many problems with that. Not only is there no water in it, but what happens if we get an algae event or something like that, or the pipeline breaks down? There are other things that can cause problems. We are so reliant on it. I believe the Rann government has not helped.

But, to get back to struggling business and industry, this state Labor government has not helped by being the highest taxing government in South Australia's history. Taxes are up 43 per cent, or \$949 million, compared to the last year of the former Liberal government in 2001-02. Business and industry in South Australia do not escape, either, with the highest level of state taxes. The Business Council of Australia's president, Michael Chaney, was quoted recently in *The Advertiser* as saying the Business Council is concerned that:

... agreements, particularly by the states, to streamline the business tax system following the GST's introduction have changed, slowed, or not been acted on. Instead, we continue to see the overall number of taxes growing.

South Australia's businesses pay a higher level of payroll tax because the state's payroll tax threshold of \$504 000 is the lowest of all states and territories in Australia. As a consequence, payroll tax collections in 2006-07 will be 40 per cent higher than in the last year of the former Liberal government in 2001-02.



I note in today's *Advertiser* that stamp duty on vehicles in Victoria has been reduced, so that a Holden motor car in Victoria will be \$750 cheaper than in South Australia. All I can say to the state government is that it has no choice but to match that because, if it does not match that cut in stamp duty, we will all be buying our Holdens in Victoria, and the vehicles will all come over the border. In fact, the Victorian agents will probably set up here in South Australia, because how can you expect our state's agents to compete with across the border where the vehicles are \$750 cheaper, which is a large amount of money.

I turn to property taxes. Land tax continues to have a crippling effect, and tax relief packages announced in early 2005 have been ineffective. Collections are continuing to rise, with total land tax collections increasing by \$256 million in 2004-05 to \$342 million in 2006-07, even after the rebate and the relief package. Home ownership is almost out of reach for the average family now, and I do not need to remind members here about that, and land tax is a large part of it. As I said, there is no stamp duty relief for struggling home owners. In 2005-06 the Rann government collected \$116 million, or 24 per cent, more than budgeted for in conveyance stamp duties.

The Lands Titles Office is the bane of my life. Since I have been in this place there have always been delays and problems. The delays in the Lands Titles Office not only cost the government money but also add to home owners' frustrations. I spoke to a neighbour at West Beach where he is a developer. He has a new residence for tenancy but, because it is all delayed in the Lands Titles Office, the government does not get the GST payment or the stamp duty, the developer is frustrated and the tenants have nowhere to live. So, really, it is high time the government said enough is enough and did something about the Lands Titles Office. It ought to be outsourced, because there are always excuses that they do not have enough staff.

All these imposts have an effect on the ability of businesses to prosper and employ more people, making rental properties less affordable, making investing in property less attractive, and generally having a negative effect. It does drive developers away from our state (and we all know about that because we are all involved in it), especially to Queensland and Western Australia where so much is done for them and it is so much easier, quicker and cheaper. Those states can process these things in a fraction of the time that they do here, and it is high time we said we will match that to remain competitive.

All this is at a time when the South Australian government is reaping massive increases in GST incomes each year. The annual GST benefit to the state budget is steadily increasing to over \$400 million per year by 2009-10, with a cumulative \$9.8 billion of additional revenue over and above what the last Liberal government budget had five years ago. This government is awash with cash, but what do we see for it? That is the frustrating thing. We are having unprecedented boom times, but what are we seeing for all this extra money from all these extra taxes? Where is this government spending that extra money?

It has a \$9 million spin team to ensure the Premier looks good. I think it is high time (and I know previous governments have done this) that we put a stop to spending huge amounts of taxpayers' money on a team—in this instance, over 100 people—who just sit in an office and go through every statement, comment and question—everything that the Premier does—to make him and the government look good.

It is high time that it was outlawed. In some countries of the world you are not allowed to spend taxpayers' money promoting yourself. You should be able to do that by being a good government. You should not be employing spin teams. I am not being naive and saying that this is the first government that has done it but, at the level it has arrived at now, it is time we said: enough is enough. It is probably close to \$10 million: \$10 million would build a lot of roads and \$10 million would go a long way to solving a lot of our water problems.

People wonder why the opposition is not able to get its message across. It is up against an army like that—an army of highly paid, professional people. Look what we have on our side. We have about six very good people up against over 100—and that is just in the Premier's office. What about all the ministers' public relations staff? How many of them are there and what do they cost? This is just little South Australia. I think enough is enough. We ought to say, 'Hang on, we cannot justify this.' I say again, governments of all persuasions have done it, but at the level that it is now I think we should say, 'Hang on, let us have a moratorium on this. That is enough.' It should be outlawed totally. The government should rest on its own laurels and its performance, not on this team that puts a spin on everything that is done. I really get upset about that.

Also, the two extra ministers employed in the last government—and one is sitting here—cost us approximately \$6 million extra. It is all money: it all adds up. Members who have run a household budget know that, if you worry about the small dollars, they become the big dollars. It is a continual drain on the public purse. What about all those extra public servants—8 000 of them. What did that cost? All this extra money; all these extra places. Were they gainfully employed? How did they get there and why did the Treasurer not know about it when he was asked during the election campaign? Why is this Premier so popular when people oppose so many of this government's initiatives and the lack of action, particularly in relation to water—and none more important than their very rearguard action on the provision of a desalination plant.

