

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY**Tuesday 13 November 2007**

The **SPEAKER (Hon. J.J. Snelling)** took the chair at 11:00 and read prayers.

EDUCATION (COMPULSORY EDUCATION AGE) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 13 September 2007. Page 844.)

The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher) (11:01): I support this measure; I have always been very supportive of increasing the age at which young people can leave school. My philosophy, which I believe is reflected in this bill, is that a person has to be in education, in a job or in training: you have no other choice—you have to be in one of those three areas. In researching for this speech, I noticed that, on Monday 18 June 2001, the Democrats put out a press release which described Liberal and ALP promises to raise the school leaving age as 'a simplistic approach that plays politics with our children's future'. Well, making a decision about when someone can leave school is political, and it is a good decision at that. The reality is that, in this day and age, one needs to be more adequately prepared for the workforce than ever before—but, of course, the training and the education must be relevant not only to the particular age of the student but also in terms of preparation for that person's future.

I have not checked this out, but I was told yesterday that there is a move afoot in the UK to increase the school leaving age to 18. I understand that either this policy has been introduced or they have indicated in the UK that the school leaving age will be raised to 18. So, I imagine it will not be long before we follow suit. Once again, I would not and do not have a problem with that, provided the training and education in the school setting is relevant and appropriate, and I do not believe that is necessarily the case at the moment. I think there is room to improve, and I am heartened to see a commitment by all the major parties at both a state and federal level to reintroduce technical education.

The removal and closure of technical high schools here was a big mistake, and I think everyone recognises that. Reading the *Hansard* of the time, as well as other documents, I am amazed to see that, apart from the closure of Goodwood Tech (which did create some angst), the move to close technical high schools happened without much disquiet in the community. That is somewhat surprising, and I say that not simply as someone who went to one of those schools. I went to the famous Goody Tech and, whilst I did not pursue a trade, nevertheless the training received there in terms of technical skills remains useful even at my late stage in life.

The move from technical high schools to the so-called comprehensive high schools was well meaning but it has never delivered the range of options needed. That is partly because teachers, in the main, come from an academic or non-technical background, and there has always been a bias in the high school system against people who use their hands as well as their head. Sadly we have even seen that at the university level, where the University of South Australia got rid of home economics and technical studies and then, in a decision one can only describe as stupid, destroyed the training facilities at Underdale. Now we do not have facilities for training home economics or technical teachers in South Australia; theory is taught at Mawson Lakes and the practical studies are done at TAFE. However, we had purpose-built facilities costing millions of dollars at Underdale which have now been destroyed by the University of South Australia. That was a most regrettable decision.

The question one has to ask is: from where are the trained teachers to come who will work in the technical high schools, the high schools that will offer technical studies and home economics, nutrition and hospitality studies? From where will those trained teachers come? They used to do a three-year specialist degree that integrated teaching methodology as well as the technical aspects; that has all been destroyed, and we are now getting an attempt to try to recreate what was already there and functioning very well.

In terms of opportunities in high schools, as I have said there has been a bias against technical studies, the suggestion that if you use your hands and your head you are somehow less capable or not as gifted as someone who does not use their hands in their occupation. We still see that in the wider community, and I have had people crying when they have discovered that their son wants to do carpentry rather than go to university. How sad and inappropriate that is. As a community we have not valued our tradespeople and we still do not value them—in many ways we

still regard them as inferior to other occupational groupings—and that is a very silly, short-sighted and inappropriate approach. It is certainly not matched in countries such as Germany and Japan where technical people are regarded much more highly than they are here.

One of the reasons we have a skills shortage is that for many years we, as a community, have denigrated and downgraded the role of technical and tradespeople in all areas. Hopefully, the wheel is now turning and we will see a return to an option in secondary schools for people to do school and workplace-linked apprenticeships as well as other aspects of technical training—whether that be computer-assisted design, robotics or the like. This will require a lot of impetus and effort from the minister and senior departmental officials, as well as from the private and Catholic school sectors, to really push the importance of technical training because, as I said, there is an inherent bias in the high school sector at the moment away from anything to do with technical training and towards having students go to university.

Most people do not go to university; in fact, 70 per cent do not. I spent 16 years at university (eight years full time and eight years part time) and I do not see myself as in any way superior to someone who has, for example, gone into plumbing, electrical, is an aircraft engineer fitter or anything like that. The sooner we move away from that snobbish and arrogant class-ridden attitude towards technical people the better.

If I am in an aircraft—and I am sure all of us have been and will continue to be—I place great importance on the skills of the engine fitter as well as on the pilot, both of whom use their hands as well as their head. In fact, if you think about it, a surgeon uses his or her hands as well as his or her head—we hope so, anyway—and dentists, so it is an artificial dichotomy and a nonsense to try to separate out those who use their hands and their head and those who may use their hands less frequently in their occupation.

This is a worthwhile measure. As I say, I predict that within five years we will be moving towards a school leaving age of 18, as is happening elsewhere in the world. It already exists in parts of the United States and in Belgium. In the United States, the district of Columbia and 11 other states already have an 18-year school leaving age. So, we are not actually setting the pace but we are doing something that is very worthwhile, and I am pleased that both the government and the opposition support this measure.

I think we are going through a very interesting phase with the consolidation of schools. We are moving to a one-stop shop. In my electorate, the Reynella East High School, I am confident, will become a B-12 school (birth to year 12). I do not think the mothers will actually give birth on campus, but soon after birth the children, or the child, will be cared for on site and that child will be able to attend that campus right through to year 12. Someone jokingly said, 'We should bring the retirement village on campus and then we can have B-R—go the whole hog.'

What we are seeing with the creation of the so-called super schools out north and the B-12 at Reynella East is a one-stop shop. The way those schools are administered is very important, so they do not just become great entities with masses of students but the children within them can identify with their peers as part of an early school, middle school and upper secondary school component. I am sure that is what will happen in those particular consolidated schools.

If you look at the private school sector, they have moved to early learning centres. I call them early enrolment centres because you enrol a child at an age pre five, and then the school can say to the parents: 'Look, if your child stays here we guarantee a place through into the secondary school.' It is a very smart recruiting technique and the state schools have to do the same. So, we are going to see more consolidation, I believe, with state schools offering a one-stop shop where a child will go to a school from the crèche and childcare right through to year 12.

In conclusion, the essence of this bill is about ensuring that, as best we can, young people are given the best opportunity in life. I do emphasise, once again, that the training and education has to be relevant and appropriate, not just a form of enclosure where you keep young people contained until they reach the age of 18 and then release them. It has to be meaningful. It will need to involve off campus activities and workplace training. If it is approached in that way and the schools are able to deliver meaningful training and education that helps young people not only for their future but also for their present, I think we will be doing the right thing for our young people. I support the bill.

Mr HANNA (Mitchell) (11:15): I am speaking briefly in relation to the government's measure to increase the school leaving age to 17. Strictly speaking, it is a little bit broader than that: it is to ensure that 16 year olds have some sort of meaningful occupation, whether that be as

a student, in a training institution or working. I support the bill, but I do not think it is straightforward. If the bill ensures that our 16 year olds have meaningful activity, whether they be at school, whether they be training or working, then that will be a good thing.

The real challenge is to provide quality education in schools that is relevant to 16 year olds. Looking at the other side of it, then, if we do not achieve that, we are going to have 16 year olds at school who do not want to be there, and nothing could be worse for them, for their other classmates or for the teachers. There are already a number of teenagers who, quite clearly, do not want to be at school, and that shows in behaviour, in grades and in a negative influence on the people around them. So, I think it is not as simple as passing a law; I think it requires more resources and better programs for 16 year olds.

Having sounded that note of caution, I would like to applaud the many schools which focus on vocational training within the public high school environment. In fact, two high schools which I have had something to do with—Seaview High School and Hamilton Secondary College—have a strong emphasis on vocational training and/or pathways to work outside of school, whether that be acquiring trade skills or simply doing unskilled work. So, it can be done, and it is being done in some schools, but I do not believe that that applies across the board. In principle, because it is a good thing that 16 year olds all be provided with something meaningful to do, I support the measure, but I think there are those concerns that need to be addressed.

One particular provision which I have made public comment about is the fine for parents who do not take reasonable measures to ensure that their children are at school. When I say 'children' I mean 16 year olds—once this legislation passes. They are children in the eyes of the law, although most 16 year olds I know or have met do not think of themselves as children. They are, in a real sense, young adults, but for so many things they need to be 18 to fully participate in adult life legally.

The interesting thing is that parents have not been prosecuted for failure to ensure that their children attend school. I think there is some common ground when we consider this issue. When teenagers are failing to attend school or getting roped into criminal conduct, one looks at the parents, one looks at the school, one looks at the young person involved, and there is a question mark of responsibility in relation to each of the parties. In some cases, the parents might be doing absolutely everything they can and, yet, the young person becomes wayward. In some cases, the school will be doing absolutely everything it can and providing the best of care and, yet, because of other factors, the young person will stay away from school and be seduced into other things. One cannot ignore the partial, if not full, responsibility, of a 15 year old or a 16 year old for their actions.

In that context, the question that I raise—whether it is dealt with at this stage of discussing legislation or when we look at it in more detail—is why we have a criminal sanction for parents if in fact it is not being used. I would like to know exactly what the education department policy is on whom to prosecute and when to prosecute. I do not think that is clear at the moment. If it is there just as a reserve provision which is not intended to be used, then the question is: why increase the penalty from \$200 to \$500? With those remarks I support the legislation.

Mr O'BRIEN (Napier) (11:21): I rise to support this bill. Ensuring that young people complete their schooling is pivotal for the continued prosperity of this state, and, most importantly, it is essential for the well being of young people themselves. The quickest and most effective way to ensure that more young people stay at school longer is to legislate for it. This will be the second time that this government has lifted the school leaving age, having already raised it from 15 to 16 in 2003. Legislating to ensure that children stay at school is, however, only one plank of our reform agenda for this complex problem. The need to have young people complete their schooling is abundantly clear to anyone who has looked at the statistics involved.

Students who fail to complete their schooling are locked out of further study options and consequently are excluded from the majority of job employment opportunities in our modern knowledge-based and skills-based economy. There are always individual exceptions—I have known quite a few of them—who have done remarkably well in life without finishing school, but on the balance of statistical probability young people who fail to finish school find it difficult to obtain long-term stable employment. The SACE review released in 2006 found:

37.5 per cent of school leavers in the year 2002 who had not progressed beyond Year 11 were unemployed in May 2003

That is 37.5 per cent. It continues:

For school leavers who had completed Year 12, the unemployment rate was 17.5 per cent, half that of the early school leaver group.

Confirming these figures, in 2004 in South Australia 82.2 per cent of people with tertiary qualifications were employed, compared to 73.3 per cent of those who completed year 12, and only 57.5 per cent of people who left school before year 12. That is the group that this legislation is targeting. It is a group of which only about half were able to find secure employment on leaving school as opposed to nearly three-quarters who had gone the extra year who were able to attain an employment outcome. Moving from 50 per cent to 75 per cent is really the target of this legislation.

Young people who do not finish school find it difficult to find a job, because the proportion of jobs requiring tertiary qualifications is greater than the proportion of the population with these qualifications. As a society we are basically moving to a position of needing a very skilled workforce, but at the moment there is a direct skills mismatch within our community. Unless something is done this gap will only continue to widen, because skilled jobs—those requiring certificate III or IV or university degrees—are growing at twice the rate of non-skilled jobs, and that is at around 2.4 per cent growth compared to 1.2 per cent—just about double the rate. In fact, the growth in skilled employment is growing even faster in South Australia than it is in the rest of the nation, which I think is a positive for this state.

According to new data from the Department of Employment and Workplace Relations released on 24 October, South Australia has shown the strongest growth in skilled vacancies in the country, with vacancies increasing by 14.3 per cent. It should be noted that this is before the full demand of the mining and defence industry sectors finally kicks in. In future, young people who have failed to complete their schooling will be in an even more perilous position than they are currently. They will find their classmates going into the mining sector or the defence sector and they will be barred entry. Burdened by poor job prospects, young people who fail to complete their schooling are at risk of falling into a downward spiral of welfare dependency and social and psychological difficulties. Representing the electorate of Napier, I am very much aware of these particular problems.

Until 1990, South Australia had school retention rates above the national average. During the 1990s, retention rates fell away substantially and reached their nadir in the year 2000, when South Australian retention rates were at 65 per cent compared to the national average of 72 per cent. I think that was basically an underlying cause of our poor economic performance during the 1990s. In the five years to 2005, our retention rates grew at twice the rate of the national average and now stand at 71 per cent compared to the national average of 75.

We still have a little way to go, and hence the legislation. At a time when a skills shortage has created so many opportunities for those with skills and education, there are still too many young people who are failing to grasp these opportunities because they have not completed their schooling. It is a tragic outcome for these individuals and it is a missed opportunity for the state as a whole, because the single biggest constraint upon our economy in coming years will be finding sufficiently skilled individuals to meet labour demands.

Retention rates in northern Adelaide are lower than in the rest of the state, and consequently the problems encountered by early school leavers are higher. In my maiden speech, I cited several studies which highlighted the fact that the Elizabeth region stood out as the metropolitan region within Australia with the lowest combined TAFE and university participation across the nation. Pre-tertiary education was clearly failing the young people of the Elizabeth area.

I have often had occasion to return to this maiden speech because, effectively, it set my personal agenda as a parliamentarian to seek improved educational outcomes in the electorate of Napier. At the time, I came to the conclusion that the problem was so bad that it was not an option to keep limping along the same path and producing the same results. Such poor outcomes indicated a systemic problem within the education system that could only be solved by systematic reform. Decisive and bold action was required.

This government and the minister have gone about ensuring systematic change. We are changing the way children are learning and the environment in which they are learning. Unfortunately, systematic change takes time, particularly if it is done well. It takes time because reform implemented in the early years of schooling will take over a decade to materialise in year 12 completion rates. Furthermore, major reform can be truly successful only when supported by the community it affects. Consequently, what appears to be a long and arduous consultation period is required.

Finally, major building works in terms of new super schools require extensive behind the scenes preparation to ensure that they provide the best possible results. However, there are early indications that our reforms will pay long-term dividends. Starting at the critically important early

years, we have reduced class sizes in the years of reception to year 3. We have provided \$35 million for an early years literacy program to improve children's reading, writing, spelling and communication skills in preschool to year 3.

The feedback from all my principals is that they are noticing the results not only in terms of literacy and numeracy but also in terms of class behaviour. Across the state, 20 children's centres are being established, with a focus on finding and rectifying learning problems early in a child's life. These investments have been rewarded with some of the best results in the state literacy and numeracy tests on record, as was reported in *The Advertiser* on 1 November. However, it is in secondary education that this government's reform agenda is the most far-reaching. We are changing what students learn, how they learn it and the environment in which they learn. Simply forcing children to remain at high school through legislation is only a small part, albeit an essential one, of the solution to a complex problem.

The new SACE, the trade schools for the future and the new super schools being built as part of the Education Works program provide the key tools to ensure that all South Australian students will benefit from their time in the schooling system. The central theme of the new SACE is that curriculum should be approached in a flexible manner. Academic and vocational pathways can sit side by side and schools should have the ability to modify curriculum to suit local needs. Those who criticise the new SACE for allegedly dumbing down the curriculum need to be mindful that not all students will progress to university and that these students need to be catered for equally to those who have ambition to undertake university studies. As a young boy who went through Whyalla Technical High School, I am very much aware of the two paths down which young people can go.

The new SACE will allow for existing academic pathways to continue but it supplements these with alternatives for students. Under the prevailing system certain schools—like many in my electorate—are labouring to provide programs that prepare students for university when few of these students will progress to university. The SACE review suggested that the result of this is that these students are simply abandoning all forms of education or training because they are being forced into forms of study for which they see no purpose or relevance. Vocational training should not be considered by the education system as a second-rate or second-tier scheme. Wages paid to skilled trades people certainly indicate that the labour demands of the current economy are not prejudiced against vocational pathways.

Vocational training in schools should be undertaken side by side with academic training. In a modern knowledge and skills-based economy there is considerable crossover between vocational and academic training. The new SACE will provide the methodology to allow this crossover to occur, and the \$29.5 million investment in 10 new trade schools for the future will provide the environment in which this can occur. The trade schools will operate within existing schools and use the extensive facilities of the TAFE network. Unlike the Prime Minister's plan for an unbelievably expensive investment in bricks and mortar to replicate an infrastructure that already exists—and I see this all around the state—this government plans to bring vocational and skills training to supplement existing general education. An article in the higher education section of *The Australian* on 31 October states:

...leading skills formation countries such as Finland and Sweden worked to strengthen the connections between building knowledge and skills in young people rather than separate them as [Howard's] technical college plan does...the whole move [in Finland and Sweden] is to further integrate vocational and general education to allow students to move freely between the sectors.

Fluidity between traditionally defined vocational and academic sectors is necessary because modern jobs exist somewhere in a continuum between vocational and academic. As members can well imagine, an electrician wiring an air warfare destroyer requires considerable skills. These skills will not be learnt in an old-style technical college where troublesome students learn to weld two pieces of metal together.

This state Labor government's trade school model and the flexibility provided by the new SACE will allow students to remain engaged in education and move freely between vocational and academic studies. In northern Adelaide, the trade school for the future is being co-hosted by Parafield Gardens and my high school, Craigmore High School. We will be specialising in advanced manufacturing, engineering and electronics. This co-hosted trade school will function as part of the highly successful Northern Adelaide State Secondary School Alliance (NASSSA). NASSSA works as a cluster of schools, whereby each school has an academy. These academies provide each school within the alliance with a specific specialisation, and the new super school at Playford North will adopt the health and health sciences specialism.

In the fullness of time students will be able to travel between the different schools in order to pursue the specialisation of their choice. Students will pursue a conventional education at their home school and take courses offered by the academies as their extended learning initiative under the new SACE. I take my hat off to the minister and the group that developed the new SACE, particularly for the new extended learning initiative—I think it is absolutely brilliant. The NASSSA model of collaborative specialisation avoids the pitfalls of establishing a single specialist school or trade school within a particular location in so far as it avoids a two-tier state schooling system. If a single specialist school was set up in a particular area it could draw the children of more aspiring families into one particular school at the expense of other schools.

The NASSSA model is also particularly attractive because it is not a mandated structure but one driven by the schools themselves. Specialisation has proved extremely successful in the United Kingdom as I discovered on a three week study tour I undertook in July 2006. I had a fairly good idea before I embarked on that tour that they were experiencing tremendous success. The statistics and the commitment of the Blair Labour government indicated it. I visited specialist technology, engineering and business and enterprise high schools across the UK to investigate possible education models that could be applied here in South Australia. One highlight was visiting a new, state-of-the-art educational facility being built as a PPP at Hadley near Telford at the bottom of the Midlands and the beginning point of the British industrial revolution.

This super school involved the closing of three existing schools, as is the case with our model. From having some of the worst educational facilities in the UK, this disadvantaged area will end up with probably one of the best. I was pointed in the direction of the school at Hadley because it was the showpiece of the British educational system. It was a couple of months away from final construction completion when I went through it. I could not be happier that the team that managed the process at Hadley is now in Adelaide overseeing the Education Works program that will see six new super schools across Adelaide. As a point of interest, the moniker 'super schools' came not from the government but from media commentators. If they are talking about the educational offerings as opposed to just sheer size, the media have it just about right in using the descriptor 'super'?

The first two of these new schools will be built in the Smithfield Plains/Davoren Park/Playford North area, and so they should. These suburbs are in the heartland of disadvantage that exists in northern Adelaide. Along with my colleague the member for Light, I have taken a very keen interest in these schools. I can report that the only complaint coming from the community is that the schools cannot come quickly enough. The minister and I attended a meeting of the school council at Davoren Park Primary School, and the message that came through from the mums there was, basically: can you give us a rock solid assurance that our children will get in and will not be denied places in this super school because of children coming from outside the suburb wanting to avail themselves of the great educational opportunities that this new school will provide?

The price of providing an effective education is high, but the cost of failing is higher. Educational attainment is a strong predictor of later life outcomes in terms of employability, welfare dependency, general health and life expectancy. For people with lower levels of educational attainment, adverse social outcomes not only impact on the quality of their lives but also have a broader community implication in terms of the economic costs of extended periods of welfare dependency, high rates of health care use and gross under-utilisation of human capital in terms of exacerbating the skills shortage.

By investing so heavily in education, particularly in areas of social disadvantage, this government has attempted to neutralise the regrettable inequality of opportunity that children suffer simply as a result of where and to whom they were born. Lifting the compulsory school-leaving age will ensure that all students stay at school. The government's broad reform agenda in education will ensure that all students are given a leg up in life by our education system.

Mr PISONI (Unley) (11:41): I, too, rise to support this bill, which raises the age for leaving school to 17. I left school at the age of 16. I was fortunate that my parents understood the importance of continued training through the means of an apprenticeship. The only criterion from my parents was that I could leave school before I had completed year 12 but that I had to do an apprenticeship. I am really thankful that my parents had that understanding, and that they understood the value of an apprenticeship and the tools that that apprenticeship would give me in later life.

The unfortunate reality in our modern society is that many parents today cannot recognise the benefits of those skills not only for themselves but also for their children. Those parents grew

up in a welfare family, they have no mentor and they have no understanding of a work ethic. Consequently, they do not have the tools to be the guiding light for their children. This intervention, if you like, will keep children at school to this age. Let us be realistic: this measure will not affect many people at all in my electorate of Unley but it will affect the majority of people in the struggling outer suburbs (where I grew up) of Salisbury and Smithfield, which the member for Napier represents but which is not where he lives—at Springfield!

The challenge for the government is to ensure that children who need this guidance are not left to wilt at school and that they are left without mentors. An opportunity has been given to children as a result of this requirement to stay at school; and, hopefully, it will be a benefit to them beyond that age of 17. In other words, I would not like to see a situation where kids are at school just biding their time. I would like to see resources go to these schools so that these children can use that extra time at school (because technically they do not have a choice to be there without being in breach of the law) to improve themselves and to make them aware of the opportunities.

A previous speaker, the member for Fisher, made some very good points about trades, which are a great start for anyone in life. In my time in business I trained 20 apprentices in a 22-year period. One of the most satisfying things for me I think was seeing these young boys—they were predominantly young boys but we did have a female apprentice at one stage—

Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr PISONI: One of the most rewarding things about the apprenticeship system, particularly in a small business when you are very close to the training of these apprentices, is that these young lads, who do not have a lot of confidence when they join you and often have not even finished growing when they start at the age of 16 or 17 years of age, work alongside tradesmen and learn not only skills of the trade but also life skills in the workplace. Many of my apprentices went on to management positions elsewhere or started their own businesses. A lot of them left the trade altogether to go and get further academic skills, but that was an opportunity that was not available to them while they were at school.

So, building on the training that you receive at that young age, whether that be preparing you for university, TAFE or, alternatively, a trade, should be encouraged, because it is at that time when the greatest opportunity is given to us to study and improve ourselves. Realistically, most kids do not have a lot of responsibility outside of managing their weekends, and to use that time productively to improve their skills and make a valuable contribution to life as adults I think should be very much encouraged.

I would like to see, particularly in the trade schools and the areas that are teaching trades, an emphasis on enterprise and the option of going out on your own, whether that be as a contractor or starting as a carpenter, as the candidate for Makin, Bob Day, did. He started as a carpenter and built up a multimillion dollar business employing hundreds of people and now is very well connected within his community. But, again, the start was given to Mr Day through the apprenticeship system. He, obviously, was in a position where he could see an opportunity to use the skills he learnt and go out and be entrepreneurial and a businessman. Not everyone can see that, and I think that is where some mentoring would come in very handy for many of our younger people.