The state Rann Labor government is just wasting our state's opportunities. We have very prosperous times at the moment on the back of the resources boom. In mentioning the resources boom, I cannot help but note how the Premier rides along the wave of the boom, with never a mention of his past vehement opposition to uranium mining, as I said earlier, as witnessed by that now infamous booklet he produced in 1982. On the back of this resources boom, we should also be having a boom in new government infrastructure. But what do we have to show for it?

As I said before—and I know that we have some younger members in the house—we all share in the successes and failures of government. If there is a problem, we all share a 47th of it. When we retire and look back at the time we were here, collectively we have to take the blame for what occurs both in opposition and in government, but particularly when in government. We will look back at this time and say, 'Well, the rest of Australia went ahead in leaps and bounds, yet South Australia went backwards.' This is just not rhetoric: it can be backed up quite clearly by the statistics. Our industries are booming, particularly our resource industries, but the infrastructure that they require to keep on increasing is not there. A lot of the infrastructure that our mining industry requires in South Australia is now being provided by Queensland.

In relation to the roads being built to the border, a lot of the supplies for those ventures are coming out of Brisbane and Gladstone in Queensland because the roads to the border are beautiful roads. What do we give them? We give them goat tracks. It is a terrible situation. Surely, the royalties that we are collecting ought to be going directly back to fixing the roads so that we can encourage them to develop even further. The roads are a disgrace.

What about the roads here? Every morning I am even wilder than I was the day before. The congestion on our roads in the metropolitan area at the moment is absolutely—and I am sorry, I will use the expletive—bloody disgusting. It is absolutely disgusting, it really is. I have been travelling to this parliament for many years and every morning it gets worse. This morning I was trying to get into Sportsmed on Payneham Road. I was trying to turn right, but I sat there holding up the traffic behind me. I could not get across the road because the traffic on the other side of the road was queued up and blocking my access. There was a total traffic jam. What is causing this? It is a ridiculous situation. We have not kept up with these critical areas. The Maid & Magpie Hotel intersection should have had a major rebuild 20 years ago. The same applies to the Britannia roundabout, but you have not done a thing.

*Mr Kenyon interjecting:*

**Mr VENNING:** The member for Newland will pay the price. My driving days are numbered, but the member for Newland will have to put up with this. I will be in my gopher on the footpath and he will be battling down the highway, but I will get there before him in my gopher. He will be putting up with it. Either that, or we will have to restrict cars from the CBD. However, let us look at the alternatives. Look at the trains as they go past. They look a disgrace from the outside—what are they like on the inside? I never use them. I would if I could, but have a look at them. Aren't they a disgrace? What is going for us here? We are now paying the price for Labor mistakes.

The problems of Adelaide would have been solved if the MATS plan had been implemented. I believe that a bigger loss for South Australia—bigger than the State Bank—was selling off the MATS plan. I urge young members to get a hold of a copy, which would have been written almost before they were born. It was the late 1960s, early 1970s. Have a look at what it would have achieved had it been implemented. The land was acquired then. We owned the land. The first project was an overpass over—guess what—Anzac Highway and Henley Beach Road. Exactly what the government is doing now, but how many years later—and look at the cost. The money the government is spending on those two projects alone would have more than built the whole of the MATS plan. It was a freeway from the north of Adelaide through to south.

What happened? The Dunstan government took over and sold it off. We did not need it, the government said. Now look at Adelaide compared with every other capital city in Australia and ask, 'What happened here?' Colonel Light did the right thing in that we had a wonderful city with wide streets and, until the last 10 years, we were the envy of all capital cities. But now what do we have? Just come into the city in the morning or in the evening and see how ridiculous it is. To top it off, we have these ridiculous speed limits—40, 50, 60, 70 and 80 km/h—all over the place. It is a disgrace on all of us as MPs, because we make the laws and we allow this to happen.

All arterial roads should be 60. The member for Newland knows. If you observe, you can see what is happening now. People drive at 45 now on all arterial roads because they are not sure of the speed limit, so it is 50 less a few for safety. People now worry about points. I got picked up myself the other day doing 60 in a 50.

**The Hon. P.L. White:** Again?

**Mr VENNING:** Yes, again. I have one point left. I was doing 60 in a 50. I had come round the Gawler bypass and was just beginning to slow down. There was a car there and I kept my foot down for about 10 seconds longer than I should have and there under the tree, 60 to 50. Another point: more money.

**The Hon. K.A. Maywald:** You broke the law.

**Mr VENNING:** The law as is, yes. This is a ridiculous situation. And the minister knows: she smiles; she is laughing at me. Why is it that, going across the south Parklands, going one way is 50 and back the other is 60? What is the sense in that?

**Mrs Geraghty:** Blame the city council.

**Mr VENNING:** Blame somebody. We are the government in here: we can override these rules. The government should take the power to itself and fix it. It is a ridiculous joke and a total disgrace, and I think every member would be affected by this, not just me. It must really get up people's noses, when you see people going along a road at 45 km/h. Selling off the MATS plan was a bad mistake. Many of the state government roads in my electorate still leave much to be desired. Uneven surfaces and cracks are appearing all over the place. We have rusty road barriers—and I have never seen rusty road barriers on the sides of roads—particularly on the road to Walker Flat. You would think we were in a third world country. These things are rusty and crying out for paint.