Previous speakers have been right in saying that the workplace of the future is the skilled workplace. I recently visited a couple of businesses—one was quite a small business and one a large business, but the larger business was a customer of the smaller business, which was an electrical engineering company. Its job primarily was to identify robots that could be used to replace unskilled labour and then to program those robots and match them with cameras and work with mechanical engineers to produce a conveyor belt system.

So we saw these very highly skilled tradespeople and tertiary educated people working together producing a product that was going to replace 20 unskilled jobs. But the good news of this story is that, because those efficiencies were able to be kept in that business, that business that employs 80 people here in South Australia now does not have to move to China. So, that was a great success story.

I have seen that happening in irrigation and in other areas. We tend to see quite a bit of this, particularly in businesses that produce plastics and electronic products and, of course, we are seeing it more so in the motor industry. So, it is important, I think, that we understand that, just because you may start your life as a tradesman does not mean that is where you will be for the

next 20, 25 or 30 years. In my time in business and in my time as a member of parliament I have come across many people who started their life as tradesmen and are now running large businesses or businesses of their own, or are TAFE lecturers or in a different area altogether. However, the bottom line is that it was that initial start in life—the training they received as young people—that got them to where they are today. On that basis, I am very happy to support this bill.

Ms THOMPSON (Reynell) (11:50): I am very happy to support the bill. I congratulate the minister and those in her department for bringing it forward, particularly those in her department who are going to make it work. As has been indicated by the member for Unley, the impact of this bill is not universal. The ABS prepared an analysis for me in relation to the number of young people not attending school or training. At the time of the 2006 Census, in the Adelaide Statistical Division, 1,147 16 year olds were not attending school or training, which is 8 per cent of the 16 year olds in the ASD. In Reynell, unfortunately, 66 young people (nearly 8 per cent of the whole total of the ASD) live in Reynell, or 14 per cent of all 16 year olds, are not attending school or training. I know (as do, I am sure, members present) how much that will affect their future and their opportunities.

This is reflected as young people get older. In Reynell, 30 per cent of 17 year olds are not attending school or training, compared to an ASD of 17 per cent. At 18, the figure is 54 per cent for Reynell and 39 per cent for the ASD, and in the 19 to 24 age group, 74 per cent of young people in Reynell are not attending school or training, compared to only 56 per cent for the Adelaide Statistical Division. That shows a significant difference in the opportunities that these young people have.

The first reaction when I talk to people about that is to ask whether these young people are in jobs, and whether they are in good jobs. The Census does not really tell us that sort of figure very easily, but it does tell me that, in Reynell, three-quarters of the 15 to 19 year olds are earning less than \$250 a week. When we move to the 20 to 24 age group, we see that two-thirds are earning less than \$600. So, it does not appear that they are leaving school to engage in well paid, meaningful work, with a significant future. It is reflected all the way up the line.

The City of Onkaparinga has in the past produced an excellent community atlas, which I hope it will continue to produce under the current administration. This shows that, at the 2001 Census, 4.5 per cent of people in Morphett Vale (which is about two-thirds of my electorate) held a university qualification. This compares with an average across the Adelaide Statistical Division of 12.2 per cent. So, only about one-third of people in my area, compared with the ASD, have the benefit of a university qualification.

We are doing well in terms of TAFE qualifications. In Morphett Vale, 19 per cent of the population have a TAFE qualification, compared to 15.7 per cent of the ASD. However, what worries me is that, when I look at some of the figures for participation in TAFE training now, compared to the ASD, I see that we are not keeping up that record. We are in real danger of falling behind in the qualifications that we have.

There are many reasons for this. One, of course, is the rapid plummet in school retention rates that occurred during the mid 1990s, when we fell from about 92 per cent year 12 retention rate in 1992 (which is why I can remember the figure) to down to about 56 per cent by 2000. That had a severe impact on the future of young people in my area, and it is something that is very difficult for them to make up. But when we look at TAFE participation, comparing Reynell with the Adelaide Statistical Division, the number of kids attending full-time is less than across the Adelaide Statistical Division and, in terms of part-time, it is slightly higher. So, young people in Reynell at the moment are not being well equipped to take their part in the skilled jobs of the future and the types of jobs and future that the member for Napier has outlined so eloquently.

This move of demonstrating to the community how much we value education by requiring that every young person is in school, training or secure employment when they are 16 sends an important message not only to the children and the schools but also to the whole community about the importance of education in the future.

My concern about the lack of participation in various forms of education by young people in my area has been reflected in the fact that this year I have a parliamentary intern looking at the measures that we should be taking in the community as well as in schools to encourage young people to stay at school, to go on to TAFE and university, and examining what measures we might need to take to influence their parents to support them in that decision. When we have a community such as the member for Napier outlined and my community where there are few people in the older generations with university qualifications, it is very hard for them to understand what it might mean for their young people to go to university.

While most people opposite, particularly the member for Fisher, have talked about the importance of trades versus university, for me it is the importance of both. Particularly, we need to look at young people in the south being able to aspire to the full range of occupations that is needed to make a modern community function. At the moment, the south is experiencing a severe shortage of general practitioners and, indeed, it has experienced the shortage for quite some time. We have about one-fifth of the ratio of general practitioners that is available in the eastern suburbs and, in fact, the ratio of general practitioners in the south is often lower than it is in country South Australia.

When this occurs in the country, many measures are put in place to support young people from the country to go away to train to be doctors and come back to those country areas. I am looking to see such measures put in place in the south and the outer suburbs generally, so that young people from the outer suburbs, where there are severe shortages of doctors and other professionals, can be supported to train and then come back to serve their community in the same way, rightly, as happens in the case of young country kids.

I am pleased to see that the Minister for Health has announced recently that 10 scholarships of such a nature will be available each year for the next five years (I think it is); so, that is a start. I have written to the principals of high schools in my area and the St John's Ambulance cadets to point out that these opportunities are available because, unless it is clear to people as to where they can go, it is very hard for them to engage meaningfully in further education.

Just how uneven distribution of access to education is in our state, and the need to implement this new measure seriously and to build on it, is illustrated by a brief comparison of my electorate of Reynell with that of Bragg. If I had known that the member for Unley was going to speak so eloquently, acknowledging that it was not going to impact many of his students, I would have looked at that electorate. However, I looked at Bragg some time ago.

I point out that 34 per cent of the population of Reynell and 66 per cent of the population of Bragg have completed year 12. This shows a gross inequality in our area. In Reynell, I do not believe that masses of people who complete year 12 will get up and move out. Whilst some do, I do not think that that is an overwhelming trend. It is a matter that concerns the environment: it is how people approach schooling and further education, and our need to support measures particularly within our public schools, that will enable our youth to have access to the full range of occupations and professions available to others in our community and also, importantly, to increased life and cultural understandings obtained through further education, whether it be through TAFE or university.

This is one of the important things about the current structure of trade support being implemented by the state government and supported by the federal opposition, where young people are encouraged to develop their trade and technical skills in an environment of skill development in arts and crafts and overall cultural experiences, as well as sporting activities. One of the big problems with the federal government's Australian Technical Colleges is that they cost too much. The second problem is that they happen too late: they are only available at year 11. We need to expose young people to the skills that they might have when they are in years 8, 9 and 10, not wait until years 11 and 12.

Another problem is that the constrained environment does not enable young people to continue their development in terms of general education encompassing sport, drama, arts and other activities available in our larger schools. I think that is one of the reasons that the uptake of places in these technical schools has not been anything like what was anticipated and, certainly, in the southern college, unfortunately, there have been quite a number of withdrawals in its first year of enrolments; that is a very sad situation.

So, the combined measures of increasing the school retention age, developing a SACE which enables young people to explore their own skills as well as develop a better understanding of the world and how it works, combined with increased resources being provided through the state government—and, hopefully, when the federal opposition becomes the government, through them—will enable a broad range of young people to develop their skills to their full potential and become really active participants in our community.

At the moment, we are experiencing higher unemployment in Reynell than applies in the Adelaide Statistical Division; we have about 6½ per cent compared with 5 per cent across-the-board. Our workforce participation is only just under 60 per cent compared with 63.1 per cent overall. The lack of education in the community, in Reynell in particular—and often in the South but

also reflected, as the member for Napier has said, in the north—is having a great impact on many individuals and on the community as a whole. The measure that we are considering today is one small step in overcoming those difficulties and, as I have said, I commend the minister, the department and the government for its initiative with this legislation.

Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder) (12:04): As a parent of an 18 year old and a 16 year old, I think it is important that I say at least a few words. My son left school when he was 17¼, at the end of year 11. He decided that he wanted to go into a trade area, and I was quite proud of that fact. An opportunity was not available straight away, so he was within the TAFE system for six months before he was lucky enough to gain an apprenticeship as an electrician about two months ago. My great frustration is that it is in the city instead of the region in which we live (on Yorke Peninsula), but I am very grateful to the people who have given him this chance. He works for a small family-run firm, and they are very good to him, which is fantastic.

I wish to support the increase in the age to 17. I think it is important that we in this place do everything we can to ensure more security for young people who leave school so that they are ready to do so and in a position either to continue their learning opportunities or join the workforce. I think that the learning or earning focus is an important one. Essentially, it is the challenge for young people to become useful members of our society, but I think it is the responsibility of society to provide that opportunity for them. Too many people make far too many derogatory comments in relation to our young kids. They see the example of those who are relatively unruly and who create a lot of problems for sections of our community, and they class all younger people in the same way.

However, in the brief time I was the shadow minister for youth I had the fantastic opportunity to see some young people who will one day lead this nation. There are some great young people out there, and they are getting a lot of support. They probably have some mentoring from within their family circle, but no doubt they receive enormous support from within the school system, too, which is very key. I admit to being a 1962 child. I left school in 1978, when I was only 16½. I left at the end of year 11, and I think I was ready for that. In my case, it was more that my mother told me I had to because she was not prepared to put me through year 12, even though, in hindsight, I would have liked that opportunity. However, for me it was the threat of, 'Either get out there and find a job or be sent to Israel to work in a kibbutz.'

For those who do not know what a kibbutz is, as a 16 year old I considered it to be a bit of a slave labour camp, where you were up before dawn and finished at dusk. I thought that there had to be more to life than that, so I decided to leave school at the end of year 11 (as it was then called) and was lucky enough to get a position within a few weeks. So, it worked out for me, but I had friends who left school at the minimum age of 15, as it was then. My absolute best friend at that stage left when he was 15 and one day to take on an apprenticeship as a carpenter. Sadly, he had a terrible car accident only three years later and has been in a wheelchair ever since. However, it was the right time for him to leave school, too, so it does really depend on what the right time is for our young people.

I want to focus a little on unemployment because it is very high in South Australia, especially in the youth area. The overall unemployment of 4.9 per cent is a good statistic, and it is hard to criticise it but, for youth (those between 15 and 19 years), in the time I have been in this place and monitoring statistics, it has been in the 25 per cent bracket. Last month it reduced to 17 per cent, but again this month it is back up to 25 per cent. We need to make certain that government policies, with the support of the opposition and all political parties, ensure that that percentage comes down and stays down. We need to get it more in the realm of the Western Australian situation, where I think youth unemployment is about 7 per cent. Our great challenge is to create the economic opportunity within South Australia to ensure that that occurs.

Education is clearly the key. Everyone who has spoken today has reflected upon the fact that it is important for our young children, who are going through that difficult time of their life, when they are 14, 15 or 16, and who are considering their future options, to try to ensure that they make the correct subject choices. Having done that a couple of times in the last few years, it is hard to get the mix right, but we have to ensure that the educational system is there not only to provide advice to the child but also to ensure that the parents are involved in the decision. It has to be a collective decision and one that certainly focuses on the child's strengths and where their opportunities might lie in the best interests of the future of the child.

To me, there is no doubt that children who leave the education system must have a mix of future interests. In the past there was more of a focus upon university opportunities for young people, but I am very pleased to see that society's attitude is changing and that there is now a

recognition of the need for technical training. My son is an apprentice electrician, and it is fantastic for him. My daughter, who will definitely complete year 12 at the age of 18¼ in two and a bit years' time, will probably not go to university. That is a decision she has made, and again I am pleased because I know that she will get out there, continue her training opportunities and really push the fact that she wants a good job. It was probably 10 years ago when I heard that people being born at that time would not have five different jobs in their lifetime but five different careers—and no-one can have a career without continually improving their skills. So, let us hope this works.

Finally, I want to focus on South Australia's future needs as they relate to employment. All of us who look at the figures know that 765,000 South Australians out of a population of 1.85 million, I think it is, are in employment. The Select Committee on Balancing Work and Life Responsibilities, of which I was a member, heard evidence from Professor John Spoehr that, within the next eight years, South Australia's challenge will be that another 340,000 employees will be required either to replace those baby boomers who are retiring or required because of the economic growth within the state.

I asked Professor Spoehr to clarify that point because I thought it was amazing that such a large number of people would be required, and I reflected on the fact that participation rates are a key factor for the state. The member for Reynell made the same point, and she said that in her electorate the participation rates is lower than the state average. The state average is 63.1 per cent, and the national average is a bit higher than that, at about 66 per cent. We need to ensure that everything we do encourages a higher participation rate.

There is probably only a core nucleus of young people out there for whom this legislation will be particularly applicable, that is, those who are seemingly falling through the cracks who are continuing with their education or who are in the workplace, or who are being trained in some way. I think any move the government makes to arrest that situation and ensure that these young people who are falling through the cracks start to contribute and become great members of society and make a difference to our state is a good one. With those few words, I indicate that I am very happy to support the government's bill.

Ms BREUER (Giles) (12:12): I will be brief, but I do want to say a few words about this bill. Before becoming a member of parliament, I worked in the TAFE system and, prior to that, I worked for the commonwealth employment service for many years. In those days, one of the traps for young people was that they would leave school at 15, when they were old enough, and look for a job, and they found that employment was not always as easy to get as they thought at the time. Up until recent times, young people were able to access unemployment benefits at 15, and they would stay on that for some time. Initially, they would be keen to get a job, and they would go for job interviews. However, they would miss out on getting a job and, after they had been told about half a dozen times that they were not suitable, a syndrome would set in that would gradually get worse.

I would watch young people who had lots of drive and ambition when they first left school gradually lose that and go downhill and, after about six months, they would get into a syndrome where it was very difficult to get them moving again. They had been told so many times that they were not suitable for a particular job they had applied for, and they would then find it very difficult to motivate themselves to keep applying for jobs. If someone is hit in the head 20 times, they do not go back for the 21st time.

We saw this happen to young people, and this concerned me greatly at the time. So, I am very pleased that this legislation has been introduced, because it will ensure that these young people are in some sort of training, whether at school or elsewhere, and it keeps them motivated during that time. While I was working for the CES and TAFE, I worked with people in transition, particularly young people. These people had been unemployed for some time, and they were trying to enter the workforce. Initially, it was very difficult to get them motivated and to get them to come along for training.

Centrelink or social security would make them undertake training, although they were very reluctant and nervous about doing it because they thought everyone else would be smarter than they were. They had been sitting at home watching television for six, 12 or 18 months up to three years, and they were very reluctant to undertake the training courses.

The first two weeks of any course was getting them out of bed in the morning to attend TAFE and getting them motivated. We would give them something they could do so that they would have small achievements. and they would then go on to bigger and better things, and eventually we would get them to the point where we could get them to apply for and get employment because

they had the confidence they needed. Of course, against them was their long-term unemployment; employers would look at that and wonder why they were unemployed.

I was very aware of that syndrome and fought against it for many years in my previous positions, and I think this legislation will alleviate some of those problems—because that has continued on; it did not disappear when I went into politics. This syndrome can and does occur, and it is very difficult for people, which is why I support this legislation in particular. Initially I was a little horrified at the thought of people staying in school for so long; however, now that I have thought it through and looked at the alternatives for young people I believe it is an excellent choice for them and will continue to keep people in the workforce and maintain their motivation. I fully support the bill.

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (12:16): I rise to speak briefly on this bill. I commend the bill, and believe that these days you cannot have too much education. Opportunities are arising in this state—not just through universities, but hands-on opportunities such as trades—with the mining boom currently under way. Certainly, the Liberal Party promotes freedom of choice in education, and in this state we do have the freedom to attend either state or private schools. There is a lot of debate on what happens to communities if too many people attend other schools, but at least we can have that debate and decide where we want our children to go or where we think is the best place in terms of their career opportunities.

However, we also have to look after opportunities in the regional areas. Recently I went out to the East Murray Area School's 40th anniversary celebrations, and this school is a real oasis in the Mallee, encompassing a sporting ground as well. It is more than just a school; it is a community centre, and you can certainly see the people's pride in the school and community centre. It is just outstanding. The educational programs—whether it is growing vines or olives, or the workshop work they are doing where they have their own business and are selling products—are absolutely outstanding.

The importance of education is absolutely paramount. When I was at school I did up to year 10 at my local school at Coomandook and then I went to Urrbrae Agricultural High School here in Adelaide. My intention was to complete matriculation and then either come home or perhaps go on to something else, but for a lot of different reasons (I did not really mix and I did not like living in Adelaide) I ended up back at the farm. It may have been interesting to see where I would have gone had I finished matriculation; I may have made some other choices. Be that as it may, one way or another having a career in agriculture, the mining industry and the shearing industry has not done me too much harm, and I am now making a contribution in this place.

Earlier I talked about the future of the state, and there are many opportunities, not just in the urban areas but also regionally. Engineering firms are picking up contracts with the mining boom all around the state, and certainly work is being offered to people who are having hard times in regional areas. This is picking up some of the younger people who have, perhaps, just finished school; there is not enough income to keep them at home on their farms, so they might manage to pick up a job at the Australian Zircon mine at Mindarie near East Murray or at the Strathalbyn Terramin mine, which is also opening up in my electorate. So, there are certainly plenty of opportunities there.

As things boom along there are plenty of manufacturing opportunities in the region, especially around Murray Bridge and the Monarto region. There is the Complete Pipe Systems at Murray Bridge manufacturing plastic piping systems. There is a whole lot of transport infrastructure opening up around the Monarto region, and other opportunities with Australian Portable Camps having moved up there from Aldinga recently. They are certainly having a great boom directly related to the mining industry and other industries that need portable buildings. We cannot push enough good education or good training. It is common knowledge now that if you get the plumber out it will cost you more than if you go to see the doctor. So, depending on what you are good at, get good at it and you might be the one driving the Ferrari.

When I was attending Coomandook, at a school assembly at the end of the year, one of my school principals said to all the assembled children, 'If you thought this was a long time, wait until you get out in the workplace. You need to be prepared and ready to make the best contribution you can make in your life.' With those few words, I commend the bill.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (12:21): I wish to make some comments in relation to the Education (Compulsory Education Age) Amendment Bill. This bill contains a very simple proposal. It proposes to increase the compulsory—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Member for Davenport, can I just inquire, are you the lead speaker?

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Yes. It will not take long, Deputy Speaker. This bill simply raises the compulsory education age from 16 to 17, and there is a slight change in the definition in that you now have to be enrolled in compulsory learning programs rather than schooling. So, that is essentially the nub of the bill. It is a simple bill and, as the opposition has indicated, the Liberal Party will support the bill.

There are some comments I will make in relation to the bill. I have asked the minister's office to forward to me the truancy rates for various ages. I guess I will get them eventually, hopefully before my time in this place is finished. The minister might want to forward me the truancy rates eventually so that I can at least see what I might have said on the basis of those rates, but for some unknown reason the figures asked for two, three or four weeks ago, whenever we met in my electorate office, have not come, but that is life. Welcome to the minister's office.

Madam Deputy Speaker, in your contribution you mentioned a figure of 1,147 students you thought it might affect; the minister's speech mentions 2,000 students that it is going to embrace; and the briefing number that was given to me was 1,200 students. So, somewhere between 1,147 and 2,000 people are supposedly going to be impacted by this bill. All the bill says is that if you are of the age of 16 then you need to be involved in an approved learning program. You do not have to pass it, you simply have to be involved in it.

Essentially, that means rolling up and getting your name ticked off: a bit like going to vote, you do not actually have to vote, you just need to roll up and get your name ticked off. The way I read this bill that is essentially the process that is envisaged: that the 1,147 to 2,000 students that it might impact on do not actually have to pass, they just have to be involved. Basically they just have to roll up.

I know that the members opposite hold great hope for the impact of this bill. I have to say that it is my experience in life that it is a person's energy, determination and attitude that actually will determine their station in life. Education plays one part in that. The point I make to the house is this: currently the education age is 16, and there is a whole range of kids who are truant at whatever age.

I asked for those figures because I was trying to get a handle on what the truancy figures might be, but whatever the figure is there are those students who even though they are compelled to go to school do not go to school. We call them truants. All the 15 year old kids who are at school are doing the right thing. Those kids who are doing the right thing will continue to do the right thing, generally, and they will go on and continue their education. We are essentially talking about the 1,147 or 2,000 students (depending on whose figures you want to believe—the minister's or the member for Reynell's) who, essentially, do not want to continue their education at age 16 or 17.

This is the point that I think the member for Fisher made (or it might have been the member for Mitchell): ultimately resources are needed to deal with the kid that we now force to go to school who does not want to go to school, and those resources that will have to be supplied to the schools and the teachers in the classroom to deal with that problem. Previously, when they raised the age to 16 years (which was first promised by Malcolm Buckby when he was education minister) the government injected some \$28 million at that point. I know of no figure, at this point, for this change in relation to an increase in budget.

Essentially, what we are going to have is a piece of legislation that says to those kids of 16 or 17 who are not really interested in going to secondary school, 'You now have to go to secondary school for that extra year.' Then I am asking the question, I guess on behalf of the teachers and parents of the kids who do want to be at school: what extra money and resources will be put into the classroom to actually deal with this issue? Essentially, what this bill does is say: you used to be able to leave school at 16 regardless of your skill level; you can now leave school at 17 regardless of your skill level.

The member for Reynell mentioned issues about this somehow improving access to education. I dispute that. I do not think it changes the access regime to education. Every 16 year old and 17 year old now has access to education, if they so choose. I do not think it changes the access arrangements one bit. All this bill does is give the police and authorised officers the power to go out and round up these 1,147 to 2,000 kids on whom the legislation will impact and use the powers under the act to try to get them to attend school. The bill does nothing other than bring into the regime of the authorised officers another range of people who can be rounded up. I do not think it changes the access regime at all.

The member for Reynell talks about 'meaningful work', but the bill simply talks about being employed. One of the options is being employed. You do not have to be involved in whatever the member for Reynell means by 'meaningful work'. I am of the view that any work is meaningful work because it gives you a leg-up; it gets you into the employment market and you can make your way from there. I think the member for Unley makes a valid point when he says that education is a lifelong exercise. There are hundreds of thousands if not millions of people out there who left school early but then came back when they were 22 or 23, having matured and seen a bit of life, to seek some direction and undertake various training courses, whether that be in trades or whether it be accountancy or whatever is their field of interest.

The other issue I raise is that essentially what this bill is saying is that, because parents and guardians cannot get 16 year olds or 17 year olds to go to school, we are going to have legislation to compel them. Again, I come back to the point that, while the Liberal Party supports this particular piece of legislation, one has to ask oneself: what resources will be given to the school community? If parents or guardians cannot make the kids go to school, or do not want them to go to school, and the kids themselves do not want to go to school, then what in the bill, or in the budget, will make it happen? I asked for the truancy levels three or four weeks ago, so that I could feed them into the debate but, regrettably, that information is not to be provided to me.

The other issue is the approved learning program. I notice that after a year or so of this announcement, the minister has dropped an amendment on the table this morning without notice, warning or consultation. The amendment has been tabled. I am interested to see what the amendment does. One of the approved learning programs is volunteer work and, when we get to the committee stage, I will be interested to see how volunteer work fits in this particular program.

With those few words the Liberal Party supports the bill, and we look forward to a quick passage through the committee stage.