With South Australia's greatest tourist corridor, the Barossa Valley Way, you would need a four-wheel drive to get a comfortable ride, because it is so rough. The edges are breaking away. It is a disgrace, and I have raised the matter several times. I have shut up about it in the last 12 months, thinking that they might do something if I ignore it, but nothing has happened. The Schubert electoral office moved from Kapunda to Tanunda last Friday, but prior to that move my staff regularly travelled to Gawler on the Kapunda road, which needs urgent attention in some places. If you go over 80 km/h in one spot, you just about take off, the undulations of the road surface are so bad. There are so many state government roads in South Australia that are in a similar shocking state.

I was not going to say it, but I will: it has taken 12 months to move my office from Kapunda to Tanunda. I have had my office out of my electorate for over a year, and we moved in last Friday. Even with 12 months' notice, my PA does not have a desk and there are no telephones, and that is on top of a huge list of problems. This is the public service, and I am not blaming Chris Grant Allen: I think it is the whole system. It has taken over a year. I read in the paper over the weekend about the member for Goyder's problems, and if that is the way the public service is working, no wonder we have a problem everywhere. I am not picking on individuals here: the system just does not deliver the goods. It is a disgrace that for over a year my electors have had to go to a town that is not even in the electorate to see me. We chose the venue 12 months ago.

However, we are in now, such as it is, without a telephone. We may be getting the phone on tomorrow morning and my

PA might get a desk before Christmas. It is a disgrace. Members opposite might smile, but that is fact.

**Mrs Geraghty:** Didn't you bring her desk down with you?

**Mr VENNING:** The old desk was built into the old office and we left it behind. We have lots of problems. In terms of transport compliance and enforcement, my colleague the member for Stuart raised some matters during his speech about overzealous police in pursuit of overloaded, heavy vehicles. I want to enforce what he said and talk about the outrageous implications of the new transport compliance and enforcement standards. I spoke vehemently against the implementation of such draconian responsibility measures when the bill was before this house last year, and my worst fears are being confirmed as constituents let me know almost daily of problems that they are encountering.

I have seen myself where a traffic patrol pulls over a farmer carrying hay, which is always done on the truck, two big bales wide. They pull them over and put the ruler over the load. These bales have been carted on these trucks for years and years. You cannot do anything about it, because that is how wide the bales are. You cannot make them any narrower unless you single-stack them, and then you have half a load. It is absolutely ridiculous. These people are law-abiding and they are totally being victimised. One of my constituents who manufactures machinery for wine marketers reported that one of his vehicles was taking a load of steel to Manoora and was basically held up for the whole day when pulled over by police because the steel was too long, under stringent new guidelines.

My constituent indicated that this means that steel would have to be cut prior to transport and reconnected on the site, meaning more delays, more cost. It also means that he may be held responsible, as well as all the other people in the chain, should any other items of machinery he has manufactured be involved in a breach of the guidelines. He is seeking legal advice, and that is a day wasted for the man delivering the steel. Our productivity is being severed, hampered by delays like this with red tape. No wonder that, according to the ANZ Bank, based on ABS figures, one of South Australia's real structural problems is low productivity and low productivity growth. What about the costs for the police to enforce the legislation? Would it not be better for police resources to be spent catching real criminals and drivers under the influence of drugs, which they are finding more of a problem than first realised?

It really annoys me that these things are happening. I have a lot of respect for the police, but I believe that this is an abuse. When I see it now, I am going to pull up and take the number of the police car, the time and also the policeman's number, because I think this is picking on farmers. If the farmer is breaking the law or his vehicle is not roadworthy, no problem: book him or her. But this whole law is wrong and in our house we tried to amend it, but I think the upper house got it very wrong when members did not agree with those amendments, and now we are paying the price. I will say that the member for Stuart is dead right and I am 100 per cent behind him in that.

Finally, I want to discuss regional health. We are still waiting for funding for the new health service in the Barossa. I am almost hoarse saying it, but I share the Deputy Leader of the Opposition's concern that country health received only \$1 million out of the \$130 million capital works budget last year. The shortage of doctors in regional areas is well documented. I note that there could soon be a serious

shortage of GPs in the Barossa. I am also concerned about the state government's apparent intention to change the powers and responsibilities of country health service boards. My question is: why is that?

Finally, in making this contribution today, I am very cognisant that some people read our speeches. I have to say that my greatest fan will no longer be reading mine. Mum used to read every detail and, when you know that your mother is reading your speeches, you are a little more careful. I want to note again that I appreciated the support she gave me, particularly when she handed the *Hansard* reports back to me with her written advice and encouragement on them. RIP Shirley Venning.

#### SOUTH AUSTRALIAN TOURIST COMMISSION

**The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH (Minister for Tourism):** I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH:** In response to the member for Kavel's assertion that the SATC was about to close its Sydney office, I can inform the house that the Sydney SATC presence is not a retail shopfront, and its location may change at some time in the future. However, the New South Wales market is a very important one which the SATC has no intention of quitting.

#### ADDRESS IN REPLY

Debate on motion for adoption resumed.

**Mr KENYON (Newland):** First, I would like to congratulate the Lieutenant-Governor on his speech and congratulate the new Governor and his deputy on their appointments. I know Rear Admiral Scarce, and I think that he will be an excellent Governor: it is a very good choice.