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (12:31): The startling omission in this debate is some explanation from the government as to why we do not have a new education bill to fundamentally review the whole Education Act 1972. When we debated increasing the age of children at school in 2002—the review—and then in 2003 raising it to 16, which the opposition supported (the former minister, the member for Taylor introduced it), we asked the question then: why has the government not introduced a complete review of the Education Act? Several speakers today have talked about systemic review and reform by this government, and yet, five years into this government, we have not seen a new education act.

We have had it in almost every other facet and portfolio area of responsibility. Ministers come into this house and explain to us how important it is, after decades, that new legislation be introduced. This legislation dates back to 1972, it has not been reviewed, and, in fact, the previous government in the lead-up to the 2002 election undertook two years of consultation. The then minister referred the matter to a select committee—I think that the member for MacKillop was a member of that committee; he may have been the chair—and there was very significant work done to prepare a new education act.

When we came to debate increasing the school-leaving age in 2003, the government had not been in power very long, and the excuse given to me at the time was, 'We need to have a look at it; we want to get on with the age for compulsory attendance at school. We need to have a little bit more time.' Five years down the track, we still do not have a new education act before us for consideration. Instead we have the cherry-pick, piecemeal approach of this government continuing in the important area of education, which I find, shamefully, an omission. Local schools in my electorate of Bragg, for all three sectors—public, Catholic and independent—have a high level of achievement in children being retained a school. That has been mentioned, I note, by one of the speakers today. That is something that we are proud of in my area—the high level of commitment to education.

The problem that we have in the eastern suburban area of South Australia is that our schools are so popular that they are frequently zoned. People from overseas line up for the public, independent and Catholic education sectors to enrol as students. An enormous number of people even move in to the area so that their children can go to those schools. Just today I read a letter from a family who lives in the area of the Marryatville High School, and they have been told, 'I'm sorry, there's no room for your child; you'll have to go across to Glenunga,' which is in the member for Unley's electorate. We have, in fact, the reverse problem. We do not have enough schools, we do not have enough capacity in the schools that we do have to accommodate the high level of demand. They are the sorts of issues that the government should be addressing.

I will not oppose this bill. I think that there is merit in the argument that, if children do attain higher education, they do have greater opportunity in life, in particular, to obtain sustained employment. That is very important; we support that principle. But, as I said in previous debates, unless the government is prepared to make a commitment to resources to ensure that the curriculum, as has been canvassed by other speakers, is commensurate with the attention span and interests of the students who will be compelled to stay at school, then it is of no merit.

There is not much point in having a nearly 17-year old boy in a classroom who is two foot taller than one of the teachers and who causes a disturbance unless they are actively engaged in their education. This bill introduces a new level of participation, rather than simply requiring attendance. The definition of 'participation' has been significantly expanded to mean not just attendance at a secondary school. That is logical and appropriate in the circumstances of modern education.

However, I am at a loss as to how the employment of a person can exclude them, and I would like the minister to answer this at some stage. This has been talked about. The bill does not explain the nature of employment for a person under the age of 17 who will be able to avoid the participation obligation under this legislation or how an employer avoids being prosecuted (which I now note in this legislation has a penalty of \$5,000) if they employ a child of compulsory school age, which, in this legislation, is defined as up to the age of 17 years. We do need some clarity about the nature of employment that will be excluded and how it will ensure that there is some indemnity to an employer who may be offering employment to a person during school hours.

The other aspect is that, whilst there is an increase in the penalty for parents who do not send their children to school or ensure that they attend and participate, there is also an increase in the powers of the inspectors or the authorised officers to be able to take children into care. As a member of the opposition, I introduced a private member's bill to consider the participation in education as an important component. That has already been rejected in the lifetime of this government. I notice that it has now adopted a number of those aspects and is running with them. I am pleased that it has taken up that initiative.

In relation to parents being able to escape prosecution, what is the point of expanding the powers of an authorised officer (which they have had historically and which have been repeated in new section 80) so that an authorised officer may at any time attend at residential premises—presumably of anyone—and request any person on the premises to provide the officer with the full names of all children of compulsory school age and the children of compulsory education age resident in the dwelling house and the respective ages of those children and the schools at which, or the approved learning program in which, if any, the children are enrolled in accordance with this part?

What is the point of expanding the powers of these people if they are not following through and ensuring that children are at school or participating in an improved learning program which, everyone agrees, is beneficial. We need to know how many authorised officers are currently employed and how many additional authorised officers (full, part-time or perhaps full-time equivalents) the government will employ. The best figures I have been given in the lifetime of this government is that, every day in South Australia, 10,000 children of school age do not attend school.

Some of them have legitimate reasons for not being at school such as they are sick, or they have a note to say that they did not get out of bed early enough, missed the bus, a special relative is visiting, they have a special occasion which they need to attend, going on a holiday, or visiting Aunt Mary, but there are also thousands who do not have a lawful excuse for not attending school.

What is the government doing about that? The previous minister said, 'We have difficulty enforcing this in the courts. We bring the parents to court for failing to ensure their children are at school.' At that stage it was a \$100 or \$200 fine, but I note that it has been increased to a \$500 fine. What is the point in having this legislation if there is no action and it is not followed through? There can be an army of authorised officers, but it is utterly useless unless it is followed through.

Frequently, people ask me, particularly on a Friday (which is the big truancy day), 'How can children be in Rundle Mall in school uniform after lunchtime and still no-one does anything about it?' Why are these children not approached and asked why they are not at school? The act provides that an authorised officer, who can be a teacher or principal, or other people appointed by the minister, can ask why they are not at school and return them to their home or place of school. If

it is established that a child has not given a lawful excuse and there is no legitimate explanation, why have the parents not been approached? If they have not given a legitimate explanation—such as 'I forgot to write a note,' or it is a special occasion—why are they not being taken to court?

The previous minister, in particular, was concerned, as is the government, about the lack of capacity to enforce the legislation against parents in the courts. Why are we not dealing with a bill to secure enforcement of the legislation rather than pretending that this is a way of enforcement which will never get used? I ask the question in the sense that 16 year olds will now be forced to stay at school. If they do not want to be there, they will disrupt others in the classroom or turn up in the morning and then leave at lunchtime. We have heard previously about these situations. They will cause further heartache for the school if there is no enforcement procedure to ensure it happens.

I say well done in relation to the participation factor. I am pleased to see that it has come about. The government might not have accepted my bill, but at least it is in this bill. Secondly, there is little point in having a process to encourage what we all see as benefits for children unless we have a process to ensure that those who are not complying with the obligations are dealt with—and some parents need support to do that. There is little point in our ranking up the compulsory attendance and participation age unless we do something about it. I ask the minister for some answers about this and to tell the house whether in the five years of this government there have been any prosecutions—and, if so, how many—of parents who have failed to ensure their children are at school.

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH (Adelaide—Minister for Education and Children's Services, Minister for Tourism, Minister for the City of Adelaide) (12:43): I am delighted to close the debate. I thank members from both sides of the chamber for their support for what is an important step in our reform agenda for secondary education, as well as the whole education process, in South Australia. I am particularly indebted to the insightful explanations of the principles underlying the Rann reform agenda given by the member for Napier. His input and diligence in driving reform, both in his own electorate and across the state, should be commended. He quite rightly points out that in an environment of high employment opportunity we need to increase the level of employability of school leavers to ensure that they get high-level certificates, diplomas and degrees. He quite rightly says that business as usual will not serve any reform agenda and we need to make changes.

I thank the members for Reynell and Giles for their comments about their own constituency, but I also thank the members for Hammond and Unley, and others opposite, who have made some significant observations and asked specific questions which I am happy to answer. Before doing that, I want to clarify a level of confusion amongst members opposite. We are not introducing a bill to increase the school leaving age. We are introducing a new concept. The proposition is quite simple—you imagine that you need more education so you keep children at school longer—but the reality is not as simple as that solution might imply.

In fact we are not proposing to increase the school leaving age to 17 years. We are happy to have the compulsory education age at 16 years, which is our reform, whereby children of the age of 15 years must be in school, but we recognise that children up to the age of 17, that is 16-year olds, should be gainfully employed, and the reason for that is blindingly obvious. We will have no increase in jobs in future for unskilled young people. We will not have jobs for early school leavers, and the massive job growth in South Australia and the rest of the developed world is in certificate 3, diplomas and university degrees and, unless we get our young people job ready, we will be facing the need to recruit overseas, to steal staff from interstate and to leave our children with no opportunities. This reform has to occur because the worst brain drain is young people not reaching their potential.

The class of young people we have introduced in this act is a compulsory education group, and of course there will be exemptions, as there are for 15-year olds now, but 'compulsory education' means that they must be enrolled in a school and, having been enrolled, they must then take part in training, in an apprenticeship or in a process whereby they are upskilling.

One of the points the member for Unley made that I thought was rather telling was his observation that, even if you take up one of those important jobs in the trades, the chances of your staying in that employment for the rest of your life are slim. You may well go back to university, take on a diploma or run a business, and in order to do that it is important that young people reach levels of certification in school through their SACE so that they can be flexible and change

directions in their lives. That is why what is a simple proposition has been worked through extraordinary collaboration to allow young people flexibility and options in their lives.

I am very pleased with the bill as presented to parliament now because we have been through a massive consultation process and independent reviews. We have brought stakeholders together and have tried on all fronts to accommodate the concerns of those people who will have to work with this bill when implemented.

The issues that have been raised specifically need to be answered. Of those 1,200 or so children whom we expect to stay in education during their sixteenth year, there will be some who, like the member for Goyder, might just have listened to their parents and, with a little more encouragement, stayed at school. They will become routine year 10 and 11 students; they will stay on at school into their next year of study and, to all intents and purposes, behave like the children in the electorate of the member for Bragg who stay at school because it is expected of them. Some of these children might be encouraged to stay at school until the middle of year 12, when they turn 17 years, and because they have got so far they will be on the path to achieving a SACE completion. The others will be registered and may well be in a VET course or employment, and the exemptions young people can achieve are related to what they are doing.

Of course, this is a labour intensive process because we will have to monitor those young people, find out where they are and track them. To address the question asked by the member for Bragg, we will not be introducing a fine for those young people in the compulsory education category, because we believe they are young adults; but we will be saying that they should be in work, in school or in training, unless they have finished year 12 (which some young people have done), unless they have gone to university (which some may have done), or unless they are in employment (which some may wish to be in).

The tracking will be the most significant change in that the school will have to register the fact that they have disappeared if they leave school; an employer will have to register the fact that they are no longer working in that employment; and an RTO will have to register the fact that they are no longer attending. That will set in train not a punitive process but a process whereby they will be approached and counselled.

It is quite clear that giving young people the same that they have been given before will not achieve higher retention levels or higher engagement levels, and that is why this is only one part of a comprehensive strategy that involves, of course, early intervention in early childhood, better literacy and numeracy skills, smaller class sizes and behaviour management processes in schools—a range of processes. It is early intervention so that we get to young people in the early years of difficulty (when they might be in years 8, 9 or 10) and keep them on the rails.

Some of the reforms are not apparent within this bill. For instance, last year we started year 9 testing for literacy and numeracy (the last chance to pick up underperforming skills at schools), and introduced intervention to make them able to continue in their education. People talk about money. The schools in which children decide to become routine (chemistry, physics, maths 1, geography or history), run-of-the-mill children (just like all those children in the member for Bragg's electorate) will receive the per capita funding that any school receives for any enrolled child—simple! Their money is there—not a problem.

On top of that, of course, there is the \$84 million School to Work Strategy which involves a massive reform agenda and which is being worked through on our SSABSA system and in our SACE reforms. It also includes funding for our 10 trade schools which will incorporate every secondary school in the state and which will have a real focus on counselling, career advice and job brokering for those young people who do school-based apprenticeships. However, where our school-based apprenticeships will, perhaps, differ from some other models of trade schools or technical colleges is that our young people will be within the context of a routine school.

That is especially important for those people about whom the member for Unley talked who might do a trade now but who, in the future, may well wish to go back to do a specific course, go to university or take up another career. They need to have the flexibility and the employability skills of year 12 completion. The member for Davenport said, 'Oh, they only have to attend; they don't have to do anything.' This is the sort of nihilistic approach—'Oh, it's terrible. They're dropping out from school. They're no-hopers; they're off the rails. What can we do? They might not be in the member for Bragg's electorate, but there's nothing we can do. They don't have the moral calibre to stay at school.' What was his line? 'They don't have the energy therefore, perhaps, we should just abandon them. These people are not good enough. They don't have the energy.'

The Hon. I.F. Evans interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH: The reality is—

The Hon. I.F. Evans: Stop lying, Jane.

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH: Excuse me, Madam Deputy Speaker, the honourable member did say 'energy' and he has called me a liar.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Is the minister asking that the honourable member apologise and withdraw?

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH: I am, madam.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I ask the member for Davenport to withdraw the word 'lie'.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Madam Deputy Speaker, I am happy for you to look at the *Hansard* and see whether I have used the word 'energy' in the context in which the minister just told the house. I used the word 'energy' in terms of people's energy and attitude, which takes them to their station in life.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! This is not a matter for debate. The word 'lie' was used. I heard that. That is unparliamentary, and I ask the honourable member to withdraw. If he wishes to make a personal explanation at a later time the honourable member may do so. I now ask him to withdraw the word 'lie'.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: I withdraw the word 'lie', and I hope that the minister does not tell any more untruths.

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH: I accept the member for Davenport's apology, mealy-mouthed though it was. The issue is that we have a shortage of people with skills in this state, and every young person—

The Hon. I.F. Evans interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH: —deserves an opportunity to achieve their potential. The biggest opportunity for us as a government is to get people into those opportunities and those jobs that are burgeoning in the air warfare destroyer industry, the defence industry and the mining sector to make our young people who are currently leaving school job ready. The greatest investments we can have are our \$84 million School to Work Strategy, the investment that goes into our new SACE and the flexibility and the opportunities through our trade schools.

The issue that is worth addressing from the comments earlier is that those young people who are walking with their feet would not want to stay at school, anyway—they are going, they do not want to be in classrooms, they are disruptive—but that misunderstands the whole context of our compulsory education class of young people (those who are aged 16 years). We are not offering the same opportunities as before, that is, physics and chemistry on a Monday to Friday basis in a secondary school with an academic basis.

We are offering them opportunities for flexibility. We are offering the chance to do school-based apprenticeships; we are offering the opportunity to go into a registered training organisation to take part in a TAFE course; and we are offering them part-time employment. But, as that process goes through, of course they will have to be monitored and followed so they do not drop through the cracks. But offering more of the same is not an option, and that was never our plan. Our plan in lifting the school leaving age was to have it coordinated with our SACE reforms, trade schools and investment in early intervention to ensure those young people, perhaps 1,200 of them who are currently not successful, have opportunities into the future.

In terms of what work would be regarded as meaningful, clearly this is a debatable and difficult issue. One might well argue (and I think it is a reasonable argument) that any employment that has decent conditions and a properly regulated environment is a good job but, clearly, a child who decides to leave school at 15 years but works two or three hours a week is not in meaningful employment and for the purposes of the bill we will be talking about 25 hours.

There has been criticism of the sorts of approved learning programs we should have, with the shock/horror that they might be volunteering. Those members who are present might like to look at the current SACE requirements whereby the SSABSA act and the SSABSA organisation allows volunteering to be part of the SACE requirements, and this is quite reasonable. One of the arguments that was put forward in the SACE review was that young people are engaged in a range

of activities which might include firefighting (the CFS is a very responsible activity) or surf lifesaving, not a kind of club that you participate in without any kind of accreditation, but organisations that run accreditation and examination processes that any involved person has to go through. There are ways to have those individual programs accredited for SACE and it is quite appropriate that that should occur so that young people can get credit for their skills. If we want young people to be employable, we need to recognise those employability skills when they demonstrate them.

The other area that I think is significant that I should respond to is the question of the confusion over the fines that are discussed in the act. There have always been fines for non-attendance at school and that has not changed, but what has changed is that in the course of meetings with our stakeholder groups the parent bodies suggested that the \$100 fine is inadequate and it should be increased to \$500, but I should make it clear that does not reflect or impact on the compulsory education students.

The other issue that has been raised is that of the number of truants, as they were called. We allocate figures based on attendance and non-attendance, and children who have unexplained absences are in the level of 3 per cent at the moment within our schools, and I understand that data was sent to the member for Davenport's office so I am not sure how that was lost. In addition, this material has been in the media and the subject of press releases, so we need to find out how that information was not apparent to the member.

The issue remains that we have no choice but to lift the skills in South Australia, and I think that all of those opposite understand that. I know that the Prime Minister has been quoted earlier this year as making some extraordinary statements. He clearly does not believe that children should stay at school beyond year 10 and actually has urged young people to consider leaving school in year 10 before going on to blame parents who encourage their children to pursue university studies. In view of the time, I lay the information from the Prime Minister on the table and am happy to wrap up my comments. I will answer any questions during the debate.

Bill read a second time.

In committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Progress reported; committee to sit again.

[Sitting suspended from 13:02 to 14:00]

WATER RESOURCES

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Presented a petition from 1,147 residents of South Australia requesting the house to urge the government to take urgent and immediate action to address the water shortage situation in South Australia.

GLENSIDE HOSPITAL REDEVELOPMENT

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Presented a petition from 175 residents of South Australia requesting the house to urge the government to retain the areas known as precincts 3, 4 and 5 of Glenside Hospital to ensure they continue to be available as open space and recreational, together with mental health services.

SOLID WASTE LEVY

Mr PENGILLY (Finniss): Presented a petition from 49 residents of South Australia requesting the house to urge the government to ensure all funding raised from the solid waste levy is directed to programs designed to help meet the SA Strategic Plan target for the reduction of waste to landfill.

SCHOOL FUNDING

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport): Presented a petition from 15 residents of South Australia requesting the house to urge the government to reject cuts to public school and preschool budgets to enable each student to achieve their full potential.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

The SPEAKER: I direct that the written answers to the following questions on the *Notice Paper* be distributed and printed in *Hansard*: 12, 64, 83, 84, 87, 88, 91, 97, 99, 100, 106, 112 to 114, 118, 130, 145, 163, 170, 183, 189, 191 to 194, 201, 203, 205, 208, 211 & 213.

SUICIDE POSTVENTION

12 Mr HANNA (Mitchell) (9 May 2007).

1. How is the Government promoting suicide postvention services as a suicide prevention strategy?
2. When will the Government develop a suicide postvention policy, service delivery and staff support, education for professionals and accreditation of counsellors?
3. Has a steering committee been established to guide the forming of a central administering agency and if not, why and if so, when will it report?

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Kaurna—Minister for Health, Minister for the Southern Suburbs, Minister Assisting the Premier in the Arts): The Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse has been advised:

1. Suicide postvention services are an important element of a suicide prevention strategy. A key South Australian initiative that promotes suicide postvention is the implementation of the primary health care suicide prevention model which is supported by the square (Suicide Questions Answers Resources) education and training package.

This initiative, which is funded by the Australian and South Australian Governments, is being coordinated by the SA Divisions of General Practice with training provided by Relationships Australia SA. It has been piloted and evaluated in three metropolitan and country regions. Implementation of the model has started in a number of country regions with training commencing in June 2007.

Although suicide postvention information is already included in the square resources, a specific booklet on suicide postvention is also being developed which will primarily target trained counsellors and therapists throughout SA already skilled in grief counselling by giving them additional skills around suicide postvention. The upskilling of existing practitioners in metropolitan and country regions will ensure that people will be able to access services in the communities where they live.

Suicide prevention and postvention is also promoted as part of the core business of the public mental health services. Relatives and friends of people who have suicided are offered grief or suicide postvention counselling from mental health services. Mental health services may also provide grief or suicide postvention counselling when significant community events occur.

As part of the National Suicide Prevention Strategy, I am advised that Anglicare SA has been funded by the Australian Government to provide a new suicide postvention program – 'Living Beyond Suicide: Support for Families Recently Bereaved Through Suicide'. This community-based postvention program will support families immediately after a suicide through the provision of emotional and practical support. This project builds on the existing work undertaken by Anglicare through its Loss and Grief Centre.

2. The South Australian Government's policy direction on suicide prevention (including postvention) is guided by and consistent with the direction of the National Suicide Prevention Strategy. As indicated in response to the previous question, suicide prevention is part of the core business of the specialist mental health services in South Australia.

3. The South Australian Government continues to collaborate closely with the Australian Government under the National Suicide Prevention Strategy to build on the learnings of suicide prevention (including postvention) initiatives to ensure a coordinated and comprehensive approach to suicide and self-harm. This includes a steering committee which addresses statewide suicide prevention issues and projects, such as square.

STATE HERITAGE LIST

64 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (31 July 2007). How many buildings were added to the State Heritage List in each year since 2003-04 and how many buildings were delisted in each of these years?

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Kaurna—Minister for Health, Minister for the Southern Suburbs, Minister Assisting the Premier in the Arts): The Minister for Environment and Conservation has been advised:

The growth of State Heritage Places entered in the SA Heritage Register has been as follows:

2003-04

Four places were provisionally entered, one provisional entry was removed, five provisional entries were confirmed and two confirmed entries were removed.

2004-05

Five places were provisionally entered, two provisional entries were removed, and two provisional entries were confirmed.

2005-06

Two places were provisionally entered and three provisional entries were confirmed.

2006-07

Three places were provisionally entered, three provisional entries were confirmed, and seven confirmed places were removed.

The total number of State Heritage Places as at 30 June 2007 is 2,199.

CULTANA ARMY TRAINING CAMP

83 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (31 July 2007). What will be the cost of expanding the Cultana Army Training Camp and how much funding has been allocated to this project in 2007-08?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Port Adelaide—Deputy Premier, Treasurer, Minister for Industry and Trade, Minister for Federal/State Relations): The proposed expansion of the Cultana Training Area will be undertaken by the Commonwealth Department of Defence. All costs associated with acquiring the existing pastoral leases, constructing any necessary infrastructure and generally setting up the expanded area for Defence use will be the responsibility of the Commonwealth.

The State Government has agreed to undertake the necessary work for technical identification and protection of present rights over the land. It is anticipated that any related costs will be borne from within existing agency budgets.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN PRIVATE EQUITY PROGRAM

84 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (31 July 2007). Why has funding to the South Australian Private Equity Program been increased by \$7.7 million?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Port Adelaide—Deputy Premier, Treasurer, Minister for Industry and Trade, Minister for Federal/State Relations): The Department of Trade and Economic Development (DTED) has advised:

On 11 August 2005, the Premier announced that Paragon Advisory Pty Ltd would receive up to \$10 million from the Government under the South Australian Private Equity (SAPE) Program, on the basis that it raises between \$3 and \$4 in private capital investment for every \$1 that the Government invests.

Fund raising for the Paragon Private Equity Fund 1, managed by Paragon Private Equity (formerly Paragon Advisory Pty Ltd) achieved a final close in April 2007. A total of \$25.6 million in private capital investment was committed as at final close. The Government's commitment at final close, based on the approved and documented formula of \$1 for every \$3 of private capital investment up to \$15 million of private capital investment and \$1 for every \$4 of private capital investment over \$15 million, is \$7.7 million.

The \$7.7 million funding commitment is the actual final commitment under the approved amount of up to \$10 million. It is not an increased commitment. The balance of the \$10 million, namely \$2.3 million, will not be required under the SAPE Program.

PUBLIC HOSPITALS, ADVERSE EVENTS

87 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (31 July 2007).

1. In each year since 1995, how many South Australians have died from 'adverse events' or medical mistakes within the State's Public Hospital System?

2. In each year since 1995, how many South Australians have died from 'adverse events' or medical mistakes at each of the following hospitals: Royal Adelaide Hospital, Flinders Medical Centre, Modbury Hospital, Queen Elizabeth Hospital, Daw Park Repatriation General Hospital, Women's and Children's Hospital, Lyell McEwen Hospital, Noarlunga Hospital, St Margaret's Rehabilitation Hospital, Gawler Hospital and Glenside Hospital, and in each case, what were the reasons and details of these events?