One thing that concerns me is the propensity of the Liberal Party, the first time a policy issue arises, to charge consumers extra without any thought, rushing in and saying, 'We've got to do it now.' We see the Leader of the Opposition doing it with nuclear power: his first instinct is to rush in and say, 'Let's charge people 50 per cent more for their power bill.'

*Mr Bignell interjecting:*

**Mr KENYON:** As the member for Mawson says, when you feed it through the system, it could be up to 100 per cent more. I do not know whether the member for Schubert thinks it is a good idea to double people's power bills. I do not know whether he agrees with that. He may think it perfectly fine for a family with a \$2 000 power bill suddenly, and for no apparent reason, to be paying \$4 000. He might think that is fine, and that is good for him, but what worries me is that the reaction of the Liberal Party is to charge people more—'Let's not think about it. Let's not try to find a way of keeping the price even. Let's not worry about trying to reduce prices. Let's just charge people more.' Perhaps if you live in some suburbs, it is not a problem. It worries me that they think that it is perfectly acceptable to raise power prices by 50 per cent, which is what the Switkowski report—the Prime Minister's own report—said. As the member for Mawson said, it could be up to 100 per cent.

**Mr Venning:** It never said it.

**Mr KENYON:** You should read it.

**Mr Venning:** Show me!

**Mr KENYON:** I will email it to you. You are not going to like it. Of course, we have seen the Liberal Party rushing

in and saying, 'We must build a desalination plant immediately,' completely immune to the fact that it could add \$300 a year onto a water bill—'That's fine. Let's not worry about that. Let's just build it and make people pay \$300 more.'

I congratulate the Minister for Water Security on putting together a review on this issue, because it should not be rushed into. It may be the way to go, and it may be that we have no option but to go down this road, but it is a bit precipitous just to rush in and charge people \$300 a year more on their water bill without thinking about it. It is just typical of the way the Liberal Party goes about things—rushing in without thinking about things and making people suffer for no apparent reason. It greatly disturbs me, but it is quite useful as it rejuvenates my enthusiasm for being a member of the Labor Party.

I heard the member for MacKillop. The Libs are a bit caught. It really worries them that the government is doing so well with mining. On the one hand, the member for MacKillop comes in here and says, 'It's all bipartisan, but they have really rebadged what we did anyway,' and then, 'It's not working.' Essentially, that is the thrust of his argument. For instance, he claims that the PACE initiative is a rebadged TEISA. There was no drilling component in TEISA. It was all geoscientific stuff. It was all radar, gravity and magnetic images. There was nothing in it that involved drilling, and it certainly did not involve exploration drilling. There was a drilling program at one point, but that was mainly involved with research: it was drilling to see what the rocks looked like underneath. The difference with PACE, why it is so novel and why the mining industry loves it—and it continually tells us it does and asks us to keep extending it, which we have done—is that it helps the industry find not just rocks. It does not give them an idea of the geology of the state: it helps them find minerals and things that develop into mines.

You might care to flick through some of the results, and they are pretty good. Carrapatina was a deposit found under the PACE initiative. They drilled a hole the other day that was 900 metres of ore, but the drill was not powerful enough to keep going. The percentage was 1½ to 2 per cent copper, which is a pretty magnificent grade. This was as a direct result of the government's PACE initiative—a drilling component that was not in the TEISA, which was a rebadged South Australian exploration initiative and which was the brainchild of the former member for Whyalla, Frank Blevins. You can claim bipartisanship: it is good, we welcome it and it is important. You should also give credit where it is due, but that is obviously a very difficult thing for the member for MacKillop to do.

I also take umbrage at the member's claim that there are problems with greenfields exploration. Obviously, you could always have more greenfields exploration, but one of the problems with it at the moment is that all 17 drill rigs are tied up at Roxby. The moment that they are released from drilling at Roxby (where they still cannot find the bottom of the deposit), they will be going straight into greenfields exploration. In 2006, as a direct result of the PACE initiative and the mining boom in general, there was an increase of 54.6 per cent in greenfields drilling. I imagine that once the drill rigs are released from Roxby it will increase even further. By the way, the interest in greenfields drilling in the rest of the country was 12 per cent. Again, we are not only increasing the rate of exploration across the state in all brown and greenfields drilling faster than the rest of the country but also

improving greenfields drilling faster than the rest of the country by a substantial margin.

Last weekend I had the great pleasure of being in Sydney for the national conference of the ALP. I was pleased to vote for the change in the ALP's uranium policy. Members will know that I have been a stronger supporter of change in that policy. I congratulate the Premier for his leadership on the matter. It is always a big thing to change your mind—and the Premier has. He said it today. That is not an easy thing to do. Perhaps we could see a little bit of acknowledgment of that from the other side—but I suspect we will not. The leadership displayed by the Premier will have a significant benefit to this state. I was at the SARET conference on Monday and Tuesday, and I congratulate the organisers of that good conference. They are very happy with that change in policy and they are looking forward to millions of dollars flowing into this state from uranium exploration. One could not wipe the grins off people's faces on Monday morning when the Premier was talking about uranium. I congratulate the Premier for his leadership on that matter. In 20 years people will look back at what happened and what he did for this state and they will see the tangible benefits of it. Jobs will flow from it and there will export dollars and royalties from it. It would not have happened without him.