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Kaurna—Minister for Health, Minister for the Southern Suburbs, Minister Assisting the Premier in the Arts): I am advised:

1. Since 1995, no formal study such as the 'Quality in Australian Healthcare study' has been conducted to establish the number of South Australians that have died from 'adverse events' or medical mistakes in South Australian Public Hospitals. Without such a rigorous study, which in itself is subject to methodological weaknesses that can affect reliability and validity, it is impossible to accurately quantify deaths from adverse events or medical mistakes.

2. While no formal study has been conducted since 1995 into the number of deaths from adverse events or medical mistakes in Australia, the South Australian Department of Health introduced in 2003 a reporting system for health services to report sentinel and serious adverse events (events in which death or serious harm to a patient has occurred) to the Department of Health. Not all events reported to the Department of Health have resulted in death. Reported deaths may not be directly attributable to an adverse event or medical mistake. Nonetheless, the health service investigates the death to identify vulnerabilities in the system and takes corrective action.

26 deaths have been reported to the Sentinel and Serious Adverse Event System from all South Australian Public Hospitals from 2003-04. In 2004-05 there were 27 deaths and in 2005-06 there were 30 deaths reported. The reporting system is not designed to determine if an adverse event could conclusively be causatively connected to the outcome of death in patients. Rather, the system is designed to review all cases of unexpected outcomes of death and serious injury of patients and improve hospital systems to reduce the likelihood that identified vulnerabilities could contribute to or cause harm in future.

The reported deaths from 2003-06 were associated with inpatient suicide, obstetric problems, medication problems, gas embolism, falls, clinical management of medical conditions including resuscitation techniques, misdiagnosis and delays in correct treatment and diagnosis.

INDIGENOUS MEDICAL SCHOLARSHIPS PROJECT

88 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (31 July 2007). How much Government funding has been allocated to the Indigenous Medical Scholarships Project and how many scholarships were approved in each year since 2003-04?

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Kaurna—Minister for Health, Minister for the Southern Suburbs, Minister Assisting the Premier in the Arts): I am advised:

\$740,000 has been allocated to the Indigenous Medical Scholarships Project since 2003-04.

During this time, the following scholarships were approved each year:

Year	New Scholarships	Existing Scholarships	Total
2003-04	8	13	21
2004-05	11	15	26
2005-06	16	11	27
2006-07	18	17	35
Total	53	56	109

TRANSPORT SAFETY AND REGULATION SERVICES PROGRAM

91 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (31 July 2007).

1. Why did the estimated result for 'employee benefits and costs' under the Transport Safety and Regulation Services Program exceed the budgeted amount by \$6.2 million in 2006-07?

2. Why has there been further \$2 million budgeted for 'employee benefits and costs' in 2007-08 and how many more employees will be employed under this Program?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Elder—Minister for Transport, Minister for Infrastructure, Minister for Energy): I provide the following information:

The increase in 'employee benefits and costs' in 2006-07 is primarily a result of:

- A proportion of Corporate overhead charges originally budgeted to 'supplies and services' which are now allocated to 'employee benefits and costs'; and
- Employee costs previously allocated to investing projects, now being charged to the operating program.

2. The increase budgeted in 'employee benefits and costs' in 2007-08 is a net result of:

- enterprise bargaining increases to salaries and wages;
- A proportionate reallocation of corporate overhead charges to 'employee benefits and costs' from 'supplies and services'; and
- Increased expenditure resulting from a total increase of 18 FTEs associated with 2007-08 Budget Initiatives including:
 - (i) Rural Road Safety—additional support;
 - (ii) Heavy Vehicle driver fatigue management—increased support;
 - (iii) Vehicle Emission standards—testing services; and
 - (iv) Unregistered/uninsured vehicles—increased compliance.

MOTOR VEHICLE REGISTRATION DATABASE

97 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (31 July 2007). What was the total cost of implementing the new vehicle registration database in 2006-07?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Elder—Minister for Transport, Minister for Infrastructure, Minister for Energy): I provide the following information:

The total cost of implementing the new vehicle registration database in 2006-07 was \$3.2 million.

ROADS, RURAL SEALED NETWORK

99 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (31 July 2007).

1. Why is the 2006-07 estimated result for the percentage length of rural sealed network to be rehabilitated only 0.1 per cent when the 2006-07 target was 0.4 per cent, and why has the target been reduced to 0.1 per cent in 2007-08?

2. Why is the 2006-07 Estimated Result for the percentage for the length of rural sealed network rescaled only 2.6 per cent when the 2006-07 target was 3 per cent?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Elder—Minister for Transport, Minister for Infrastructure, Minister for Energy): I provide the following information:

1. The 2006-07 predicted rehabilitation target of 0.4 per cent was based on the reported 2005-06 achievement of 0.4 per cent. This 2005-06 reported achievement was subsequently found to be incorrect with some treatments having been incorrectly coded. The actual amount rehabilitated in 2005-06 was 0.1 per cent and this should have been the target for 2006-07. The estimated result for 2006-07 is on par with the 2005-06 actual and typical of the annual rural coverage rate.

2. The 2006-07 resealing result is slightly down on the target due to the use of some of the funds to repair the existing surface of approx 0.4 per cent of rural sealed road using restoration treatments, such as waterblasting. These treatments aim to rejuvenate the existing seal and are not recorded as a new surfacing (i.e. reseal).

FLOOD DAMAGED ROADS

100 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (31 July 2007). How will the \$23.5 million committed to repairing flood damaged roads be spent in 2007-08 and what repairs have already occurred as a result of the \$6 million already spent in 2006-07?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Elder—Minister for Transport, Minister for Infrastructure, Minister for Energy): I provide the following information:

During 2007-08, the Department for Transport, Energy and Infrastructure (DTEI) intends to undertake the following works:

On the Sealed Road Network

- Construction of four new major floodways to replace those lost around Hawker.
- Continue to repair damage caused to floodways and repair shoulder scouring and damage across the road network.
- Continue to repair scours to sides of creeks and levee banks and install scour protection in the form of large rocks.
- Continue to repair scour damage around culverts and undertake scour repairs around bridge structures.
- Stabilise remaining sections of road pavement that were weakened due to water infiltration.

Unsealed Road Network

- Undertake stabilisation works at unsealed floodways and scour repairs to side drains where they match into creek alignments at floodways.
- Replace rubble on unsealed roads washed away during the event.
- Repair scour damage around culverts, grids and in creeks using large rocks and concrete.
- Remove silt build-up around creeks and floodways.

DTEI will continue to monitor the progress of the works against the budget allocation.

To date, DTEI has undertaken \$6.4 million in repair works. The following is a brief summary of the current status of the works program.

Sealed Road Network

Floodways—major damage

Significant damage was caused to four floodways:

- Hawker—Orroroo Road, at Yanyarrie Creek and Wirreanda Creek (Cradock)
- Wilpena—Hawker Road, at the Wonoka Creek and 1km north of the Hawker Airstrip

Demolition works and construction of temporary detours have been completed. A detailed drainage assessment has been undertaken by an independent expert and the designs for replacement structures are due in August 2007.

Floodways—minor damage

Damage to varying degrees was incurred to the majority of floodways in the Flinders Area, in particular on the Leigh Creek-Hawker Road, Wilpena-Hawker Road and Hawker Orroroo Road. In February 2007, work crews commenced repairs, mostly scour and concrete repairs and it is estimated that it will take 12 months to complete these works.

Shoulder Scour—major damage

Major scour damage incurred to shoulders across the road network, with sections up to 0.6 metres deep washed away. The majority of damage occurred on the Eyre Highway, Stuart Highway, Lincoln Highway, Iron Knob-Whyalla Road, Leigh Creek-Stirling North Road, Wilpena-Hawker Road and Hawker-Orroroo Road. Major repairs on these roads have been completed.

Shoulder Scour—minor damage

Minor scour damage incurred in hundreds of locations across the network; work crews are systematically working through roads to undertake repairs.

Scour to road embankments

Significant scour incurred to large road embankments on Stuart Highway and Roxby Downs-Pimba Road. The majority of these repairs have been completed.

Scour to sides of creeks and levee banks

Significant scour damage was incurred along the edges of creeks and existing levee banks, due to the high intensity and velocity of the creek flows, particularly along the Leigh Creek-Stirling North Road and Hawker-Orroroo Road. In a number of locations the extent of scour was such that it impacted the integrity of the adjacent road. Work is underway to reshape these areas, install a protective fabric and place large rocks, in excess of 0.7 metres in diameter. This work will reinstate the shape of the creek edge or levee bank and provide a protective barrier against future scour in these areas. Work is continuing.

Scour around culverts

Scour occurred around many culverts in the Flinders Ranges area. A small work crew is systematically working across the network to undertake repairs.

Weakened Road Pavements

A number of sections of road pavement were weakened due to water infiltration. A one kilometre section of the Hawker-Orroroo Road has been stabilised using cement and resealed. Other sections will be addressed during 2007-08.

Unsealed Roads

DTEI's work crews moved across the unsealed road network and made temporary repairs to scours in the road pavements and unsealed floodways to allow access to remote communities.

Work crews have now commenced undertaking final repairs, which include replacing sheeting material on roads where it was washed away, repairing and stabilising floodways and undertaking repairs to side drains that were badly scoured. Repairs to road embankments and the sides of creeks using large rock as detailed above is also being undertaken.

TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURE SERVICES PROGRAM

106 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (31 July 2007). Under the Transport Infrastructure Services Program:

- (a) why is there a \$11.2 million increase in employee benefits and costs in 2007-08;
- (b) why was there a \$4.8 million underspend for 'supplies and services' in 2006-07;
- (c) why have 'other' expenses been reduced by \$2.8 million in 2007-08;
- (d) why is there a \$1.5 million decrease in the 'sale of goods and services' in 2007-08; and
- (e) why is there a \$2.7 million increase in income from 'other' sources?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Elder—Minister for Transport, Minister for Infrastructure, Minister for Energy): I provide the following information:

- (a) The \$11.2 million increase is a result of:
 - a proportion of Corporate overhead charges originally budgeted to 'supplies and services' being allocated to 'employee benefits and costs'; and
 - enterprise bargaining increases to salaries and wages.
- (b) The \$4.8 million underspend for 'supplies and services' in 2006-07 is attributed to:
 - the re-allocation of corporate costs from 'supplies and services', 'grants and subsidies', and 'other' to 'employee benefits and costs'; and
 - carryover of LeFevre Peninsula expenditure (operating in nature) to 2007-08.
 partially offset by:
 - a re-classification of investing minor works expenditure that was operating in nature; and
 - a re-classification of ICT finance lease expenditure from 'depreciation'.
- (c) 'Other' expenses reduced by \$2.8 million in 2007-08 as a result of:

- one-off expenditure in 2006-07 associated with Mawson Connector, and costs associated with the disposal of Rail Land; and
 - the reallocation of Corporate overhead charges originally budgeted to 'supplies and services'.
- (d) The \$1.5 million decrease in the 'sale of goods and services' in 2007-08 is due to rental property income being recognised against 'other' income.
- (e) The \$2.7 million increase in 'other' income is from the transfer of rental property income from the 'sale of goods and services' and increased interest earnings due to higher Rail Transport Facilitation Fund cash balances.

CONTRACTORS

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Elder—Minister for Transport, Minister for Infrastructure, Minister for Energy): I provide the following information:

The Department is not aware of any overpayments to contractors, defective service adjustment provisions, or unreliable assessments of contractor's compliance.

DRIVER AND VEHICLE LICENSING

113 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (31 July 2007). Have identified areas for improvements of Driver and Vehicle Licensing operations in 2006-07 been implemented?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Elder—Minister for Transport, Minister for Infrastructure, Minister for Energy): I provide the following information:

The Department for Transport, Energy and Infrastructure introduced a new EzyPlates web site that has resulted in a 40 per cent increase in special plate sales over the internet. Overall Driver and Vehicle Licensing transaction volumes through the Internet have also grown by 15 per cent during the year.

The TRUMPS registration and licensing system was implemented in September 2007.

The expansion of on-line and electronic delivery of services, using TRUMPS, will now be progressed.

MOBILE PHONES

114 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (31 July 2007). With respect to Departmental mobile phones:

- (a) how many employees currently have a departmental mobile phone;
- (b) what is the annual expenditure on mobile phones and related costs;
- (c) what is the formal process currently in place to allow the allocation of mobile phones to be justified against the Department's policy criteria;
- (d) have all Departmental employee mobile phones been approved by the employee's manager;
- (e) what arrangements are in place to ensure employees reimburse the Department for the cost of private calls or calls not actually made by the employee; and
- (f) has the Department reported back to the Auditor General on these issues?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Elder—Minister for Transport, Minister for Infrastructure, Minister for Energy): I provide the following information:

The below relates to the Department for Transport Energy and Infrastructure (DTEI) prior to the inclusion of the ex-Department for Administrative and Information Services (DAIS) divisions. These new divisions continue to receive their ICT Services, including those associated with mobile phones, through the Department of Treasury and Finance (DTF).

- (a) There are currently 1006 employees who have mobile phones. This includes 135 from the Passenger Transport Division.
- (b) The annual expenditure for the mobile phones, including call costs and handset purchases is \$446,000.

- (c) The process requires a business case providing justification and outlining the business need for the mobile handset/service/accessory and must be approved by the section manager or nominated delegate prior to the acquisition of services from the service provider.
- (d) DTEI policy requires all departmental mobile phones be approved by the employee's manager.
- (e) DTEI has an electronic process which requires all users of departmental mobile phones to verify that the calls recorded on the individual mobile reports are valid and to identify any personal calls. The employee is required to reimburse the department for private use of the phone.

DTEI provided a response to the Auditor-General in late 2006.

BUS REPLACEMENT

118 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (31 July 2007). How many additional buses will be purchased from the \$17.4 million allocated under the Bus Fleet Replacement Program and how many older buses will be decommissioned and replaced with new buses?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Elder—Minister for Transport, Minister for Infrastructure, Minister for Energy): I provide the following information:

The bus replacement program is a program to replace decommissioned buses. 44 buses will be delivered in 2007-08.

CONTRACT POSITIONS

130 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (31 July 2007).

1. How many senior public servants within the Department and TransAdelaide transferred to contract positions in 2006-07, what are their pay scales and how many are women?

2. What initiatives will be introduced to retain and attract high quality people with relevant skills and qualifications to the Department?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Elder—Minister for Transport, Minister for Infrastructure, Minister for Energy): I provide the following information:

The following table provides information on those senior public servants within the Department for Transport, Energy and Infrastructure (DTEI) and TransAdelaide who transferred to non-tenured contract positions during 2006-07.

Agency	Classification Level	Gender	TRPV of Contract (to nearest \$1,000)
TransAdelaide	Equivalent to Executive Level A	Male	\$110,000
TransAdelaide	Salaried Officer Level 8	Male	\$112,000
DTEI	Executive Level A	Male	\$133,000
DTEI	Executive Level A	Male	\$132,000
DTEI	Executive Level A	Male	\$159,000
DTEI	Executive Level A	Male	\$137,000
DTEI	Executive Level A	Male	\$152,000
DTEI	Executive Level A	Male	\$129,000
DTEI	Executive Level B	Male	\$170,000
DTEI	Executive Level B	Male	\$164,000
DTEI	Executive Level B	Male	\$153,000
DTEI	Executive Level B	Male	\$170,000
DTEI	Executive Level F	Male	\$329,000

DTEI Shaping South Australia's Future (2006-10) provides a comprehensive workforce planning framework and implementation strategy to retain and attract high quality staff.

PUBLIC TRANSPORT PATRONAGE

145 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (31 July 2007). What does the increased patronage of 4 per cent for trains and trams for 2007-08 equate to in numerical terms and does this take into account the effects of increased fares?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Elder—Minister for Transport, Minister for Infrastructure, Minister for Energy): Based on 2006-07 patronage figures, an increase of 4 per cent equates to 12,653,032.

ROAD MAINTENANCE

163 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (31 July 2007). For each year since 2000-01:

How much has the State Government spent on building and maintaining metropolitan and non-metropolitan roads, respectively, what is this expenditure in per capita terms and what has been the Federal Government's contribution?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Elder—Minister for Transport, Minister for Infrastructure, Minister for Energy): I provide the following information:

Since 2001-02, the last full year of the previous Liberal Government, road maintenance has steadily increased. In 2007-08 the State Government has budgeted \$76 million in road maintenance operating expenditure. This compares with \$61 million in 2001-02—the last full year in office for the Opposition. Additionally in 2007-08 the State Government has boosted the Long Life Roads Program by \$3 million, a program aimed at preservation of the State road network including shoulder safety improvements and targeted safety improvements, and a further \$23.5 million has been allocated to address damage from flooding in the north of the State.

The State Government will spend \$287.8 million (\$76 million maintenance and \$211.8 million road capital) this financial year on road maintenance and road investment, a record amount for a South Australian State Government and nearly double that of the Liberal Government's road transport investment spending in 2001-02.

In terms of total transport investment the State Government has allocated \$311 million (excluding maintenance) for 2007-08, more than double that of the last State Liberal Government (\$129 million).

South Australia's 6.1 per cent share of the Australian Government's AusLink National Network Programme funding compares unfavourably with other key indicators such as: population (7.6 per cent), lane kilometres of the National Network (11.8 per cent) and road freight task (tonne-kilometres) (8.8 per cent).

HOUSING TRUST

170 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (31 July 2007). How many Housing Trust homes were sold in Warradale, Glengowrie, Glenelg East, Glenelg North, Glenelg, Glenelg South, Somerton Park, North Brighton and Novar Gardens in each year since 2000-01, and what were the total sales (in dollars) for each suburb during the same years?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Minister for Families and Communities, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation, Minister for Housing, Minister for Ageing, Minister for Disability, Minister Assisting the Premier in Cabinet Business and Public Sector Management): Since 2000-01, ten South Australian Housing Trust homes have been sold in the suburbs of Glengowrie, Glenelg East, Glenelg South, Somerton Park and Novar Gardens, to a total value of \$2.06 million. Details of the sales appear in the table below.

Of the ten properties sold, five were to existing tenants, whilst the other five were vacant property sales. During that time, no properties were sold in the suburbs of Warradale, Glenelg North, Glenelg or North Brighton, nor for all suburbs listed in the financial years 2002-03, 2004-05 and 2006-07.

	2000-01		2001-02		2002-03		2003-04	
	No.	\$	No.	\$	No.	\$	No.	\$
Glenelg								
Glenelg East							2	421,000
Glenelg North								
Glenelg South							1	341,000
Glengowrie	*	37,125	*	142,800				
North Brighton								
Novar Gardens	1	113,000						
Somerton Park	2	233,000						

	2000-01		2001-02		2002-03		2003-04	
	No.	\$	No.	\$	No.	\$	No.	\$
Warradale								

	2004-05		2005-06		2006-07	
	No.	\$	No.	\$	No.	\$
Glenelg						
Glenelg East						
Glenelg North						
Glenelg South						
Glengowrie						
Glenelg South						
North Brighton						
Novar Gardens			2	477,500		
Somerton Park			1	295,000		
Warradale						

*The one Glengowrie sale was under the former Progressive Purchase Scheme, where 25 per cent was sold in 2000-01 and the remaining 75 per cent in 2001-02.

ENVIRONMENT PROTECTION AUTHORITY

183 Mr HANNA (Mitchell) (31 July 2007).

1. Has the EPA allocated any resources to survey communities to compare the environmental reporting by particular companies and the experiences of the local community?
2. To what extent does the EPA audit the reports on environmental factors sent to them by the owners or managers of industrial and commercial premises?
3. In what circumstances will regional reporting of air quality lead to particular spending programs to ensure air pollution is contained?
4. What costs would be involved to ensure containment of the air pollution at Port Adelaide and Whyalla?

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Kaurna—Minister for Health, Minister for the Southern Suburbs, Minister Assisting the Premier in the Arts): The Minister for Environment and Conservation has been advised:

1. The EPA is involved in programs incorporating both the local community and industry, whereby the experiences of the local community can be described and compared with environmental reporting by the relevant industries. The programs have been championed by a combination of the EPA, the local community and industry.
 - (a) The tenby10 program has been developed through a partnership agreement between the EPA, the Department of Health, Zinifex and the regional council.
 - (b) The Adelaide Brighton Cement Liaison Group stemmed from negotiations between the EPA, Adelaide Brighton Cement and the Adelaide Brighton Cement Residents' Group.
 - (c) Other forums include community meetings held in areas such as Kilburn, Whyalla and Strathalbyn.
2. Experts within the EPA audit and compare reports submitted by industries against the appropriate environment protection laws, policies, EPA guidelines, Australian Standards, National Environment Protection Measures and EPA licence conditions.
3. The EPA is committing resources as a result of carrying out regional monitoring and reporting within a variety of areas including Port Pirie, Whyalla, Birkenhead, and Kilburn. The reported air quality parameters are compared with relevant National Standards such as the National Environment Protection (Ambient Air Quality) Measure and the National Environment Protection (Air Toxics) Measure.

As with all EPA related issues, resources are allocated to ensure compliance with the Environment Protection Act 1993 and associated regulations and policies. EPA resources focusing on regional air quality topics are often directed towards the development of regional programs,

which incorporate the relevant stakeholders including Government departments, local government, local industry and the local community.

4. Currently the EPA is allocating resources in the form of employee resources, air monitoring equipment resources and visual monitoring equipment to the regions of Port Adelaide and Whyalla. The resources allocated to the Whyalla area include funding for the operation and maintenance of visual and air monitoring equipment and the equivalent of one Full Time Employee.

The resources allocated to the Port Adelaide area include funding for the operation and maintenance of air monitoring equipment and the equivalent of one Full Time Employee.

SUPPORTED ACCOMMODATION STRATEGY

189 Mrs REDMOND (Heysen) (31 July 2007). Does the Supported Accommodation Strategy aim to remove or separate people with intellectual disabilities into separate facilities from those with mental illness and how does it contemplate single gender facilities?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Minister for Families and Communities, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation, Minister for Housing, Minister for Ageing, Minister for Disability, Minister Assisting the Premier in Cabinet Business and Public Sector Management): The Supported Accommodation Strategy aims to help people across a range of all disability types as a result of intellectual, psychiatric, cognitive, neurological, sensory or physical impairments. The Strategy's focus is on meeting people's needs as a result of functional incapacity, regardless of disability type, under a single system so that all needs can be considered on a more equitable and equal footing.

Although some supported accommodation services for psychiatric disability fall within the scope of disability services provided by the Department for Families and Communities, primary responsibility for supported accommodation for people with mental illness sits with Mental Health Services through the Department of Health. As part of a 'stepped system of care', mental health will provide a range of supported accommodation options that will include psychiatric disability support within one's own home through to more intensive models of care, such as clustered housing with 24 hour staff support for residents.

Supported accommodation services are designed to best meet the individual needs of clients across both the mental health and disability systems. Decisions regarding the arrangements for individuals living together in congregate care facilities are determined by a range of factors including the nature of services to be provided on-site, e.g., whether they be clinical/therapeutic, transitional or longer term accommodation and the levels of support required to meet personal care, behavioural and supervisory needs. Compatibility, personal safety and capacity for independent living are also key factors in deciding the suitability of facilities for individuals.

The Supported Accommodation Strategy is not prescriptive in determining the living arrangements for individuals requiring supported accommodation nor does it dictate what models should or should not be available. It assumes that a range of service models are required. Within that range, there is a place in the service system for accommodation facilities to support groups of individuals with similar support needs that are gender or diagnosis specific. This type of option will be considered where this best meets the needs of the individual and in consideration of other factors as mentioned above.

JULIA FARR ASSOCIATION

191 Mrs REDMOND (Heysen) (31 July 2007). Were the Julia Farr Trust Funds transferred to the Julia Farr Association and if so, how was that possible and by what instrument of variation of Trust (and of what date) did the Government come into possession of any Trust Funds?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Minister for Families and Communities, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation, Minister for Housing, Minister for Ageing, Minister for Disability, Minister Assisting the Premier in Cabinet Business and Public Sector Management): The Board of Directors of Julia Farr Services met on 25 June 2007 and passed a resolution to dissolve Julia Farr Services in accordance with Section 48(6) of the South Australian Health Commission Act 1976, with effect from 1 July 2007.

Prior to dissolving, and in accordance with their designated responsibilities as trustees of a property trust and two funds, the Board of Directors appointed new trustees for the following, with effect from 1 July 2007:

- Julia Farr Services Trust, the new trustee being the Minister for Disability;

- J.F.C. Benefactors Endowment Fund, the new trustee being the Julia Farr Association; and
- Residents' Benefit Fund, the new trustee being the Julia Farr Association.

The Board affixed the Common Seal of 'Julia Farr Services' to Trust Deeds relating to each of the above on 25 June 2007. Funds, including interest accrued totalling \$1.4 million, were subsequently transferred to the Julia Farr Association on 17 July 2007. The Minister for Disability became the trustee of the Julia Farr Services Trust, comprising the property at 103 Fisher Street, Fullarton, from 1 July 2007.

DOMICILIARY CARE SA

192 Mrs REDMOND (Heysen) (31 July 2007). Has the newly created Domiciliary Care SA replaced the established community organisation?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Minister for Families and Communities, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation, Minister for Housing, Minister for Ageing, Minister for Disability, Minister Assisting the Premier in Cabinet Business and Public Sector Management): Domiciliary Care SA is the new name for the former Metropolitan Domiciliary Care (MDC). There have been no changes to the services to the Metropolitan Domiciliary Care clients.

AGE ACCOMMODATION

193 Mrs REDMOND (Heysen) (31 July 2007). Has the Government developed a range of accommodation models to meet the needs of ageing clients with complex needs or behavioural issues and, if so, what are they and when were they implemented?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Minister for Families and Communities, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation, Minister for Housing, Minister for Ageing, Minister for Disability, Minister Assisting the Premier in Cabinet Business and Public Sector Management): Objective 2.2 of the State Housing Plan for South Australia affirms the Government's commitment to increasing the supply of social rental stock that is suitable for older people. The Ageing Plan for South Australia reiterates this commitment by stating that

...it is a priority for Government to create adaptable housing and communities that work for older people.

There are currently a variety of housing programs funded by the State Government that specifically cater to older people. They include fully independent living arrangements through Housing SA, including in the community housing sector, along with assistance with private rental and home ownership options.

In addition, those with complex needs and behavioural issues can access Government programs and services relevant to their circumstances. Not only must we provide suitable housing for the State's ageing population, we need to attach packages of support that will enable people to remain living in their homes for as long as practicable. The Department for Families and Communities (DFC), through Housing SA, currently provides a range of housing products for aged people, including those with complex needs. For example:

- Housing SA has 5,142 aged cottage flats (housing predominantly older tenants) located throughout the State and many more elderly people live in other forms of public housing.
- The Disability Modification Program modifies existing tenants' homes to ensure maximum accessibility for aged occupants with mobility issues.
- Joint venture programs have been undertaken over many years with local government and non-government organisations, e.g. churches, to create community-style developments for older community members, with strong connections to local services and facilities. A recent example of this work is a new 19 unit aged housing complex as part of the Westwood redevelopment next to a 90 bed aged care facility being built by the Salvation Army on land formerly owned by the South Australian Housing Trust. It is intended that social housing tenants with support requirements will access services and programs offered by the Salvation Army at the new facility.
- Elderly people who meet Housing SA's usual eligibility criteria may obtain financial assistance to establish private rental tenancies.

- The government is also ensuring that at least 15 per cent of new housing developments provide for affordable housing outcomes. For example, 15 per cent of the 700 new houses being constructed in the Northgate redevelopment are to be set aside for affordable housing, with 5 per cent of the houses to be designated for people with high needs. Aged people will be amongst the special need groups accommodated in new, adaptable housing within the redevelopment. In addition, an expression of interest was recently posted in The Advertiser seeking aged housing providers who are prepared to work in partnership with the Affordable Housing Innovations Unit to develop affordable housing options for older Housing SA customers.

DFC's Office for Community Housing has been instrumental in setting up, and providing financial assistance to, 19 housing associations and 3 housing cooperatives that provide housing specifically for the aged. They provide long term tenure for aged people, with strong linkages to local community and support services. The first of these organisations was established in 1981.

HomeStart Finance offers a Seniors Equity Loan for people aged over 60 years which allows home owners to access the equity in their properties. Repayments are flexible and affordable and allow older people opportunities to upgrade or modify their existing homes to meet their changing requirements as they age. The Seniors Equity Loan was introduced in 2004. In addition to these housing programs for aged people, the government is providing funding through Office for the Ageing for many support programs established to enable older people to 'age in place' and remain connected to the community.

For example, \$550,000 in 2006-07 was allocated to provide care services for older people who are socially isolated and require support to live independently, including social housing tenants. This included a grant of \$399,000 for Housing SA to employ Community Care Consultants for Seniors to work with ageing social housing customers living in public, community and aboriginal housing. Although originally a 12 month 'kick start' initiative, further funding of \$194,000 has recently been approved so as to extend this program until June 2008. The Community Care Consultants have been instrumental in assisting Housing SA to identify those tenants who require support to remain living independently due to complex needs or behavioural issues.

The government will continue to work towards achieving the objectives detailed in our Ageing Plan and our State Housing Plan for South Australia. We are committed to continuing to fund programs that meet the diverse needs of ageing South Australians, and to the provision of appropriate packages of support for those who require additional assistance to live independently.

AGEING PLAN

194 Mrs REDMOND (Heysen) (31 July 2007). What exactly did the Department do to lead the implementation of the 'Improving With Age—Our Ageing Plan for South Australia'?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Minister for Families and Communities, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation, Minister for Housing, Minister for Ageing, Minister for Disability, Minister Assisting the Premier in Cabinet Business and Public Sector Management): The Office for the Ageing (OFTA) has led the development and implementation of the Ageing Plan. Between August and December 2005 OFTA undertook a comprehensive consultation process to confirm the issues for an ageing population and develop strategic directions.

The following initiatives and projects are examples of how the Office for the Ageing has led the implementation of the Ageing Plan:

1. Collaboration with government and non-government agencies

Housing SA:

- To reduce social isolation and connect older public housing customers who need support to live independently, with their communities.

Department of Health:

- A State Dementia Action Plan including further initiatives for South Australians with dementia which will provide a coordinated approach to community care systems.
- The review of Advance Directives to simplify and introduce a more consistent and accessible system.

Law Society of South Australia:

- Seniors and the Law booklet developed to provide information on consumer and law issues for older people.

Department of Families and Communities (DFC)—Strategy and Research:

- Information booklets on consumer and law issues for grandparents as carers to raise awareness of rights and responsibilities.

2. Policy, Program and Service Development

Our Plan in the Prevention of the Abuse of Older People:

A strategy to address and mitigate the effects of abuse of older people through awareness raising and information provision.

Consumer Consultation:

Strategies and mechanisms to consult with the ageing and community care sector to assist OFTA in its policy and planning roles.

Aboriginal Grandparents—Respite and Support:

A program to provide respite for Aboriginal grandparents who care for their grandchildren on a full time basis.

Carer Support Services:

Recommend improvements to HACC funded carer support services.

3. Research

Universities of Adelaide, Flinders and South Australia:

- To develop the State of the Ageing Report for South Australia which will inform future policy, planning and services.
- Analysis of the Australian (Adelaide) Longitudinal Study of Ageing to provide information for policy makers, services providers and care professionals.

Ageing E-view:

Geographical Information Systems (GIS) spatial mapping tool to map services for older people.

4. Engagement through Promotional Activities

Grant Funding:

Grants for Seniors (GFS) and Positive Ageing Development Grants (PADG) encourage the participation of older people in their community.

Responding to the Challenges in Caring for Older People—an International Perspective—July 2006:

The Ministerial Advisory Board on Ageing (MAB), the University of South Australia and OFTA presented an international panel of speakers to discuss issues and trends in caring for older people.

The Australian Association of Gerontology Conference:

OFTA is a gold sponsor and a planning committee member for the annual conference to be held in Adelaide in November 2007.

5. Facilitation and Advice

- Engagement of Geoff Mulgan, Thinker in Residence, bringing together key players to consider housing options for seniors.
- Bi-monthly meetings with the MAB, bringing to my attention of issues affecting older South Australians.

The Across Government Working Party is responsible for reporting back on initiatives identified in Improving with Age bi-annually. A booklet celebrating the Ageing Plan achievements over the past year, using the information collected in the across-government reporting, will be produced.

SENTINEL EVENTS

201 Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (31 July 2007). How many of the 42 sentinel events which occurred in South Australian public hospitals from 2004 to 2006 have still not been analysed to identify why they occurred?

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Kaurna—Minister for Health, Minister for the Southern Suburbs, Minister Assisting the Premier in the Arts): I am advised:

There were 40 sentinel events reported by the public health services in South Australia for the 2004-06 period, consisting of 20 notifications in each year.

All have now been reviewed.

ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL

203 Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (31 July 2007). Is there any radioactive waste stored in the basement of the Royal Adelaide Hospital and what is the status of the centralised radioactive store to be established by the EPA?

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Kaurna—Minister for Health, Minister for the Southern Suburbs, Minister Assisting the Premier in the Arts): I am advised:

Radioactive waste, which includes contaminated equipment and waste from clinical radiotherapy procedures, is securely stored in the basement of the Royal Adelaide Hospital. The waste is stored in an isolated and secured storage area, with shielding in place, away from hospital staff. This dedicated storage area is compliant with the requirements for storage of radioactive material prescribed in the regulations under the Radiation Protection and Control Act 1982.

Radiation surveys are performed (as part of an annual audit and when required) in all surrounding areas by qualified, licensed medical physicists. The radiation levels are well below the level set by South Australian Regulations, which follow International Guidelines.

The radioactive material is registered with the Environmental Protection Authority. Registration is only granted to sites that conform to State legislation.

The Government has made a commitment to establish a store and repository for South Australia's radioactive waste. It is currently considering the roles of government agencies in conducting the implementation project.

RENAL SERVICE

205 Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (31 July 2007). Will the renal transplant service remain at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital until the Royal Adelaide Hospital is rebuilt, and, if not, why not?

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Kaurna—Minister for Health, Minister for the Southern Suburbs, Minister Assisting the Premier in the Arts): I refer the member to my response given in Parliament on 11 September 2007, page 741.

CHILD SEXUAL ABUSE

208 Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (31 July 2007). Will the inquiry into child sexual abuse be extended to other Aboriginal communities in South Australia, now that the Federal Government has actioned intervention to protect victims of child sexual abuse in Indigenous communities across the Northern Territory and the Western Australian?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Minister for Families and Communities, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation, Minister for Housing, Minister for Ageing, Minister for Disability, Minister Assisting the Premier in Cabinet Business and Public Sector Management): The Government has no intention to further extend the terms of reference of the Children In State Care Commission of Inquiry.

It is in the interests of all involved in the Inquiry that the Inquiry conclude at its scheduled time, 31 December 2007. To extend it beyond this date in order to enable it to embark on a wider inquiry would do a disservice to all those who are waiting for its report.

CHILD ADOPTION

211 Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (31 July 2007). From which countries were the 70 children adopted by SA families in 2006-07?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Minister for Families and Communities, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation, Minister for Housing, Minister for Ageing, Minister for Disability, Minister Assisting the Premier in Cabinet Business and Public Sector Management): The figure of 70 children provided in the Honourable member's question is incorrect, details on the number of children adopted by South Australian families in 2006-07 and the children's countries of origin are as follows:

China	13
Ethiopia	6
Hong Kong	1
India	8
Korea	11
Philippines	4
Taiwan	6
Thailand	7
Total	56

HOMESTART

213 Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (31 July 2007). Why are rural applicants seeking HomeStart Finance required to have a 15 per cent deposit when metropolitan applicants are only required to have a 5 per cent deposit, and will the existing 15 per cent deposit applicable be amended to take into account the latest Census figures which show several rural towns now have a population larger than 1,500?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Minister for Families and Communities, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation, Minister for Housing, Minister for Ageing, Minister for Disability, Minister Assisting the Premier in Cabinet Business and Public Sector Management): When HomeStart Finance considers deposit requirements in regional locations, several factors are considered. These include regional development, environmental factors, property sales and population (current and projected).

HomeStart's guidelines for deposit requirements are associated with the inherent risk to the organisation, of which all of the factors mentioned above are taken into consideration.

HomeStart reviews its country lending policies on an annual basis, with reference to latest Census figures. The most recent review acknowledges that many regional centres are experiencing positive underlying medium and longer term economic prospects, which are being taken into consideration.

The frequency and number of property sales in a region can also affect the sale price of a property if HomeStart were placed in a position of forced sale. The low number of sales in some regional areas can increase the prosperity and magnitude of a loss occurring.

Finally, it should be noted that HomeStart does not have a blanket deposit requirement of 15 per cent for all regional areas. In some regional locations, HomeStart's deposit requirements are the same as the deposit requirements for metropolitan areas.

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Speaker—

Pursuant to Section 131 of the Local Government Act 1999 the following 2006-07 annual reports of Local Councils:

Kingston District Council
Wattle Range Council

By the Premier (Hon. M.D. Rann)—

Public Employment, Commissioner for—State of the Service Report 2006-07

By the Deputy Premier (Hon. K.O. Foley)—

Motor Sport Board, South Australian—Report 2006-07
Police, South Australian—Report 2006-07

By the Treasurer (Hon. K.O. Foley)—

Asset Management Corporation, South Australian—Report 2006-07
Distribution Lessor Corporation—Report 2006-07
Essential Services Commission of South Australia—Report 2006-07
Funds SA—Report 2006-07
Generation Lessor Corporation—Report 2006-07
Government Financing Authority, South Australian—Report 2006-07
Motor Accident Commission—Report 2006-07
Parliamentary Superannuation Scheme, South Australian—Report 2006-07
Police Superannuation Board—Report 2006-07
RESI Corporation—Report 2006-07
South Australian Centre for Trauma and Injury Recovery Inc (TRACsa)—Report 2006-07
Superannuation Board, South Australian—Report 2006-07
Transmission Lessor Corporation—Report 2006-07
Treasury and Finance, Department of—Report 2006-07

By the Minister for Industry and Trade (Hon. K.O. Foley)—

Trade and Economic Development, Department of—Report 2006-07

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

Kangaroo Island Council—Heritage Plan Amendment Report by the Council
Regulations under the following Acts—
Harbors and Navigation—Australian Builders Plate
Development—Activities of Environmental Significance

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

Energy Consumers' Council—Report 2006-07
Technical Regulator—Electricity—Report 2006-07
Technical Regulator—Gas—Report 2006-07
Regulations under the following Acts—
Electricity—Alternative Vegetation Clearance

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

Correctional Services Advisory Council—Report 2006-07
Correctional Services, Department for—Report 2006-07
Legal Practitioners Conduct Board—Report 2006-07
Legal Practitioners Disciplinary Tribunal—Report 2006-07
Classification Council, South Australian—Report 2006-07
Equal Opportunity Commission, South Australian—Report 2006-07

By the Minister for Multicultural Affairs (Hon. M.J. Atkinson)—

Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs Commission, South Australian—Report 2006-07

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

Death in Custody of Mr Michael Cockburn, Actions taken following the Coronial Inquiry—
Report 15 October 2007
Botanic Gardens and State Herbarium, Board of the—Report 2006-07
Pastoral Board of South Australia—Report 2006-07
Upper South East Dryland Salinity and Flood Management Act 2002 Quarterly Report
1 July 2007-30 September 2007
Regulations under the following Acts—
Environment Protection—Activities of Environmental Significance
Pharmacy Practice—General

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

Mining and Quarrying Occupational Health and Safety Committee—Report 2006-07
Fire and Emergency Services Commission, South Australian—Report 2006-07

By the Minister for Government Enterprises (Hon. M.J. Wright)—

SA Lotteries—Report 2006-07

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

Advisory Board of Agriculture—Report 2006-07

Dairy Authority of South Australia—Report 2006-07

Phylloxera and Grape Industry Board of South Australia—Report 2006-07

Regulations under the following Acts—

Primary Industry Funding Schemes—Marine Scalefish Industry Fund

By the Minister for Forests (Hon. R.J. McEwen)—

Forestry Corporation, South Australian—Report 2006-07

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

Local Council By-Laws—City of Whyalla—

No. 1—Permits and Penalties

No. 2—Local Government Land

No. 3—Roads

No. 4—Moveable Signs

No. 5—Dogs

No. 6—Cats

No. 7—Caravans and Camping

No. 10—Waste Management

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

Regulations under the following Acts—

Liquor Licensing—

Mount Gambier

Renmark

Victor Harbor Short Term

Residential Parks—General

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL VACANCY

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Ramsay—Premier, Minister for Economic Development, Minister for Social Inclusion, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Sustainability and Climate Change) (14:02): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement on a most pressing and controversial issue.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: The government intends to recommend to His Excellency the Governor in Executive Council that a proclamation be issued for a joint sitting of the House of Assembly and the Legislative Council on Wednesday 21 November at 9.30am. to fill the casual vacancy in the Legislative Council caused by the resignation of Mr Nick Xenophon.

As I have previously informed the house, the government will act in accordance with its legal advice in relation to the filling of the vacancy. In a detailed statement to the house, I set out the requirements that must be met before the provisions of section 15(4) of the Constitution Act could operate to allow the appointment of a person nominated by the No Pokies Campaign. In essence, the constitution requires that the No Pokies Campaign must establish, amongst other things, that it is a political party (though not necessarily registered under the Electoral Act), that it endorsed Mr Xenophon as a candidate for the 2006 election, that it publicly recognised that endorsement, and that Mr Xenophon represented himself as an endorsed candidate of the No Pokies Campaign.

I wrote to Mr Xenophon on 24 October 2007 and invited him to place any material before me relevant to those issues to enable me to obtain further advice and give the matter full consideration. On 1 November 2007, Mr Xenophon responded in his private capacity. Mr Xenophon finally conceded that the provisions of the Constitution Act that allow for the filling of casual vacancies in cases of party appointment do not apply.

In those circumstances, I am advised that the parliament (that is, the joint sitting) has an unfettered discretion as to whom it elects to fill this vacancy. Some, including Mr Xenophon, have urged the government to follow convention. In support of that contention, they seek to rely on the words of former premier the late the Hon. Don Dunstan AC QC when he spoke at a joint sitting in 1977. The opposition leader too has relied on Don Dunstan's words. Both the leader and Mr Xenophon overlook the fact that the 1977 joint sitting was convened to fill a Senate vacancy, not a Legislative Council vacancy. In any event—

Ms Chapman: It's the same constitution.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: The deputy leader who perhaps claims to have legal experience said that it is the same constitution. In any event, the provisions of the current South Australian constitution were enacted in 1985, well after Don Dunstan had left the parliament and long after he addressed that joint sitting. They could not get the right law, let alone the right constitution. It is unbelievable that people who want to hold high office do not know that we have a different constitution and a different law.

The fundamental point about conventions is that they are established by long accepted custom and practice that is widely recognised and followed. It would be very unusual to rely on one or even two instances as a convention. The fact is that the events of 1977 surrounding the Senate vacancy and the appointment of a replacement are so far removed from the current circumstances that they do not assist in establishing a convention or a binding precedent.

The selection of a person to fill the 1977 Senate vacancy created by the resignation of former Liberal Movement senator Steele Hall turned on the question of which party had the moral right, if not the constitutional right, to claim the vacancy. The changes to the Commonwealth Constitution did not deal with the situation where a retiring or deceased senator had been a member of a political party at the time of his election and where that party had become defunct at the time that vacancy occurred.

On the one hand, the Australian Democrats, which had evolved from the Liberal Movement, claimed that vacancy as theirs. On the other hand, the Liberal Party claimed the vacancy. That is the convention that you are asking me to follow and one which your party opposed at the time. But not only did you get the wrong legislation, the wrong law, the wrong constitution, but you have also changed your position. It is a matter of historical record that the late Janine Haines was appointed. It was a question fairly and squarely about party structures and affiliation.

In the present case involving Mr Xenophon, it is clearly not about party. Mr Xenophon and Mr Darley were both independent candidates. Mr Xenophon in his letter to me confirms he was not endorsed by a political party. To my knowledge, there is no convention relating to the—

Mr Hanna: We all knew that.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: We have someone else who wants to talk about the vibe of the constitution. To my knowledge—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Yes, he knows a lot about parties—he has been a member of a number of them. To my knowledge, there is no convention relating to the filling of Legislative Council vacancies—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: To my knowledge, there is no convention relating to the filling of Legislative Council vacancies caused by the death or premature resignation of an Independent legislative councillor. Let's get that point perfectly clear: to my knowledge, there is no convention relating to the filling of Legislative Council vacancies caused by the death or premature resignation of an Independent legislative councillor. No person, party or other organisation has been able to point to or establish the existence of a convention in these circumstances. The parliament is therefore navigating uncharted waters. While there is no convention—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Oh, they're making nominations from the floor. While there is no convention, commonsense would support the proposition of replacing an Independent with another Independent. In a very real sense, it reflects the choice made by the electorate to the extent that it

supported an independent No Pokies ticket above that of the major parties or indeed the Australian Democrats.

I have previously advised the house that it is my expectation that Mr John Darley will be nominated to replace Mr Xenophon. I have seen or read nothing which alters my view about that. Therefore, with the support of my government, I intend to nominate Mr John Darley at the joint sitting to fill the vacancy caused by Mr Xenophon's resignation. Mr Darley has confirmed his willingness to accept the appointment, and I have spoken to him within the last hour.

I hasten to add that I do not expect future joint sittings—or indeed future generations of members of parliament—to rely on this support and, indeed, these noble words as a precedent or establishing a convention. The circumstances of this situation are unique and too unusual to be considered as a precedent. I urge members to do the right thing, the decent thing, and support the nomination of Mr Darley; although, I have to inform the house that all members are free to nominate other persons as there is neither convention nor precedent.

The Hon. R.B. Such interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: No; the members of the Labor Party will be supporting Mr Darley, but, of course, you change your party like other people change their pyjamas. I should advise that, if there is more than one nomination and a ballot is required, a secret ballot will be conducted.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

TRANSADELAIDE GOVERNANCE

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Elder—Minister for Transport, Minister for Infrastructure, Minister for Energy) (14:14): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: In April this year, the state government approved a review of the governance of TransAdelaide, the state's rail operator. Cabinet yesterday approved a multifaceted reform agenda for the rail operator aimed at enhancing customer service. A refreshed and revitalised TransAdelaide is to concentrate solely on the delivery of safe, efficient and effective rail services for Adelaide commuters. The original corporate structure of TransAdelaide was created by the former Liberal government as a precursor to privatisation.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Your shadow minister is on the record recently as supporting it again, so just be careful.

Mr Williams interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I will get on with it when you have stopped interjecting, Mitch.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: That's original, isn't it? They knock you over with those interjections, don't they? The changes will confirm our opposition to privatisation.

Mr Hamilton-Smith interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: You will have your chance in a moment. We are looking forward to you displaying your debating skills. Let us hope they are as good as Alexander's—he is, after all, auditioning for your job tomorrow. The changes will confirm our opposition to privatisation by bringing asset ownership back into government, allowing TransAdelaide to concentrate on providing rail and customer services. The governance review has recommended, and cabinet has approved, the state government's taking responsibility for rail assets currently owned by TransAdelaide and responsibility for new major rail infrastructure works.

We will establish a rail projects directorate within DTEI's Office of Major Projects and Infrastructure. Future rail planning will also be integrated with the department's policy and planning division. The Department for Transport, Energy and Infrastructure will also recruit additional senior management to complement the changes. The state government will bolster the executive team

working under the general manager, Bill Watson. This will result in a better mix of essential skills in customer service and rail operations, including rail signalling and track infrastructure.