The member for MacKillop also commented on AWAs and he referred to Hamersley Iron, BHP and Rio Tinto—a proposed joint venture. I do not know whether the member for MacKillop knows that around 1993 Rio Tinto started making changes to its practices. It was mainly a cultural change. It was using common law contracts because in 1993 there were no AWAs; so that 30 per cent productivity improvement that the member for MacKillop was talking about did not come about because of AWAs. It has taken them up at a later point, but it did not come about because of that: it came about because of contracts—the same contracts that would still be available under the new IR laws. The important thing in running those big mines was not AWAs: it was a cultural change across the whole of the company. There is nothing stopping anyone from doing that this second. Again, I congratulate the Lieutenant-Governor on his speech. I also congratulate the Governor designate and the Lieutenant-Governor designate; and I look forward to this session of parliament.

**Mrs PENFOLD (Flinders):** The sesquicentenary opening of parliament, as stated in the speech by the Deputy Governor Mr Bruno Krumin, 'affords an opportunity for us to look back at the achievements of not just this institution but of the people of this state overall'. In my view there are three pillars on which our nation—and therefore our state—is built: environmental, social and economic. It has been proven around the world that if the economic pillar is not successful, then the social and environmental pillars crumble and the people and the environment are not well looked after. It is surprising to me, therefore, that the blame for society's ills is so often laid at the feet of capitalism when it is this system that has provided us with the democracy and freedom to create successful competing businesses that employ lots of people, make profits and pay the taxes. Taxes are used by governments—often very ineffectively and inefficiently—to undertake public works, provide necessary infrastructure, make laws and to help to provide for people and the environment where they are not adequately being provided for. Public works and funding to provide necessary infrastructure to expand jobs and opportunities is, and always has been, in

my view, the job of government and a legitimate use of taxes, but when it becomes viable for businesses in competition with one another to provide services at an affordable price using infrastructure, then government should leave the arena and just collect the taxes from these entrepreneurs, their businesses and their employees, and let them take the risks and responsibility of doing the work.

Infrastructure is the business on which our wealth and our quality of life are built. Imagine South Australia as it was when European settlers arrived to live here permanently, when there were no jetties, no roads, no hospitals, no schools, no stored water, no cultivated food production, no homes, no businesses and no services. These foundations were put there by government and they enabled people to build their lives and businesses around them. The same opportunities must be provided now. User pays and population-based funding policies of this government cannot continue to be used to stifle growth in low populated regional areas.

The Liberals have recognised the importance of infrastructure—even when we had to cope with a state bankrupted by Labor incompetence. ETSA had been run down to the level that it could not provide the necessary power infrastructure to allow the state to recover. ETSA was leased to private companies that could provide the necessary power, and the profits used to pay some of the huge debts. As a result of the way in which the government is mishandling the state's finances we appear to be well on the way to a repeat performance. The current SA Water fiasco is reminiscent of exactly what happened with ETSA, where it is being bled dry to pay for this Labor's government's whims and not looking after its core business of providing water for the people of the state. It is compounding this disaster by not allowing private enterprise to fill the gap by providing desalination plants to communities with inadequate or insufficient water, even recently proposing to compete in the plumbing business with private companies.

In protest to what I perceive is a major problem within SA Water that is not being addressed and is holding back the development of our state, on 10 February 2006 I put in a submission to the National Competition Council, which forwarded it on to the National Water Commission for its attention. On 11 January this year, I followed it up with a letter to the Water Reform Group within the National Water Commission, and I eagerly await its response.

The regional areas and businesses, most of them small, create much of the wealth that enables us to maintain our quality of life, and it hurts me to see their quality of life eroded by the funding policies of this Labor government. I use the issue of water, which is so critical to our state, to show up the government's inadequate planning and neglectful lack of action on infrastructure that is affecting both our capital, Adelaide, and the regions. With the ridiculous and poorly costed weir option for the River Murray that the government announced as the solution at a minimal cost of \$20 million, that became, under scrutiny, a very poor option at a cost of \$110 million with an additional over \$25 million to remove it about three years after what many have said would have been an environmental disaster. There has been a lack of commitment to a desalination plant for Adelaide where, again, the government's lack of economic acumen was brought to our attention when, in response to the Liberal announcement, it stated that a desalination plant as we proposed would cost over \$1 billion, when one of a similar size in Perth actually came in under our estimated cost at about half of that cost.

However, it is my region of Eyre Peninsula that I use as my main examples. Following the practice set by the Liberal state government, Labor has been holding community forums in regional centres, a recent one having been held in Port Lincoln last February. Water was quickly identified as an issue. The government response: hold a summit! But, just such a summit was held more than four years ago, on 5 April 2002 at Wudinna. How many more times do the same people have to tell this government the same story about Eyre Peninsula before it listens and takes action? In addition, SA Water, a state government instrumentality, has commissioned numerous studies on Eyre Peninsula's water supply over the years. The PPK Eyre Peninsula Water Supply Master Plan is the most extensive and recent of these.