We can also foreshadow over time a change in the skill sets contained on the TransAdelaide board. This should in no way be construed as any criticism of the existing board, which has done a good job. It will merely be matching the board to the change in focus of the organisation and to its new executive strength. TransAdelaide's bus interests will not be changed at this time. The government had already taken the first step toward the Future Public Transport Network, which will deliver a faster, more efficient and fully integrated system using light rail and buses. This process began—

Mr Venning interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: You can join in the debate, too, Ivan. I am really looking forward to the opportunity very shortly.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: In this, your last term.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: In this, your last term! The process began with the \$115 million rail revitalisation announced in the last state budget, providing for track upgrades and re-sleeping of the Noarlunga and Belair lines. We are also working to identify potential future transport interchanges, transit-oriented development and a new ticketing system. We want the best results possible for Adelaide commuters, and I am confident that these changes will produce those results.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

DODD, MR A.

The SPEAKER: I advise the house of the recent passing of Mr Aubrey Dodd, the former clerk of the House of Assembly. Mr Dodd served as Clerk Assistant and Serjeant at Arms from 1953 until 1972 when he was appointed Clerk of the House. He held the position of clerk until his resignation in 1979. As well as his service to this house, Mr Dodd served his country with honour as an aircraft navigator during World War II. Mr Dodd was the first Serjeant at Arms of the House of Assembly to carry the mace after it was acquired by the house in 1957. His term as clerk coincided with a period of considerable reform of the practice and procedures of the house, which resulted in significant change to the standing orders that have endured. I wish to place on record the house's condolences to his family and its appreciation of his long and meritorious service.

Honourable members: Hear, hear!

DEPUTY CLERK, APPOINTMENT

The SPEAKER: I advise the house that the process of the recruitment of a deputy clerk to the House of Assembly has resulted in the appointment of Mr Rick Crump. I am sure that members join me in congratulating him on his appointment.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE

Ms CICCARELLO (Norwood) (14:22): I bring up the 278th report of the committee, entitled Cast Metals Precinct Stage 2.

Report received and ordered to be published.

SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

The Hon. P.L. WHITE (Taylor) (14:23): I bring up the 26th report of the committee, entitled Inquiry into Gestational Surrogacy.

Report received.

PARLIAMENTARY COMMITTEE ON OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY, REHABILITATION AND COMPENSATION

Mr KENYON (Newland) (14:24): I bring up the 11th report of the committee, being the annual report 2006-07.

Report received and ordered to be published.

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: I draw to honourable members' attention the presence in the chamber today of students from Kangaroo Inn Area School, who are guests of the member for MacKillop; and Bay Village residents, who are guests of the member for Finniss.

STANDING ORDERS SUSPENSION

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite—Leader of the Opposition) (14:25): I move:

That standing orders be so far suspended so as to allow me to move a motion of no confidence in the Minister for Transport, Minister for Energy and Minister for Infrastructure to be put forthwith.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Elder—Minister for Transport, Minister for Infrastructure, Minister for Energy) (14:25): I wish to indicate that we will be accepting this, even though we would be quite free to decline the debate because of the failure of the opposition to follow ordinary protocol in the matter and particularly to provide notice of debate.

Mr Hamilton-Smith: Rubbish!

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: 'Rubbish,' he says. They sent us a letter about it after we reminded them they had to do that. We would be quite—

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. Are we moving on with the motion? He has no right to speak.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! What was the point of order? I think the Minister for Transport has finished his remarks, anyway. I will put the motion to suspend.

Motion carried.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Again, on the debate, I wish to indicate our desire to move:

That the debate be in lieu of question time and there be half an hour for either side of the chamber.

Motion carried.

NO CONFIDENCE MOTION: MINISTER FOR TRANSPORT

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite—Leader of the Opposition) (14:26): I move:

That the house has no confidence in the Minister for Transport, Minister for Energy and Minister for Infrastructure; that the house calls on him to resign; and that, if he fails to do so, the house calls on the Premier to sack him for his failure to safely and effectively manage the public transport system and for his incompetent oversight and failure of leadership across his portfolios.

Despite an extra \$4 billion in GST money and extra revenue from passenger transport fares that have increased more than 20 per cent since this government came into office, we have a passenger transport system that is unsafe, inefficient—why don't you sit down, Premier, and listen? Why don't you sit down, because this affects you: it is your leadership that is in question.

The Hon. K.O. Foley: You're embarrassing.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: No, you're embarrassing. Our transport system is unsafe, inefficient and outdated, and we are the laughing-stock of the nation because of it. In the period since this minister has taken over the portfolio, there has been one failed project after another, one late train after another and one derailed tram or train after another, all of which he has blamed on someone else. It is a litany of disaster. He has left a trail of financial and organisational chaos from his first day as transport and infrastructure minister, in particular. He came to the post in March 2005, replacing former minister Trish White and former minister Wright.

Even today, we had a broken-down tram right outside the minister's office. There it was as a signal and a beacon to his achievements. Not only that, this morning we have *The Advertiser* telling South Australians—wrongly informed by the government—that the board of TransAdelaide was to be 'sidelined' because minister Conlon's department would be 'seizing responsibility' for all operations. Well, heaven help us. By 8am the minister had his minders ringing around on radio saying, 'No, that's wrong, pull the story,' and we have just had a—

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Mr Speaker, I rise on a point of order. No-one is making noise on this side, so could the Leader of the Opposition please not yell, it is very disturbing.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: Get over it! The ministerial statement we have just heard bore no reflection on the story in *The Advertiser* this morning. Even today it is chaos. It goes back. We have had the minister damning TransAdelaide board member, Libby Kosmala, condemning her—a Paralympian and a recipient of the Order of Australia—saying she has got it all wrong; the board has got it all wrong. She was telling us what the board really thinks. On 6 November, a new tram derailment near South Terrace in the vicinity of Veale Gardens—and what does the minister do, he blames the driver.

It is all the driver's fault, without the investigation even having been conducted. Of course, if you went down there, it looked like Chennai in India. You had people on the switchbox manually operating the points. There were blue plastic tents over technology with people flicking the switches, and the drivers going through and being interrupted by other TransAdelaide staff as they attempted to safely drive their trams. All this is courtesy of this minister. What does he do? He blames one of his own workers. Here is an ex-union official who straight away says, 'It's his fault; it's not my fault.' It is cowardly.

On 27 October the Rail, Tram and Bus Industry Union was warning that drug and alcohol abuse amongst TransAdelaide workers was spiralling 'out of control'. We had the big computer breakdown on 1 November, throwing the entire rail network into total chaos and leaving thousands of commuters stranded. The computer system, which has been in place for 18 months, has caused problems before—and we will hear about that shortly. On 9 October, from official TransAdelaide statistics, we heard that 100 commuters had been injured getting on or off trains and trams over the past three years. On 27 October eight train services were cancelled after TransAdelaide workers failed to clean excess grease off the Adelaide to Belair line.

On 25 October there were registration and licensing system failures at the department of motor vehicle registration. New car dealers who registered vehicles for 12 months were receiving handwritten stickers. A \$14.7 million TRUMPS system descended into a costly farce with blow-outs of \$5.2 million. There are problems with Fleet SA threatening to stop buying vehicles from some dealers. Drivers have complained that their cars have been wrongly recorded as stolen. The system is a mess; and the Auditor-General has reported on all these things.

On 27 September a Noarlunga-bound train derailed at Adelaide Railway Station, injuring passengers. The minister thinks it is a beat-up. He thinks it is not a problem having train derailments and it is not a problem for rail safety. I will tell the house what happens when trains derail. People get injured. Minister, sometimes they die in train and tram derailments. Derailments are very serious. They are not beat-ups or hysteria but rather warnings that the next derailment may be more serious. But the minister does not take it seriously. He thinks it is a beat-up. He says, 'No, we'll flick it off. It's a little malfunction when three carriages derail.'

On 15 June we were told that the supplier of the problem-plagued \$9.5 million computerised central train system 'will be forced to fix it'. Members opposite walk around and try to make light of it. They are trying to convince the media that it does not matter. Well, Premier, it does matter. Your leadership is on the line. Are you going to stick with this bloke until March 2010, come what may, or are you going to do the right thing by South Australia and move him aside? The Deputy Premier should be taking note as well, because the computer system which this government claims is faulty has been faulty for some time. We were promised an audit and we were told that it was going to be fixed, but it has not been fixed.

On 16 April there was a train breakdown which caused major delays across the network. The media reports that almost one-quarter of the fleet of 100 railcars needs to be replaced within five years. TransAdelaide reports reveal 300 breakdowns in 2005-06 related to engine failure or brakes. Of course, in February 2007 we had the new bus timetables. Weren't they a smashing success! Commuters were left confused and rattled around the metropolitan area.

That was a great little cost-cutting exercise. Members should talk to the bus commuters who are not happy with the government either. Of course, one thing that the minister has forgotten is that 96 per cent of commuters use the rail network and buses; 4 per cent use trams. One would not think that when one looks at the government's priorities. They are the priorities of a minister who needs to go. If he does not go then he needs to be put aside by the Premier.

In relation to the Outer Harbor line and the spur line to Grange, 14 per cent of the trains were over five minutes late, and far more between zero and five minutes late, making connections virtually impossible. On 27 February 2007 an unacceptably high number of late trains was put down to an increased number of speed restrictions on an aging network. The rate had doubled in just three years. Guess who has been the minister for most of that time? Answers to questions on

notice reveal that almost 20 per cent of trains (or one in five trains) on the Belair line were running over five minutes late. Well done, commuters might say.

On 6 February 2007, we found that more than 1,390 train services had been cancelled or did not complete their scheduled journey, during the past two financial years, all under this minister's lack of leadership.

In January 2007 I was asked to go to Mawson Lakes to look at a lift for the disabled out there. It is perpetually broken. The parents and family of disabled people asked me to go. I went out there. It is probably still broken today. I checked with the bus drivers. They told me it was a standing joke—a sick joke and a farce. The thing is permanently broken. They write to the minister. Nothing happens. It is broken the next week. These little things are just endemic and typical of the culture that is so wrong in this department, under this minister's leadership.

In November 2006 we had the farrago of the buses to the U2 concert at AAMI Stadium. It was absolute chaos; commuters fuming; he had to backflip; put on extra buses. It was crisis management, something which this department is very used to under this minister.

In October 2006, the mothballed 2000-class trains were returned to service to ease overcrowding. We have the only diesel rail system in the country. We are a laughing-stock. Everybody else has found the money to upgrade. No, but not this minister; no proposals going forward there.

In June-August DTEI contracts were found to be wanting. And remember the security camera systems that were going to go in the buses. He said 150 to 200 buses had been fitted, but he later had to admit that they had been fitted but none of them were connected up. None of them worked. He had just left that bit out. He thought people would believe him. Well, when he was pushed, 'Oh sure, they've all been fitted; now just go away,' but none of them worked.

This guy is an absolute star. He comes in here at question time. He waves his arms about, he goes red in the face, he prepares his little jokes, he comes in with his little jokes, and he turns around to everybody and says, 'Aren't I clever, aren't I funny?'. Well, you can get away with that if you are competent, but when you are foolish, when your department is a mess it does not wash the same. The Mr Funnyman.

Well, the Mr Funnyman needs to start getting some results. I remember the Premier: 'Mike Rann gets results.' Outside your office today, that broken tram, there are the results you have been getting, Premier. You're getting great results, and you are going to get worse results if you leave that minister in that portfolio.

In May 2006, and in fact throughout '06, we have had the tragedy of sexual assaults and attacks in our cabs. A number of women have been terribly abused in our cabs. Whenever it has been raised the minister says it is a beat-up, he says it is hysteria. What has he done about it? Effectively nothing. We had to come out with a policy of our own, while he is out there saying it is just a beat-up, it is hysteria, don't worry about it, don't talk down the cab industry. Go and tell that to the families. You didn't take it seriously then, you still don't, and you need to sort the taxi industry out.

We have raised concerns over faulty rail signalling systems. They are also failing. Do you remember in May last year he suspended drivers for allegedly going through red lights? Sounds familiar? It turned out it was a computer system. In fact, the union blew the whistle. They said the computer system had failed. The drivers had to be reinstated. It wasn't their fault. It was a failed computer. 'But what do we do, we blame the drivers, let's get the drivers, it must be their fault.' Sound familiar? It happened again just a few weeks ago: 'Let's blame the driver.'

Then, of course, we had the red-light cameras. Wasn't that a smashing success. On 22 May 2005 there was to be a \$40 million program to make South Australian streets safer. Forty-eight new red-light cameras were to be purchased, for \$35.6 million. The problem was they didn't turn up. And 19 of them had to be sent back to Germany to be fixed—a contract managed by this minister.

Read what the Auditor-General has had to say about the internal functions in management and inventory control in this minister's department and you will start to see why. I think the Germans are the same people who were responsible for providing the transponder that probably led to our derailment the other day. Perhaps if that had been in place, and we did not have blokes down there flicking switches all day, it might have been avoided. So, in that case, it was Germany's fault.

We heard today that we are to have a reorganisation. Well, won't that be sweet? When the minister took over, he sacked half of his most experienced people in the department: he got rid of senior managers, he replaced people on the board, and he got rid of CEOs. He sacked people right, left and centre. That is what you do when you are a belligerent, aggressive bullyboy minister. You get in there and finish up surrounding yourself with yes-men, because the people who stand up to you either go or you sack them, and you finish up with a group of people who do not know what they are talking about and who say, 'Yes minister, yes minister, yes minister. You know everything, minister. Off you go.' Well, what do you get after that? You get the results that we are getting.

The minister needs to look at himself, not his department, when it comes to change. And there have been warning bells. There have been freight carriage derailments on the Belair line, which could have resulted in serious loss of life, and trains have hit each other on that line. These are all matters that have been investigated by the Australian Transport Safety Bureau. They are warnings that there could be more serious accidents to come. But no, it is all hysteria; it is all a beat-up, according to the Minister for Transport.

Then, of course, we have the famed infrastructure blow-outs. Let us just consider that for a moment. Quite apart from the safety of our public transport system, we have the Bakewell Bridge, which we were told would cost \$30 million. Then we found out that it was \$41 million, and that is without counting the \$2.5 million that the commonwealth put in: \$43.5 million. Then we had the Anzac Highway underpass along South Road.

That was going to cost \$65 million, then it went up to \$118 million—but we budgeted for \$140 million. No, it was not going to go over budget, but, 'Oh, we need \$28 million more for a tram overpass,' because we had forgotten to listen in the Public Works Committee and during the public debate when everyone said, 'This won't work, because you have a tramline right next to the intersection.' Bang, in goes another \$28 million. So, that is \$148 million. It was supposed to be \$65 million. The mathematics is simply stunning.

Then we had the underpass along South Road under Grange Road and Port Road, which started off at \$120 million. It is upwards of \$250 million—probably \$50 million more than that, to \$300 million, given that ETSA pointed out to the minister that moving the substation would cost an extra \$50 million. I do not know whether we will ever get this project or how much it will cost. Another brilliant effort by the Minister for Infrastructure!

Then there is the Northern Expressway, which was going to cost \$300 million, and there were to be two parts to the project. I think we are now heading towards \$600 million, and there is only one part to the project—we axed the southern part. Heaven knows where that project is going, or what it will ultimately deliver. We found the minister secretly planning a new extension out to the west through Penrice salts to finish the job that he could not complete for \$300 million. This is a travesty of incompetence from start to finish with respect to our trains and trams, infrastructure projects and fiscal management. Everything this minister has touched has turned bad and it has turned ugly.

There is a \$200 million backlog with respect to road maintenance. There is no plan for the future. We got an infrastructure plan. Wow! The only trouble was that it did not tell people what was going to be done, when, where, how much, or in what sequence. Apart from that, it was a brilliant plan. And all this courtesy of the Minister for Infrastructure. Of course, there was a transport plan draft, but this minister put it in the bin and, despite repeated requests, will not pull it out. So, there is no plan or sequence—no plan for the future.

Why are we surprised that things are going wrong? Transport and infrastructure management under this minister is simply a mess. Every project has exceeded its budget, and we are not talking about hundreds of millions of dollars; we are talking about possibly more. He has blamed everyone but himself. It is not competent management and there needs to be change. He has left a trail of unhappy transport commuters and his failure on major projects has left a trail of fiscal ruin.

I make this point: Labor legend Gough Whitlam had something to say just recently about governance, when he co-signed a letter with Malcolm Fraser on Monday 12 November, as follows:

Ministers should be held accountable for their failings of their policies or administration...This principle is a bedrock of responsible government.

He also said:

This is a matter that transcends party politics. It goes to the very heart of the way we are governed.

Labor needs to listen to its luminary because it strikes at the very core of the Westminster system. This particular brand of incompetence that we see from the Minister for Infrastructure is not flowing from a lack of knowledge, although a lack of experience is at point in the transport area. It is not even flowing from a lack of ability. I believe it is flowing from a belligerent, bellicose and bullying attitude as minister towards his staff, people, responsibilities and duties.

We have heard all the stories. We have heard about the bullying that goes on within the Labor Party. We have heard about the showdowns in the house here with Nick Xenophon between the Deputy Premier and the minister; they have been belligerent showdowns. We have seen all the posturing—

The Hon. P.F. Conlon interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: Here he goes. Don't go there. During debate last year, he came over here and said, 'Come on. Come outside.' All I could do was laugh. He was like a little chihuahua biting your ankle and going 'Woof, woof, woof'. It was an absolute joke. But as minister, he went out there throwing his weight around. I can tell you that you have a lot to learn about leadership, minister, if that is the way you treat your people. What your people say to you as minister is, 'You know everything, we will let you go,' or they leave you out on your own, and that is what has happened. That is one of the reasons that things are going so wrong.

The minister's problem is belligerence, complacency and a lack of ministerial leadership. He is dangerous to himself and others. There are some warning shots here for the Premier. The Premier cannot allow him to continue in the post until March 2010. Public safety and sound administration demand otherwise. If this minister remains in situ, when further problems arise, they will fall at the feet of the Premier, and we have over two years to go.

There have been important warning signs. The safety and integrity of our public transport system and our major infrastructure projects depend on the Premier making the right decision, and the right decision is to find a minister for transport and infrastructure who can do the job and who can lead the department forward. Premier, you need to either back him or sack him.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Elder—Minister for Transport, Minister for Infrastructure, Minister for Energy) (14:49): Can I say at the outset that I ask those on the other side that I be allowed to speak with the same lack of interference that the Leader of the Opposition did, because I welcome this debate today. It is my opportunity to deal with what has been hyperactive and frantic dishonesty on the part of the opposition. Not only has it happened for the past week, it has happened again today. In the calmest fashion possible, I would like to point out the absolutely frantic and repeated dishonesty of the opposition.

I will start with recent comments about a tram derailment last week. The accusation was that I was blaming the driver. The truth was that, no sooner had it happened, the Leader of the Opposition was out there saying that the track had been wrongly laid and should be pulled up without any investigation. This is the Leader of the Opposition and what he would have done immediately, as leader, would have been to pull up that track and relay it. Of course, as it turned out—

Mr Hamilton-Smith: Not true.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Well, it's not true. I have to say this, too, about some of—

Mr Hamilton-Smith interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I actually have it here. I can run through it, if you want. I actually have your words here, if you really want me to run through it. I will go through all the dishonest things that the Leader of the Opposition has said, but I will say this: I will check what he claims I said about sexual assaults in taxis; that they were a beat up in hysteria. If that is what he has said—and I will check the *Hansard*—I will put him on notice. Either he withdraws or I will take a matter of privilege, because it is simply untrue. If that is what he said, he will withdraw tomorrow or I will take a matter of privilege, because it is simply too dishonest, even for this mob. What else did they say? The shadow minister said that the driver in question had been instructed to proceed through the red light, and that was the problem—simply untrue. Again, simply untrue.

Mr Hamilton-Smith said that the driver had done everything that he had been asked to do—simply untrue. Faulty switches were to blame according to—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Well, it was human error. I am not on a witch-hunt for the driver. I have spoken to the union about it, and I will come back to the union in a moment. Faulty switches were to blame—simply untrue. He could not resist. He said today that a tram broke down out the front—simply untrue. Not true. It is an invention, a fabrication. Then, best of all, during the week—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: No, they won't. They won't let anyone debate this quietly. They will not let the truth be told. During the week, in the most spectacularly bizarre thing I have ever seen, the opposition spokesperson rang media outlets telling them that the general manager had resigned—a reckless fabrication, a complete invention. It actually follows on the same member in this place making the same sort of allegations. He accused a public service officer of changing the route of the Northern Expressway to suit a family member—utterly untrue; and, of course, there is this most recent egregiousness. Above all, this is the most spectacularly irresponsible thing I have ever seen from someone who claims to have the interest of the public at heart in terms of public transport. After the train derailment—caused by human error—he amazingly sent an email to the secretary of the union. That email says in its operative parts:

To allow the driver to cop the flak is not what I would have expected. I am surprised you have not called your members out until Conlon apologised. Watson has to go, but so does Conlon; we both know it. Rann does not have the guts to sack Conlon. He needs his factional support, so you need to stick up for your members.

We have the opposition spokesperson urging the union to go on strike.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Well, it's in your writing—and he handed it out to union members. Since then, I have met with the union, and I will tell the truth about this, regardless of what he has said. I met with the union, and do you know what they said to me? They were outraged by it, but they have complete confidence in the general manager and they have complete confidence in me. Because of my natural humility, I do not really want to say this—and with the greatest respect to the members for Wright and Taylor—but the current secretary of the union said that I was the best Minister for Transport he had ever worked with, and he said that I could quote him.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: That's right; now he's attacking. When a union does not agree with him, he attacks it. The complete farrago of dishonesty continued from the Leader of the Opposition. He said that our transport system is unsafe and outdated. Of course, in 2002, when we got it, it was brand new. How could I have let it decline so much in such a short period of time? It has become outdated since then.

He said that the rail, tram and bus union had talked about drug taking and alcohol. I just had a note passed to me from the secretary of the union saying that they sought a retraction of those comments, and they were retracted—of course, again a reckless disregard for the truth. The trucks blow-out that does not exist and a cost-cutting exercise on new routes—utter dishonesty. There was no cost cutting; in fact, there were more services put on, and we had increase in patronage in some areas of 10 per cent. I say to the Leader of the Opposition: if he wants to be the premier—the 'alternative premier', as he calls himself—he will not be able to do it on a complete tissue of lies on all occasions. It simply won't wash.

He said that he cared for disabled people out there with the lift. I will check (apparently there were 6 million letters on this), but twice it has been raised. I will tell you this: what would have happened if this government had not won in 2002 and the opposition were still there? One thing is right: we would not have had a tram extension. We would also still be riding H-class trams that were over 80 years old. H-class trams are what we would be riding on—so much for his regard for the disabled, because they would not have got on those trams. The elderly would not have got on, women with prams would not have got on, and we would still be riding H-class trams.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: We know that because you said you would not have bought the trams we did, but you never said which other ones, and there are no other ones to purchase. That was the tender.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I will protect my record.

Mr Williams interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, the member for MacKillop!

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I ask you this: would a visitor to this city rather see 80 year old trams running to the heart of the city or see what we have now—something absolutely—

Mr Hamilton-Smith interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Mr Speaker, this fellow was heard in silence while he told a farrago of lies. I would like to be heard in silence while I tell the truth. Do you think that a visitor to this city would rather see 80 year old trams running to the middle of Victoria Square or this wonderful tram running through all the way to here? Can I say that Harbison—your former candidate in a state election—was on the radio praising the government for its courage. I will stand by that tram extension through thick and thin.

What would we also not have if the Liberals were still in government? We would not have the Bakewell underpass, we would not have the underpass on South Road and we would not have a list of South Road projects that now even the federal Liberal Party, as well as the federal government, have signed up to. We would not have any of those things. We would not have had a balanced budget because we never did. I tell you this: the minister would not have had any trouble with TransAdelaide because it would have been privatised by now—the reason it was corporatised in the first place.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: That is the alternative vision for Adelaide they have put forward. Let me come to more recent times. I say in all sincerity that the standards of honesty have dropped dramatically since this Leader of the Opposition has come to office. I do note that, under Rob Kerin and Iain Evans, there was a standard of honesty. Do you note that they are the two not wearing 'Fix it Pat' badges today? Is there a message in that? They are not part of the dishonest campaign by the Leader of the Opposition. Standards have plummeted under this bloke.

Can I say that for this incompetent Leader of the Opposition to take advantage of a competent campaign run by a media outlet will not make the *Sunday Mail* very happy. You have to give them credit. The *Sunday Mail* has had an intelligent if, I think, overblown and far too robust campaign on this. These guys ride on the back of a media outlet. They get their questions reading the paper. They ride on the back of a campaign, and it is pathetic.

Above all, what would be different if they were in power? I thought that they said that it should be electrified and upgraded and that it needs more money, but I must have memory problems. I tried to remember what they promised on public transport because we have heard it is outdated, so I got the 2002 election promise of the Liberal government. Of course it will be talking about electrification, it will be talking about how much more you are going to spend on public transport. That's what it would be, wouldn't it?

Ms Chapman: Very poor defence.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Very poor defence. What we have seen today is that this guy first promised a no-confidence motion in me on 22 December last year. He has moved it today. I think he is a bit worried. There is a marvellous opportunity today, because tomorrow it I will be debating the federal minister, Mr Downer, who is already on record saying that he would like to come and get the Leader of the Opposition's job. I think this is a marvellous opportunity—I urge the media—for people to watch. Mr Hamilton Smith today—wasn't he good? A little hysterical, I thought, but plenty of passion—not much honesty, but plenty of passion. I did think the barking was a bit over the top, but tomorrow they can look at Mr Downer, and they can make a good judgment about who they would like as leader of the opposition.

Can I say that I do not think that Mr Downer is going to bark tomorrow. I recently saw the Leader of the Opposition with a doll with my face on it, and he was poking it. I do think the barking might be a symptom, because that is pretty odd behaviour by anyone. He did like to poke the little

doll, but I have to put on notice that if he starts sticking needles in it I am getting an apprehended violence order—I am not going to put up with that sort of thing.

This is the standard of debate under this Leader of the Opposition. Members opposite are prepared to tell any dishonest story they can to get up. You will hear next, I suppose, from the shadow spokesperson. Do you know what he said when he was taken to task by an independent person—not me—about why he tells so many porkies? He said, 'Oh well, I only have to get one right.' That is his attitude to this chamber. 'I only have to get one right'; that is what he said.

An honourable member: That's not true.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: He said that, and two people heard him, one of whom is in this chamber. So I would be careful about saying that it is not true. I have had meetings with the board. I will come back to another piece of arrant dishonesty from the Leader of the Opposition. He said that I sacked senior members and got rid of board members. I have not got rid of a single board member since I got here—not a single one. It is simply an invention. I have not sacked senior managers because I am not allowed to. It is on the record. When I first got in I replaced Tim O'Loughlin, who went to another job, and then subsequently I did get rid of one chief executive, James Horne.

I have never sacked a senior manager. He says I am belligerent and bullying, and he comes back with all these sleazy stories. If you want me to talk about what we were told by TransAdelaide people on the Thursday night of the derailment when you came to visit them, I will do it, but I do not engage in the sort of sleazy things you do. I only mention it because you are prepared to go anywhere, but I tell you that some of them had very interesting stories to tell about you. It was Melbourne Cup Day, if you remember that, and they had very interesting stories to tell. But, I do not like to do that because we can debate it on the facts; you cannot, and that is why you always go for it.

I will close on this. When I see Alexander Downer tomorrow, I do not think he will be waving his arms in the air red-faced. I do not think that he will be barking like a dog. I am pretty certain that he will not bring a doll of me and poke it at the debate. What I will say is that he is going to have to do pretty poorly before people will recognise him as being a better candidate for the leader of the opposition than you are.

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (14:58): If that was a defence of this minister's reputation, well, God help South Australian public transport users! Mr Speaker, if you want a classic example of the mess, disappointment, accidents and incidents under this minister, you cannot go out the front there now because of the broken down tram—sorry, it is not broken down according to this minister. Well, why, minister, is Bill Watson quoted on the Adelaide Now website saying:

A tram has broken down. It has now gone back to Glengowrie for further inspection. It was the same tram as on Melbourne Cup Day.

It did not happen; it has not broken down.

Mr Pengilly: Blame Bill Watson.

Dr McFETRIDGE: Bill Watson is being honest about it. Mr Speaker, if you want an example of the litany of errors and examples of mismanagement, just go and talk to the people out there, read the papers, have a look at what this minister has done. Tram 111 did break down out the front today. It is the same tram that derailed on Melbourne Cup Day. Thank goodness it was going slowly out the front of Parliament House, because, had it been going at speed with all the kids on pageant day over the Glengowrie Bridge or Sturt Creek—what could have happened then? It is absolutely atrocious.

This minister seems to want to say that it is all a beat-up and it is all just a lot of rubbish. We know what the Premier said today on FIVEaa radio. He said, 'It is a brand new tram; brand new infrastructure; brand new rolling stock. Everything is brand new.' We know it is not all brand new because they have just let a tender to re-rail almost half the track. It is not new. That lot over there will say anything and do anything to try to discredit this side. We know that because let us look at who this minister blames. Last year, when the signal system failed, he blamed the drivers. When a board member of TransAdelaide blamed lack of ministerial direction and resources for the decline in our rail system, he said that she was spouting rubbish. When the train derailed last month, he blamed old software. It is new software: it is software that cost nearly \$10 million.

I saw an advert in the paper on the weekend for a new signalling engineer to ensure that it does not happen again. Last week, at the Australian Railway Association dinner, I was told that a

new signalling engineer will cost about \$250,000 a year, if you can get one. We should have bought a system which was not going to break down and which was reliable. But what have we got from this lot? We hear it all the time—I hear it all the time—'The minister wants it done, the minister gets it done, and make it cheap.'

That is what I hear from TransAdelaide people all the time because this minister has a reputation for being a bully. That reputation will get out there. He tries to charm those whom he can. He tries to charm them and this bloke has many people fooled. But this bloke, if you test him, he is just a bully, a thorough, through and through bully. I will not be bullied, the opposition will not be bullied and certainly the people of South Australia will wake up and realise that this man is incompetent and should not be in this position.

The only person who seems to have any faith in this man is the Premier, because I note that the Premier will speak after me. If the Premier is able to do a better job of trying to defend this minister, I will be very surprised. The minister could not even defend himself. It is just absolutely atrocious that the minister is still in his position. We know that he remains there because he uses his faction to hold the numbers and to hold the Premier at bay.

Let us look at some of the things for which this minister is responsible. Let us look at the Northern Expressway. The opposition leader spoke about the blow-out. We know about that. Let us look at what has not happened yet, that is, the safety audits. Have the safety audits been carried out yet? No. To get federal government funding, the safety audits have to be carried out. What am I hearing from engineers: who the hell organised this alignment? The safety audits will reveal that there may have to be a realignment and more land may have to be purchased.

I was criticised by this minister for raising the fact that the Gawler River flood plain management people were looking at buying land for that particular project. The minister said that I was not telling the truth. Well, it turns out that this state government has given \$7.75 million to them and the Gawler River flood plain management people are buying land upriver and they are also acquiring land for easements along the NEXy. Once again, this minister is not being truthful. He sits over there. He has gone to hide behind the Premier. He sits there and tries to say that we are not telling the truth. You can be wrong in opposition because you have such limited resources. That is what I said: you can be wrong. The minister offered extra resources. Give us some more resources and we will show you how wrong you really are.

Let us look at the Port River bridge: \$100 million out of the air by the Treasurer. Did it go to cabinet? We do not know. Certainly a public meeting was held down there and \$100 million was spent like that. What for? For a few sets of rags and sticks to go out there a couple of times a day, if they time it right. Even HMAS *Adelaide* (which is coming next year) will not come inside that bridge. We know that. We are still waiting to find out why the opening of that bridge has been delayed. Down the Port it is colloquially known as 'the big crack'.

The opposition leader spoke about the South Road underpass. In relation to Anzac Highway I talk to property owners. Some of them get a lot and some get nothing. Poor old Horst had a business there for 35 years. Don Dunstan was one of his clients. What has he got? He got nothing for his business from this minister. The minister sent out the deputy minister, Rod Hook—he is known as the deputy minister—because this bloke knows he cannot do it. He has no people skills whatsoever.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I have a point of order, sir. The shadow minister continually refers to 'this bloke'. That is not the correct way in which to address another member of parliament. I ask that he address the minister correctly.

The SPEAKER: I do not think it is unparliamentary. Perhaps the member for Morphett should refer to other members by their title.

Dr McFETRIDGE: Thank you, sir. Some 170 metres from the underpass there is a \$28 million tram bridge. This is in the minister's electorate. He goes past South Road. Did he not look left and see the tram and think, 'What are we going to do about that?' No—we will spend \$28 million building a bridge there, on top of the five kilometres of re-railing. How many millions of dollars will that cost? Is it \$2 million, \$3 million or \$4 million? They will keep it under \$4 million so it will not go to the Public Works Committee—they do not want an investigation by that committee.

We heard the opposition leader talk about Port Road. It is \$300 million-plus but they forgot the \$50 million ETSA substation move. The Sturt Road underpass has disappeared. We did hear that there may be a resurrection of the Liberal Party's policy for the Bedford Park interchange. We

did hear a whisper about that last week. I hope they do something. I hope there is a plan. They tore up and scrapped the draft transport plan which had nothing in it. What do industry leaders say?

The SPEAKER: Order! The opposition's 30 minutes have expired. I call the Premier.

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Ramsay—Premier, Minister for Economic Development, Minister for Social Inclusion, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Sustainability and Climate Change) (15:11): Here we have a motion moved by the Leader of the Opposition (who barked like a chihuahua) and which was seconded by his vet. That is the standard that we have got to in the house. I do not think that we will see this featured in the media, but I am quite prepared to table a letter from Dr Duncan McFetridge MP. I believe it is an extraordinary attempt at industrial sabotage, which may be in breach of federal law, not only the Trade Practices Act and the law of torts but also, believe it or not, WorkChoices. Can members imagine this? If a member of parliament on this side of the house had written to a union leader urging strike action—'Take the boys out'—there would be federal government-funded ads featuring people in braces. You are doing exactly the same. I will table the letter from Dr Duncan McFetridge, which states:

...to allow the driver to cop the flak is not what I would have expected. I am surprised you have not called your members out until Conlon apologises.

In other words, it is an attempt at industrial sabotage during a federal election campaign. I table these documents.

The Hon. K.O. Foley: Shame, shame, shame!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Clearly, this has been arranged to assist the federal Liberal campaign in terms of its ads about unions featuring the Minister for Transport. It is a precursor to the debate tomorrow—'the things that matter' debate—which will involve Alexander Downer and the Minister for Transport. I am sure that that debate will deal with issues such as whether the Prime Minister gave a non-core apology over interest rates that rivalled his non-core promises. I am sure that we will see massive TV and radio interest. In the interests of open government and open media, I hope that we will see Alexander Downer agree with *The Advertiser* to allow the media to be present, so that there can be no closed shop, nothing like the National Press Club.

I want to look at some words from the Leader of the Opposition. In his maiden speech to this house on 3 December 1997, he said:

I hope that our debates are more about how to do it rather than what needs to be done. I hope that we give credit to one another for good ideas and good achievements. I hope that we concentrate on the issues that are important to South Australians and not to the trivia of personality politics and intrigue. I also hope that the men and women of the media help us in this endeavour and that their reporting of events aims to inform people rather than to simply entertain or amuse them. And I hope, too, that the opposition lets the government govern and that the Leader of the Opposition—

that was me, by the way—

does not let the affairs of this house become a fiasco.

That is what he said in December 1997. But by March last year he had changed his tune dramatically. Here is what he told this house on 5 March last year:

It is much more interesting to be in opposition, where you can sit at home on Sundays making Molotov cocktails and deciding who to throw them at on Mondays.

That is not the words of an officer and a gentleman, let alone someone who wants to be premier of South Australia. Yet we saw him today getting very red faced, and quoting Gough Whitlam and Malcolm Fraser, who are urging Kevin Andrews to resign. Clearly an endorsement, so I do not know what is happening—another break-out.

But let us go on to some other issues. We have rail and bus figures from the budget of 2007: the government will invest more than half a billion dollars in transport infrastructure over the next four years; and a major commitment to revitalise the state's public transport system; a \$542 million package, including initiatives that will deliver a faster and more efficient transport system for commuters, and provide for the relocation of the Adelaide railyards.

And there is another \$115 million over the next four years to revitalise our public train network, including a massive project to involve concrete re-sleepering 64.5 kilometres of rail track on the Belair and Noarlunga lines to deliver faster and more comfortable services, which in turn will allow greater frequency of services. Also included, \$157 million to relocate the railyards as part of the new hospital works.

There is a whole series of initiatives; a massive increase in the transport infrastructure budget, compared to when the Liberals were in power. When we saw the issues in terms of the tram last week, we heard people saying, 'Oh, this is because of a failure to invest in new infrastructure.' It was a brand-new tramline; we got new trams. When we had the computer failure last week we were told that this was because of a failure to invest in new systems. It was a new computer system. That is how phony this Leader of the Opposition is and why he has to resort to barking like a chihuahua and making up things, for which you will be called to account before a privileges committee.

We have seen these things from a leader whose party privatised our public buses, who privatised the Modbury Hospital, who tried desperately hard for years to privatise the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, who privatised the Mount Gambier Prison, who privatised the TAB, for a price that was less than one year of its earnings. You talk about having some sort of corruption commission; that would be No. 1 on the list, following their water deal and what happened with the lodging of those documents and why some were opened and others weren't, and followed by the fact that you paid \$100 million to the people who privatised ETSA—against the will of South Australians.

That is really what this is all about. Because this Liberal opposition, who wants to have tolls on our roads, is very interested in privatisation of the public transport system. Now we have the Leader of the Opposition saying that that is totally untrue. Let me remind him of what the member for Morphett—who is trying to engineer a strike during an election campaign—said publically. He is on record of telling former colleague Craig Bildstein at the *Adelaide Advertiser* on 9 October this year that the government must:

As a matter of priority be looking to provide a modern new fleet either in partnership with the private sector or in full private ownership.

When I mention privatisation, the Leader of the Opposition says, 'That's not true.' And that is the fact that you don't speak to each other. Let me tell you this: that the Minister for Transport has not only our total support but he has got a darn sight more support than the Leader of the Opposition has from members on his own side. This is the same Leader of the Opposition who, of course, pledged to support Rob Kerin and Iain Evans. He was right behind them. He sure was—with a knife in his hands.

We are very proud of the fact that, unlike the Liberals, who promised repeatedly that they would bring in a tram extension but never did, we are the ones who delivered a tram extension. We are very proud of the fact that we are the ones who are building the roads and the infrastructure and re-sleepering the trains, because members opposite, when in government, basically sat on their hands with only one policy, and that was privatisation.

We totally reject members opposite in this motion. We also admire the fact, though, that we have a Leader of the Opposition who stands up here and is prepared to say anything (although he is red-faced in doing so) and, not only that, but who then proceeded to bark like a chihuahua—vision that will be used, I promise members, in the next state election campaign with the words, 'Do you want this man to lead our state?'

The house divided on the motion:

AYES (15)

Chapman, V.E.
Griffiths, S.P.
Kerin, R.G.
Penfold, E.M.
Redmond, I.M.

Evans, I.F.
Gunn, G.M.
McFetridge, D.
Pengilly, M.
Venning, I.H.

Goldsworthy, M.R.
Hamilton-Smith, M.L.J. (teller)
Pederick, A.S.
Pisoni, D.G.
Williams, M.R.

NOES (29)

Atkinson, M.J.
Breuer, L.R.
Conlon, P.F.
Geraghty, R.K.
Key, S.W.
Maywald, K.A.
Piccolo, T.
Rann, M.D. (teller)
Stevens, L.

Bedford, F.E.
Caica, P.
Foley, K.O.
Hill, J.D.
Koutsantonis, T.
McEwen, R.J.
Portolesi, G.
Rau, J.R.
Thompson, M.G.

Bignell, L.W.
Ciccarello, V.
Fox, C.C.
Kenyon, T.R.
Lomax-Smith, J.D.
O'Brien, M.F.
Rankine, J.M.
Simmons, L.A.
Weatherill, J.W.

White, P.L.

Wright, M.J.

Majority of 14 for the noes.

Motion thus negatived.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

DEEP CREEK

Mr PENGILLY (Finniss) (15:27): Just a few short weeks ago in this house, we talked at length about the Natural Resources Committee's Deep Creek inquiry. I would like to return to that matter today in the form of this grievance regarding that report and the dreadful way in which this matter has been handled by the Minister for Environment and Conservation in another place. If ever we have had a bumbling, stumbling, incompetent minister, it is this minister.

Contempt, ignorance and arrogance has been shown toward the good people of Finniss and others in relation to the outcome of this Deep Creek inquiry, which was a bipartisan inquiry of the parliament. Its membership came from across the board, from different political parties, and we produced a good report with a lot of good material in it and a lot of good recommendations. Unfortunately, the key recommendations have been totally pooh-poohed by the minister and not taken on board. She has totally disregarded the long-standing residents of the electorate of Finniss and scientific advice, which I will come to in a minute, and she has shown a lack of tolerance for any other views apart from those, it would appear, of the bureaucracy in her own department. That is where it is causing major concern.

The Times newspaper in Victor Harbor has been very actively following this campaign for many months and it was down there when the committee visited the Deep Creek area. It has come out loudly lambasting the minister's lack of guts in dealing with the recommendations.

By way of interest, a report was tabled entitled 'Fleurieu Peninsula Swamp Ecology, Swamp Hydrology and Hydrological Buffers', which included the swamp and pine trees very close to it. It was written by scientists Michelle Casanova and Mr Lu Zhang. The way that this report has been put to one side and disregarded by the bureaucracy causes me a great deal of alarm, and it should alarm members of this house and the wider South Australian community that the bureaucrats in this instance have totally taken over.

The major recommendation of getting a buffer zone between Deep Creek and drawing the pine trees back has been totally disregarded to the extent where the minister for the environment in another place just explained it away as the fault of the drought. Well, I am sorry, minister, but the fact of the matter is that those trees have been there for 30 to 40 years in the pine plantations. Forestry is a great industry in South Australia.

When the report was presented, there was a great deal of acrimony from government representatives. They were not at all happy with the hydrology aspects of the report and extremely unhappy about the swamp ecology report. Comments have been made that Michelle Casanova (one of the authors) was contemplating suing the government representative for slander about comments made about her. I think this is an absolute disgrace.

Michelle Casanova also went on to state that the existence of a pine plantation above a swamp will impact severely on the amount of water available for the swamp. This information was conveyed to government officers. Government officers are actually saying that this report has been disregarded, that it really did not have any impact on hydrology, etc, and the land surrounding the Fleurieu pine forests around Deep Creek. They did not like what the scientists came up with, so they, it would appear, said to the minister for the environment that, 'No, Ms Casanova and Mr Lu Zhang have no idea what they are talking about; we are right and they are wrong. Minister, you have to go out and say that we are not going to retract this buffer zone.' What an absolute lot of arrant nonsense. What a disgrace! What is this state coming to when the bureaucrats are completely riding roughshod over the minister on this most important issue?

Government officers actually advised the inquiry that a technical paper was reviewed but no published paper was available at that point. These government officers misled the minister, the government and the committee. I think it is an absolute disgrace. I will not name the officers, but the report is available if anyone needs it. The government officers misled the committee inquiry on a number of occasions by stating:

The government agencies did not know whether pine plantations in the Mount Lofty Ranges as they matured and reached the age of 15 to 20 years would have a similar effect on the water balance as those in the South East.

Here is the report. Here it is—eminent CSIRO scientists totally refuted by the seemingly knowledgeable bureaucrats in the Department for Environment and Heritage, who say that they are wrong.

Time expired.

DERNANCOURT PRIMARY SCHOOLS

Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens) (15:32): Last week, I attended the Dernancourt Junior Primary School's and the Dernancourt Primary School's 40th year celebration. To celebrate the 40 years of education at the schools, they conducted an art show displaying the fabulous artistic talents of students. It was marvellous to see the strong support given to the occasion by parents and friends, with several hundred people attending the early-evening event. It was also wonderful to be there to celebrate the school's 40-year contribution to making sure that our children—the children who will be adults of the future—are given a well-rounded education, good values and wonderful memories of friendships made at Dernancourt.

My relationship with the school began in 1994 when I was elected as the member for Torrens. My first encounter was with Helen Hoffman, who was then the principal of the junior primary school. As a newly elected member, I was somewhat daunted—I guess is the word to use—about this meeting but, over the years, Helen and I have had many discussions. I have to thank her for making me think about many issues relating to the way we support children and how we provide that support. As I said, she certainly has made me think about those things.

I have seen many changes at these schools, particularly with the closure of the Holden Hill Primary School in late 1994 and the need for the Dernancourt schools to provide additional space for about 100 students, and the changes that occurred with the classrooms and the library in both the primary and junior primary schools. It was a challenge, but it was certainly a challenge well met. These schools have a reputation for getting things done, and this reputation has drawn creative and enterprising people to the schools, people who can think of ways to fundraise, to provide activities and to enhance the school environment in the best interests of the children. The opportunities provided for the students have come about because of the hard-working commitment of those people associated with the schools.

One of the fundraising initiatives several years ago was the delivery of telephone books to raise money. In those days, parents and teachers had to sleep at the school overnight to ensure that the telephone books were not stolen, as they were responsible for them. Now, of course, like many other schools, they have sausage sizzles, working bees and all those things that make schools a great place for children and create a wonderful school family.

In 2006, two new principals came to the Dernancourt schools: Christine Ferguson (the junior primary school principal) and Kathy Terrell (the primary school principal). They have both shown clearly their very strong commitment to making the school environment an exciting place for children to learn and to develop good values. Without the support of the parents association, the school councils and the enthusiastic friends of the school, the children who enrolled initially in 1996, those since then and those who will come in the future would not have had the exciting activities and opportunities or the wonderful environment that is there at the schools for them to enjoy today.

The schools have a great history, and I am sure they will have a wonderful future because they have striven to achieve the best for their students and have always sought to send them to the next level of their education with sound skills and values that will stand them in good stead in the future. I have to say that this is certainly something to be extremely proud of.

Special mention must be made of the Dernancourt schools' artist in residence, Catherine Puckeridge, who did a wonderful job in bringing out the artistic talents of all the school students. Some really wonderful works of art were presented by them, and I think they will be something to be treasured in the future. Each class had a theme, and obviously the students were extremely enthusiastic about their work. The paintings were for sale, and the money raised from the sale will, of course, be well spent within the school community for the benefit of the children.

The art show, which was held for the first time, will no doubt become a tradition at Dernancourt. It showed the great spirit of getting on and making things happen, and that has certainly become part of the culture of the Dernancourt schools. I congratulate everyone involved in

the art show, and I thank all the parents and friends of the school who came along that evening and made our 40th celebration something to be really proud of.

WINE INDUSTRY

Mr VENNING (Schubert) (15:37): Today I rise to give the house an update on the state of the wine industry. We know that it has been through a difficult time, with overproduction, poor prices, drought and uneconomic yields. The single biggest problem for our wine industry is the level of the Australian dollar. It is still a major industry in South Australia, second only to grain, and it was our top industry from 2000 to 2002. The Australian wine industry is a \$5 billion plus industry, exporting over 65 per cent of its production, with half of Australian wine exports coming from South Australian wineries. Almost half the grapes grown in Australia come from South Australia, so it is not difficult to see how the exchange rate of the Australian dollar has the whole industry on a knife edge and could have particularly disastrous implications for South Australia. Today's level—88.4¢ to the US dollar—is a massive hike from 65¢ only three years ago; last week, it reached a staggering 93.2¢.