A few months after the Wudinna summit in September 2002, a Rann government cabinet meeting held on Eyre Peninsula gave a commitment to 'address Eyre Peninsula's escalating water supply problems'. Minister Jay Weatherill said that funding to provide a desalination plant at Port Lincoln was 'written in blood' which, despite an expensive trial costing over \$300 000, has never happened. For reasons known only to SA Water, they built a 90 kilometre pipeline at a cost of \$48.5 million from Iron Knob to Kimba to link Eyre Peninsula's stand-alone reticulation system into the overdrawn River Murray more than 600 kilometres away in order to pump 1.4 gigalitres of highly chlorinated water to the region. This small amount of water, at a lifetime estimated cost of \$9 billion, will not allow for the removal of any water restrictions, let alone provide for the development, mining, industry and housing currently being held up through the lack of water.

The pipeline is not a solution to Eyre Peninsula's critical water issues even if it is increased to the 2.3 gigalitres proposed when and if a desalination plant is built at Whyalla. In today's *Eyre Peninsula Tribune* an article entitled 'Desal plant prompts conservation concerns' outlines the deep concern for the sea life in the Spencer Gulf put to me by numerous people since the BHP Whyalla proposal was first mooted. The member for Giles states:

I see no other options for water for our future. We cannot continue to draw from the Great Artesian Basin or the River Murray. This is not new or untried technology, and only 3 per cent of the world's water is fresh water. It must work! I believe the objections being raised from a number of sources are more concerned with stopping the mine rather than looking at a viable, sensible, alternative water source.

There have been lots of options offered and there are more to come, but only the BHP proposal at Whyalla seems to be the one being considered. Why, when there is so much at risk? People I speak with certainly do not want to stop the mine. As with other private desalination plants proposed around the state, a desalination plant at Ceduna has received no support.

In order to provide plenty of good quality water at a reasonable cost to a new marina development and for the expansion of mining operations in the area, Ceduna council has signed a memorandum of understanding with Cynergy Pty Ltd. This company has undertaken to provide water by the mechanical vapour compression technique using solar power and graphite block technology, with the waste saline water being used by Cheetham Salt for commercial salt production. The graphite block technology is one of five new methods of storing renewable energy that has received development funding through the Australian federal govern-

ment's \$17.6 million Advanced Electricity Storage Technologies program that the federal minister announced yesterday.

SA Water and the government are not cooperating on this and other similar projects. Cynergy's letter to SA Water in March 2006 was not answered, despite the state Minister for Water Security saying that it was still being considered. Federal grant opportunities have been passing by. The need is becoming more urgent daily, particularly in the light of the problems in the basins and supply at Streaky Bay. The Cynergy proposal for 'new' water could remove 3 000 people from the present system, thus quickly alleviating some of the pressures on the southern basins. They have, in fact, been obstructed. I quote from the message of the Mayor of Ceduna, Allan Suter, to the people in an article appearing in *The Sentinel* on 26 April (last Thursday):

As many of you will know, council has been supporting a proposed desalination plant to be located in Penong. This potentially could supply 2.5 million litres of drinking quality water per day at a cost similar to the SA Water, price of \$1.09 per kilolitre. This represents about 10 per cent of the Eyre Peninsula's total water requirements and would be of much higher quality than we now receive. It would enable the township of Penong to receive mains water. It could also supply all the Ceduna district's water requirements. This proposed desalination plant would be powered by renewable energy, would not dispose of concentrated brine into the ocean and would entail zero waste emissions into the environment.

Furthermore, it does not require SA Water to provide any funding. All SA Water needs to do to allow this proposal to proceed is to grant permission for their pipes in Ceduna to be utilised to distribute the water in Ceduna. In March 2006, a letter was posted to SA Water asking them to confirm whether their pipes could be used. To our amazement and disappointment, after a wait of over a year, SA water has not even had the courtesy to send an acknowledgment, let alone a response.

At a time of crippling water shortages, it would have been expected that both SA Water and the South Australian government would have been excited and enthusiastic about this special proposition. While the whole state suffers water restrictions and shortages, this simple proposal seems to be too difficult. In a press release on 18 April, SA Water's chief operating officer, John Ringham, said: 'SA Water is awaiting the outcome of the BHP Billiton desalination proposal for Upper Spencer Gulf prior to determining the merits of a desalination plant at Ceduna.'

What a disgraceful duck-shove. If it proceeds—it is subject to an environmental impact statement process—the BHP proposal is years away. In any event, only a portion of the water may be used for Eyre Peninsula—approximately 10 per cent of our needs at best. Our proposed system at Penong could be operating in about two years. In the meantime, an exceptionally good opportunity goes begging because of the inability of Adelaide-based bodies to think outside the narrow little square. This is simply a shameful cop-out. We hope that SA Water will think again.

Today I received an email which stated:

... still battling with SA Water, but discussions with John Ringham are becoming a little more cordial.

Perhaps there is still hope that this project will not be lost to our state because of problems with our monopoly water supplier and the state government's attitude to private enterprise. The Aquasol proposal at Port Augusta has run into similar problems with approvals, and I was interested to note in an interview yesterday (2 May) that the managing director, Michael Fieldon, stated that they are still in discussion with SA Water about access to the Morgan to Whyalla pipeline. It is years since I first spoke with this company about their project, which is essentially a power project with desalinated water as part of the process, about the need for access to the pipeline. In answer to whether the price would be comparable to that of the River Murray water, he stated:

I think you would find it actually quite cheaper than what people are paying for water now.

The Aquasol proposal potentially has enough water to provide for a quarter of a million South Australians with a modular desalination system that is clean and green:

There would be very little if any discharge back into the Upper Spencer Gulf. . . It depends on the quantity of water we will be producing. . . we're not interested in producing more water than what can be accommodated on land.

Despite pressure, no adequate reason has been given as to why there is a problem with giving them access to the pipeline and saving taxpayers millions of dollars. The Aquasol company has even offered 4 gigalitres free to the government or council. I fail to understand what is happening with water in this state.

On 19 February this year I sent a submission to the First Biennial Assessment of the National Water Initiative, outlining in detail my concerns regarding water in the regions outside the River Murray catchment, and using the electorate of Flinders to provide examples. I was concerned that the river was getting all the attention and that the problems of other regions were not being heard. My submission contained substantial comments on government inaction and SA Water and government obstruction. A stated aim of the water initiative is 'to restore service and ground water systems to environmentally sustainable levels'. In the Flinders electorate, the underground resources have continued to be depleted to such an extent that at least five basins—the Poldia, Uley/Wanilla, Uley East, Uley South and Robinson Basins—have been overdrawn.

I was incredulous when I discovered that the overdrawn southern basins are being used to recharge the overdrawn Robinson aquifer that services the township of Streaky Bay. Yes, the Liberal government approved the connection of Streaky Bay to the pipeline from the south, but there were also plans to increase the water supply through desalination of sea water at Port Lincoln. Labor built the \$7 million pipeline to Streaky Bay but, with typical lack of vision and a refusal to think outside the square to see the wider picture, it has so far stopped efforts to augment the overdrawn basins with additional new water. The Robinson Basin has failed, and a pipeline is currently being duplicated over 10 kilometres of its length to get enough pressure to get over a small hill and augment the Robinson Basin so that there is sufficient water to service the town of Streaky Bay but not nearly enough to service the major housing developments that are being proposed in this beautiful part of the state.

Even the 10 kilometre increase was supposed to be 13 kilometres, but SA Water is providing only enough money for 10 kilometres (or 80 per cent of what is required). The whole sorry water saga leaves one speechless and with a complete lack of confidence in the competence of the government and SA Water to be able to look after our water supplies in the future. The only sustainable source of additional water that will enable the regions to develop their housing, agriculture, aquaculture, tourism, mining and value-adding industries is from desalination of the sea water that surrounds us, and it needs to be put in place now.

On Eyre Peninsula, new water should be desalinated with wind and solar energy. The two wind farms—Mount Millar and Cathedral Rocks—produce more than 120 megawatts of power, which is more power than is consumed on Eyre Peninsula, and it can be put into the grid through the more than 40 year old 132 kilovolt power line to Whyalla from Port Lincoln. This excess power is called spillage and it could be used for the desalination of sea water south of Port Lincoln

to be put into the existing pipes and pumping systems instead of being wasted.

While on water access, I mention the plight of Elliston District Council, which has a rate base of only 873 full-paying ratepayers but one of the largest areas of any local government district in Australia, at 6 693 square kilometres. The Elliston council has been advised by SA Water that providing water to the small communities of Port Kenny and Venus Bay in their council area is the council's problem. The Elliston council is by no means the only council faced with a cost that is beyond its capacity and which should not be its responsibility anyway. Marion Bay on the Yorke Peninsula has a similar problem to Port Kenny and Venus Bay, with an influx of tourists in the summer, poor underground resources and a reliance on rainwater tanks that is not sustainable into the future. Fortunately, their council of Yorke Peninsula has more ratepayers and it has given approval to provide them with a desalination plant at a cost of \$450 000 which is being constructed at Osmoflo's premises in Adelaide and which will be delivered in the next few months. Venus Bay—and in fact all the Gawler Craton mineralisation that covers the whole of the Eyre Peninsula—has the additional opportunity, as outlined in the *Port Lincoln Times* today, as follows:

Venus Bay and the Gawler Craton have unrealised diamond exploration potential, according to exploration companies planning to search these areas for diamonds.

It continues:

A helicopter will carry out surveys on the central Gawler Craton and at Venus Bay this month and in June.

Every kind of mineral is found on Eyre Peninsula and it is about to boom but it is already being held back by the lack of power and water.

There are dozens of small communities around the state for which the cost is being thrown back onto ratepayers. These water costs add to the ever-increasing burden caused by other cost shifting from the state government. The natural resources management levy is proposed to be charged on all ratepayers at over \$100, and the Zero Waste levy will add yet another charge that is unfair on small regional communities, particularly when I am told that half of it will be put back into general revenue of the state. Last year over \$300 million went into general revenue of this state from ratepayers through SA Water alone.

The SA Water charter states, under Strategic Directions, that it is to 'assist in promoting economic development in South Australia'. However, the economic development of many small regional communities across South Australia, as exemplified by Elliston District Council, is being severely restricted because of lack of water. The government has no plans for the necessary infrastructure that will allow the population and wealth of the regions to rise, that would improve the quality of life of those who live in those regions, and that would increase the state's revenue base.

The predicament on Eyre Peninsula has stimulated a number of desalination plant options to be looked at to provide more and better water for particular locations. Already mentioned is Ceduna because it is more than 400 kilometres from the southern basins and receives very poor-quality reticulated water. The Ceduna District Council has undertaken the supply of water to people living west of the town by buying water from SA Water, then piping it to them. The pipeline was provided with grant funding. Unfortunately it did not reach the small community of Penong, but has been a great help to farmers and Aboriginal

communities along the way. However, many communities west of Ceduna miss out and, on 1 March this year, I and many other members of parliament received a desperate email from the proactive small Aboriginal community of Scotdesco, which stated:

We are seeking your assistance in gaining some insight into a decision made to no longer fund our reverse osmosis (R/O) desalination plant. We are a remote Aboriginal community located 100 kilometres west of Ceduna on the Eyre Highway. There are currently 18 houses in the community, as well as an administrative centre, including TAFE and a women's group. The current population of Scotdesco community is 54 people.

The email goes on say that SA Water was engaged to look at their situation:

... and decided an 'on ground' collection facility, covering two hectares, would be the most cost effective in terms of ongoing maintenance cost.

It is a pity there is not a bit more rain. Further on it states:

To date we have not received confirmation of this, rather we have been advised verbally that FaCSIA will pay for an external contractor to cart 6 000 gallons of Tod water from Ceduna to Scotdesco as required.

Again, this is from the underground basin south of Port Lincoln. Since then I have visited the community twice to see if I can help to find a better solution to the two proposed, which I believe will not be at all suitable in the longer term. This is an excellent community located on a farm, and they hope in the future to have more sheep on their property, a larger vegetable garden and horticulture. Much of the land on Eyre Peninsula is top quality and only needs water. An American has planted vines, watered by reverse osmosis, at Nundroo west of Scotdesco, and believes that the location will be the next Napa Valley which, I understand, is one of the top wine-growing regions of the United States of America. Once again, the potential of Eyre Peninsula and its people is being severely constrained by the small thinking of governments and their departments.

I am aware of many other projects that are in a similar predicament regarding government approvals, accessing SA Water infrastructure and finding solutions to water issues. The rapidly expanding town of Coffin Bay is being charged augmentation fees, but the Coffin Bay underground water basins have still not been assessed, despite requests by myself and others over many, many years. It is now even more difficult to have the assessments done because of the protection of native vegetation in the national parks. Meanwhile, progress waits on the government and its departments, as responsibility—as the Mayor of Ceduna puts it so well—is duck shoved from one place to another. Is SA Water using a process of ignoring all private applications as long as possible to prevent any competition, and is the government protecting SA Water to protect its lucrative income stream? It would seem so.

On water pricing, SA Water maintains that all costs are 'commercial in confidence', even though it is a monopoly provider free from independent economic regulation. Stakeholders and alternative providers cannot determine the true cost of water. For about 13 years I have tried to get the cost on Eyre Peninsula from SA Water. However, its response is simply that we are heavily subsidised. I find this difficult to believe as the water from the basins is supplied to them free of cost. The pipelines on the whole were put in place many years ago and have not had significant upgrading in recent times and, I understand, are fully depreciated. The water to Ceduna was originally gravity fed—the longest

gravity-fed pipeline in the world at the time. Even now limited pumping is required compared with most systems. If the desalination plants were realised, the cost of piping and pumping would be minimised as most of our communities are close to the sea water that is to be desalinated for use.

SA Water is charging augmentation fees ostensibly to provide additional water in the future on blocks of land across more than 60 regional communities across South Australia, on top of already high connection fees, thus putting up the cost of housing.

**The Hon. K.A. MAYWALD (Minister for Water Security):** I move:

That the time for moving the adjournment of the house be extended beyond 5 p.m.

Motion carried.

**Mrs PENFOLD:** The augmentation fee penalty of between \$5 000 and \$15 000 is imposed in areas that already have increased costs for home ownership due to high costs of freight and labour caused by their remote locations and the reluctance of banks to lend outside larger cities. In the case of Coffin Bay, the augmentation fees are an additional burden in spite of the underground lens not having been fully assessed to see whether future augmentation would ever be needed. The augmentation fee goes into the profit of SA Water, not into a specific account. It is part of the \$270 million paid through SA Water into state government general revenue in 2006 as a dividend of 95 per cent of the utility's after-tax profit. This dividend was increased by the

present state government from, I believe, 74 per cent to the current 95 per cent. It is in addition to the \$95 million from the 30 per cent income tax that was refunded to the state government under an agreement from the federal government. Therefore, in my view, the augmentation fee has been charged under false pretences.

It is interesting to note that capital expenditure by SA Water has been reduced over the past year, alarmingly, presumably, because so much of SA Water's net profit was taken by the government as a dividend. SA Water has had to borrow money for capital expenditure. I was stunned to learn that the \$46 million that I thought was for a new SA Water building in Adelaide is, in fact, only for the fitting out of a building belonging to others, and rent will still have to be paid. The SA Water business in South Australia is the only one that I know of that is spending millions of taxpayers' dollars to urge customers not to use their product.

The Labor state government has proved to be a disaster to the state on infrastructure. Ministers point defensively to a tram to nowhere, inadequately-costed underpasses that become more expensive every time we turn around, opening bridges and, worst of all, water restrictions that would not be needed if we were leading the way instead of dragging the lag on water. As the driest state in the driest nation on earth, we should be leading the world in the provision of new water.

Motion carried.

#### ADJOURNMENT

At 5 p.m. the house adjourned until Tuesday 29 May at 11 a.m.