Our exporters are really battling hard to maintain their export markets. You can understand the resistance of a person overseas, who is a lover and buyer of Australian wine, if the same wine is 50 per cent more expensive. Sales in certain segments of the market have taken a big hit. If the Australian dollar continues to rise on its value over the last 12 months (and predictions indicate that further increases are likely), and if the current levels of profitability deteriorate, a significant section of the Australian wine industry will fall over. We now really do depend on our local domestic market for stability, but we have far too much overproduction to avoid flooding the local market.

About two years ago, a Senate inquiry came up with four recommendations, one of which Mr Leo Pech of Angaston and I have been pushing for, that is, for the federal government to set up a grape and wine consultative committee, made up of eight to 10 members from across Australia, to advise the federal minister for primary industries on matters of grapes and wine. The committee should be made up of an equal number of grape growers and wine companies. There has been quite a bit of conflict between the two, especially now that many of our larger wine companies also own large vineyards, and there has been conflict with the independent family growers.

This has been made worse with the recent further amalgamation of large wine companies, especially Southcorp's large empire with Fosters. Fosters crush 410,000 tonnes annually; Hardys, 363,000 tonnes; and McGuigan, 250,000. This equates to 54 per cent of the total national crush being undertaken by just three companies for the 2005 vintage. There are approximately 7,000 growers across Australia, and they need to be assured that there is a sustainable return to them and that the winegrowing industry remains viable in the future. A grape and wine consultative committee would report directly to the federal government through the minister, and would assist the government in making educated policy decisions regarding the wine industry when required. Such a committee would report on the state of the industry, the likely future of the industry, and what corrections or incentives are required from time to time in order to deal with industry fluctuations.

The establishment of such a committee would have a flow-on effect and aid growers by providing more relevant and timely information to assist wine grape growers investing in Australian wine to have better and more sustainable businesses. Many plans, strategies and inquiries relating to the wine industry have been undertaken in the past at great expense; however, they have all failed to take into account the speed of change that can occur within Australia and internationally in a world of wine oversupply.

A grape and wine consultative committee would provide balance and leadership from industry to the federal government and back the states and wine regions. For future development of the wine industry to be sustainable it needs to be based upon a better awareness of the global dynamics affecting the wine sector as well as an improved understanding of the Australian domestic market environment. A clear understanding of all levels of the relativity between supply and demand in the industry is also imperative to the future success of the Australian wine industry.

As the member representing the Barossa and as a proud Barossa baron, I am privileged to receive a lot of advice on matters such as these. One vigneron, Mr Leo Pech, as I said, is one such person who gives me such advice. He has been a state-of-the-art grape producer over many decades and is heavily involved in wine politics. He has been lobbying me for years to get the federal government to lift its vine planting tax incentives under section 75AA. Section 75AA was in a federal act of parliament set up by the federal Labor government in 1993 to encourage the planting of vineyards, with the goal being to reach 40,000 hectares by 2025.

This act came into effect in 1993 and was agreed to by the industries for a period of four years. However, the act was only abolished in September 2004, and Mr Pech said that even though it had been removed it should have been removed after the four-year period ended in 1997. Between 1993 and 2004 when the act was in place, 98,239 hectares of vines were planted when only 18,000 hectares were required. This equates to an excess of 80,000 hectares being planted under the scheme.

Time expired.

REMEMBRANCE DAY

The Hon. L. STEVENS (Little Para) (15:42): I would like to speak briefly today on two matters in relation to war and remembrance and particular occasions in my electorate and a nearby electorate. On Sunday 11 November I am sure that most members in the house would have attended Remembrance Day celebrations of one sort or another. I attended, with my colleague the member for Napier, a service at the Elizabeth RSL with quite a large crowd of people and representatives from various armed forces and community members who gathered together to remember our fallen comrades. That short service was followed by the dedication of a special memorial garden. I congratulate the Elizabeth RSL for its efforts in putting together that memorial garden.

The other thing that I would like to talk about today was a particularly wonderful ceremony that occurred at the Montague Farm Estate. I was very pleased to be invited to a Long Tan day ceremony on Saturday 18 August. There was a large crowd of hundreds of people, including you, Mr Speaker, and other dignitaries, such as the Mayor of Salisbury, Tony Zappia, together with members of the armed forces, plus many members of the community, including Vietnam veterans and local schoolchildren. I want to spend a little bit of time telling the house something about the origins of Montague Farm Estate Project. It is entitled 'Moving Forward: the Vietnam veterans awareness project'. They have actually printed a document, which was handed out to people at the ceremony, and I will quote from sections of it to explain what it was about. The booklet states:

In 2004 a community member, married to a Veteran, approached the Neighbourhood House and spoke of the 'specialness' of the Estate—

that is, Montague Farm estate. It continues:

A meeting was organised with all the relevant stakeholders and it was agreed that Veterans would like to see the following undertaken:

- an inter-generational project between Veterans and school students (commenced 2004 and ongoing);
- special street signage (designed and installed in 2005);
- staging of an annual ceremony for Long Tan in the estate [three have already been held];
- acknowledgment of the 20 South Australians killed in Vietnam on the dedication plaque [that occurred and was unveiled in August 2007]; and
- the design of a significant public artwork 'The Seeds of Attainment'.

That, too, was dedicated and unveiled at the ceremony that we attended. The booklet continues:

Other activities that have been undertaken include:

- Mayoral Civic Reception for the 40th anniversary of the Battle of Long Tan (August 2006);
- memory garden at the Community Centre (undertaken 2006); and
- a multimedia project to record the project (to be completed by end of 2007).

On the day that we all assembled, the public artwork called 'The Seeds of Attainment' was unveiled. It is quite a spectacular sculpture. The really impressive thing that has happened at Montague Farm estate is that we had a whole group of people, including the South Australian Housing Trust, the RSL at Salisbury, the Vietnam Veterans Association, Mawson Lakes Primary School, residents of Montague Farm, the Pooraka Farm Community Centre, interested veterans, TAFE SA and the City of Salisbury all working together to provide something of lasting value in that community. The 20 South Australians who were killed have been honoured with particular street signs throughout that estate. The garden that has been created is a wonderful place for community gatherings and the sculpture, 'The Seeds of Attainment', is something that is well worth seeing and something to reflect upon for everyone in the community.

GLENSIDE HOSPITAL REDEVELOPMENT

Mr PISONI (Unley) (15:47): I recently spoke in this house about the government listening post I attended at the Burnside Town Hall on 3 October. As members will recall, it was a listening post set up by the government to consult with residents and those who had an interest in mental health. Of course, the listening event was scheduled to start at 6pm, and 6pm is a very difficult time for people. Most people, even younger members of the community without children, are at work. Senior citizens are probably at home and they can probably attend a function at 6 o'clock, but certainly for anyone with a family it is a difficult time.

They are normally picking up their child from child care, cooking their meal, or helping them with their homework. I believe that this was a deliberate tactic to reduce the numbers of people who attended this so-called 'listening post', but then again maybe I was wrong. I attended the second listening event on 23 October. Certainly at that listening post, there was no increase in consultation. Again, there was no appearance by the minister.

What was in evidence was more indoctrination (described as consultation) and an orchestrated divide and rule agenda where people were divided into small groups rather than being allowed to speak in the public forum that they had expected. There was a large contingent of health department staff and ministerial advisers and even—get this, Mr Speaker—police presence. There was a policeman at the door and he was on duty, because I asked him. I wonder what the danger was for departmental staff and ministerial advisers. I think I was the youngest person at that function. Sorry, the member for Sturt, Christopher Pyne, was there. He is a couple of years younger than I, so he was the youngest person at that function.

I guarantee to the minister that there was no risk to public safety at this meeting. So, the minister was not present and the public servants were left with the hard sell of this unpopular plan to deliver the news that despite this being a consultation process—supposedly—the plan was non-negotiable. These words came from the public servants. The plan for the sell-off of land was non-negotiable. The open space had to be sold off to pay for the hospital facility upgrade, otherwise (we were told) there would not be money to do it. This is at a time when the budget is 50 per cent bigger—\$4 billion bigger—than it was five years ago, and we are told that the government does not have \$100 million to upgrade the mental health facilities at Glenside without selling land.

I was asked the other day, 'What about Goodwood orphanage? When the Liberal Party was in office it sold Goodwood orphanage.' That is exactly right. We did do that and it is still there as open space. It was sold to the council. The residents were given the option. There was a huge consultation process, the outcome of which was that the residents wanted it to continue as open space so the council was offered a deal. That was at a time when the former Liberal government was fixing the mess left by premier Bannon after the State Bank mess when we did not have money. We had a budget smaller than \$8 billion yet we managed to secure an outcome that left open space there. A deal has already been done at Glenside. If one lives in the inner suburbs one will understand that one of the biggest concerns of those living in the inner suburbs is access to open space. Geographically, the electorate of Unley is the smallest electorate in South Australia.

Ms Breuer interjecting:

Mr PISONI: And the member for Giles has the biggest electorate, followed by the member for Stuart, I believe.

Mr Hanna interjecting:

Mr PISONI: Unley is densely populated and it has only 2 per cent open space. It is not acceptable for this government to say to the people who live within the vicinity of Glenside that they will pay for this development by a reduction in their lifestyle, open space and facilities for a statewide facility. I concede that there is a statewide benefit for this development, but why should the residents of Glenside be forced to pay the price disproportionately to other members of the community?

Time expired.

FOREIGN AID POLICY

Ms CICCARELLO (Norwood) (15:52): Today I rise to talk about an issue very close to my heart; that is, Australia's foreign aid policy and its obligation to make world poverty history. Seven years ago, Australia and the other member nations of the UN committed to the Millennium Development Goals: a set of eight goals focused on reducing international poverty. I had high

hopes when Australia initially signed on. It is well known that Australians are amongst the most generous people in the world when it comes to privately contributing to overseas aid. In fact, we are rated the second best in the world, just behind the Irish.

I thought that the government of a country of such generous citizens would do everything in its power to maintain its humanitarian profile and moral obligation to assist those in need. But, like many things to do with the Howard government, my optimism was very quickly extinguished. When Australia's aid contribution dropped to 0.26 per cent of gross national income just one year later I feared the worst; and six years later I am not surprised to learn how badly Australia is failing to meet its international commitments under these goals. Where once Australia was a leader in international development assistance, we have now fallen woefully behind.

The 2007 Millennium Development Goal 8 Review, which looks at Australia's progress in meeting its obligations, makes for sobering reading. I could not have imagined a worse result than Australia receiving a pitiful five out of 20 on the Make Poverty History Report Card. Unfortunately, it is one that is well deserved. We only need to look at the facts. We as a country now rank 15th out of 22 OECD countries. We as a country now only contribute 0.3 per cent of our gross national income to foreign aid. The Howard government, while committing to increase our contribution to a meagre 0.34 per cent by 2011, has refused to make any policy beyond this date.

The Prime Minister in stating that his government 'will reassess its position at this time' means, effectively, that his government has thumbed its nose at the commitments they agreed to. Despite its trumpeted billions of dollars in surplus and the fact that Australia is enjoying record economic conditions, the Howard government seems curiously unable and unwilling to reach out its hand to our poorest global citizens.

This is not what Australia signed up to. It is simply not good enough. Perhaps it can best be summed up by the Treasurer's own brother, the Reverend Tim Costello, who on *Lateline* just 12 days ago said:

We're saying to the government you're out of step being at the bottom of the league table...we think this should be bipartisan because it's a moral, not a political issue.

The reverend also stated the following day:

We'll be telling all the churches that Kevin Rudd is way ahead of the Prime Minister on this issue. It's not too much of an exaggeration to say this issue is life and death.

I do not think you can get any more candid than that. When your own brother thinks that you are, (a) out of step, (b) immoral and (c) should be actively campaigned against, you know you are in trouble. I am delighted, however, to say that Labor has stepped up to the mark and pledged to do the right thing.

Labor has made a commitment to the UN interim target of 0.5 per cent of gross national income by 2015 and has agreed to abide by Australia's commitment to the millennium development goals. This is not just a feel good pledge with no real significance. It will have a real impact. It will save the lives of 140,000 children and provide clean water and sanitation for 37 million people in the Asian region. I would have thought that that demanded a more definite response than the Prime Minister's 'Let's wait and see in four years' time.'

The choice at the coming election is clear: we can vote for a government which has allowed Australia's reputation as a generous and compassionate country to continue to deteriorate or we can vote for a Rudd Labor government which is committed to Australia playing its part in ensuring that everyone throughout the world receives the best chance of a happy and healthy life.

AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for State/Local Government Relations, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Volunteers, Minister for Consumer Affairs, Minister Assisting in Early Childhood Development) (15:57): I move:

That standing orders be and remain so far suspended as to enable the report of the Auditor-General for the year ended 30 June 2007 to be referred to a committee of the whole house and for ministers to be examined on the matters contained in the report in accordance with the timetable as distributed.

The SPEAKER: There not being an absolute majority of members present, ring the bells.

An absolute majority of the whole number of members being present:

Motion carried.

In committee.

The CHAIR: If I can just remind everybody that it is the same procedure, with the committee of the whole, in respect of the courtesies that normally occur. I will be generous with my interpretation of three questions per member. So I call now the Minister for the River Murray, Minister for Water Security, Minister for Regional Development and Minister Assisting the Minister for Industry and Trade. We will consider these matters for 30 minutes.

Mr WILLIAMS: I refer to page 1269 of the Auditor-General's Report. The Auditor-General noted that the government fulfils a number of roles with regard to SA Water, including price setter, taxpayer, banker, shareholder and owner, and regulator. Does the minister not see a conflict between these various roles? How can the South Australian public and SA Water customers be confident that the primary role of SA Water remains that of service provider?

The Hon. K.A. MAYWALD: The Auditor-General did make those comments. I remind the member that SA Water was established under the former Liberal government, and I have every confidence in SA Water's undertaking its roles.

Mr WILLIAMS: I refer to page 1269 of the Auditor-General's Report. Given that Treasury must sign off on SA Water's annual performance statement, which sets out targets for after tax profit and return on capital, and that Treasury is also reliant on significant dividends from SA Water, which are set at 95 per cent of after tax profit, what are the chief drivers within SA Water management?

The Hon. K.A. MAYWALD: SA Water's management is, of course, driven by its charter, government policy of the day and the shareholder and, indeed, the people of South Australia are major shareholders in the organisation.

Mr WILLIAMS: I think the point that the Auditor-General made, and the point that I am making, which I would like the minister to address, is this. Given the imperative of SA Water to produce such returns to the Consolidated Account (and the chief role of SA Water is to provide cost efficient water supply and delivery service to South Australians, both domestic and industrial users), how does the minister ensure that there is control to make sure that the service delivery component remains at the forefront? I have just pointed out that the Auditor-General listed all the roles that the government has with respect to SA Water, and that Treasury has such an important role in negotiating with SA Water, basically, what its after tax profit is, in which Treasury has a 95 per cent interest.

The Hon. K.A. MAYWALD: The SA Water charter sets out quite clearly the roles and responsibilities of the board of SA Water and the management of the business. The Minister for Water Security and the Treasurer are the shareholders and the point of contact between the SA Water board and the government. We work very closely together and we ensure that the charter is adhered to, and the performance statement is the way in which we gauge whether or not SA Water is meeting its obligations.

Mr WILLIAMS: On page 1270, the Auditor-General again raised the issue of SA Water's being required to borrow against its assets to provide for the level of dividends and return on capital required by Treasury. I note that this is certainly not the first time that the Auditor has raised this issue. From memory, he said that, in the last four years at least, SA Water has been under similar pressures. Does the minister believe that it is sustainable for SA Water to continue to have to borrow against its asset base to provide these funds to Treasury? In particular, does she believe that it is sustainable, in view of the desperate need for investment in water infrastructure in South Australia, and how is it envisaged that such infrastructure will be funded?

The Hon. K.A. MAYWALD: The member would know that, when one is embarking upon a very large capital works program (or, indeed, any capital works program), the realisation of those assets for community use is sometimes quite extended and down the track. The government has set a borrowing target for the corporation with a debt to asset (or gearing) ratio ranging from 15 to 25 per cent, which is modest in itself. Overall, the corporation's actual results in the forward budget estimates from 2007-08 to 2010-11 show that the current debt to asset ratio of about 18 to 19 per cent will be maintained. That is also acknowledged by the Auditor-General.

Mr WILLIAMS: I refer to page 1268 of the Auditor-General's Report. Given the myriad controls that the government has over SA Water, to which I have been alluding, is it not true that the Treasurer simply sees the organisation as a cash cow to underpin his budgets? For example, dividends appear to be simply stripping cash against the revaluation of SA Water's assets. This year, the revaluation amounted to \$664 million.

In answer to the previous question, the minister acknowledged that one of the targets is to maintain a debt to asset ratio of between, I think, 15 and 25 per cent. In the last 12 months, we have seen the assets of SA Water increase in value by \$664 million. I think the average debt to asset ratio has been hovering at just under 20 per cent; at 17 or 18 per cent. If one takes 17 or 18 per cent of \$664 million, it is a fair bit of cash that all of a sudden, under the government's set of guidelines, it can strip out of SA Water to prop up the budget.

The CHAIR: As I best recall the question, the first part was: isn't it true that the Treasurer views...? The minister cannot answer in relation to the Treasurer's view but she may be able to provide information.

Mr WILLIAMS: On that point, Madam Chair, I was under the opinion that every minister speaks for the government, and the opposition is often told in question time that any minister, irrespective of who the question is directed to, can speak for the government. I would expect that the minister (certainly as the minister for SA Water) would be across the issue that I have questioned.

The CHAIR: Member for MacKillop, I indicated that the minister could probably provide some factual answers but she cannot provide an indication of another minister's mind.

The Hon. K.A. MAYWALD: In referring to the part of the question regarding the revaluation of assets within SA Water, of course revaluation of assets occurs on an annual basis in line with the increase of replacement costs of assets, plus there is also the adding of new assets into the business. SA Water has an extensive and very large asset base, as you would be aware, investing in things like the improved country water treatment program at the moment with over \$50 million being invested out in the regions to provide new filtration plants and a whole range of asset upgrades that SA Water invests in every year. Of course, the revaluation is going to go up as a consequence of that.

Also, when you are talking about borrowing rates for a company the size of SA Water—and, indeed, any kind of borrowing ratio—you actually spread the cost of that asset across the duration of the life of that asset, and that is why borrowings are an important part of the business. SA Water has a very modest target in regard to its debt and asset ratios (as I said, 15 per cent to 25 per cent), currently sitting at about 18 per cent to 19 per cent, which is quite acceptable for an organisation the size of SA Water.

Mr WILLIAMS: The point of the questions I have been asking, minister, is also what the Auditor-General has pointed out on a number of occasions: SA Water is forced to go into the market and borrow against its assets to pay into the consolidated account. Every South Australian knows that there is extreme pressure on SA Water to perform its key role which is to source water and deliver that water to its customers across South Australia.

We continually hear from your government that there are cost pressures—and I will come to that in a moment in further questioning—and difficulties that the government faces in being able to finance the sort of infrastructure that we need to be provided by SA Water. I guess that is why I asked the question earlier. Is it sustainable for Treasury to keep ripping money out of SA Water when SA Water is unable, first, to maintain its existing infrastructure because of cost pressures and, secondly, to build new infrastructure which is patently needed?

The Hon. K.A. MAYWALD: There is certainly no evidence that SA Water is having difficulty maintaining its current assets. As you would be aware from the budget papers, the increase in capital expenditure in SA Water over the past five years has been considerable compared with the asset investment of the previous five years under the Liberal government. Of course, in any business the size of the SA Water Corporation, it is important to have prudent management which includes a sensibly geared debt to asset ratio.

We are investing in major projects such as the Glenelg waste water treatment upgrade and pipeline to the city which will provide for the use of recycled water in parks and gardens around the city. The Christies Beach upgrade will extend significantly the waste water reuse in that area. The extension of the Virginia pipeline is another major project. These are all great projects that SA Water is embarking on well within its capacity under normal prudent business management. As I understand it, the ratio was established back when the corporation was formed under the previous Liberal government, so I cannot see why it is a problem now.

Mr WILLIAMS: That was an interesting comment in the minister's answer. The reality is that those projects you have mentioned, minister, have all been underpinned by funds from the federal government. In fact, that money has been on the table for three years and that is how long

it has taken your government to get to the point where it can agree to put in some money of its own. So, that suggests to me that there is either a lack of will to do anything or there are financial pressures which are not allowing your government to match the commonwealth funds to get on with those projects. But I will move on.

Page 1260 of the Auditor-General's Report refers to the key objectives, one of which is to 'provide value for money water services within South Australia.' Minister, can you clear up the confusion over water charges arising from various government statements? First, the former minister, the Hon. Michael Wright, on 8 December (almost 12 months ago) announced price increases of CPI plus 3 per cent for each of the ensuing five years—that is, a total of CPI plus 15 per cent over five years. He stated that 'the increased price will allow the government to significantly invest in the future of our state's water supplies.'

Then the Treasurer around budget time told the house on 28 June, 'We have set a price path—and I do not have the brief in front of me, and I will get a better answer than this—but it is inflation plus 2 or 3 per cent, which gives us the capacity to service more capital than is needed to waterproof Adelaide. If we do a desal plant or a build of Mount Bold, we would then have to lift that even higher'.

Minister, you were quoted in *The Advertiser* of 13 September as saying, 'Increased infrastructure will lead to increased prices.' Did minister Wright get it wrong last December or did the Treasurer get it wrong in June or did you get it wrong in September? What is the real situation?

The Hon. K.A. MAYWALD: The only person who has it wrong is the member for MacKillop. Back on 8 December the announcement by minister Wright was an increase of CPI plus 3 per cent. The 3 per cent was to build into the forward estimates the capacity to deliver on projects under the Waterproofing Adelaide strategy—an extensive strategy (developed from 2003 and released in 2005) which had major investment in demand management, stormwater projects, recycled effluent and reuse projects as well as catchment management. From memory, about \$240 million in the forward estimates has been allocated towards Waterproofing Adelaide initiatives.

Since 2005, you may recall that we have had the most severe drought on record. It may have escaped your notice but it has actually changed the parameters under which Waterproofing Adelaide was initially established. Waterproofing Adelaide was based on the previous 116 years of data; however, 2006 has been a year that could never have been predicted from looking back through those historic records.

It was 56 per cent of the previous low year, and it has re-established new perimeters. We have immediately gone back to the books to revisit the perimeters of Waterproofing Adelaide and look at what other projects we need to build security into the water supply for Adelaide and South Australia. I can assure you that there is no confusion in this. Waterproofing Adelaide will still continue.

The Waterproofing Adelaide projects are an important component of securing the future of South Australia's water supply. There is no magic silver bullet; however, there will be further investment in infrastructure and further investment in desalination. An expansion of the reservoir capacity in the Mount Lofty Ranges will incur further cost increases in the future as those investments are decided upon.

I can assure you that the Waterproofing Adelaide document, however, does not become redundant. That document is a very important document. It is a very important strategy. It has some terrific targets which will certainly assist in securing Adelaide's and South Australia's water supply in the future. However, with the new perimeters as a consequence of the drought, we have revisited that document. We are looking at other major infrastructure projects and desalination, which the Premier has already announced. Also, the expansion of Mount Bold will of course incur extra costs associated with construction. It is a \$2.5 billion investment over and above the Waterproofing Adelaide strategy, so therefore you can see that it does not get pulled out of thin air. The capacity to pay will have to be built into that.

Mr WILLIAMS: Again, another interesting answer. Minister, if you consult the Waterproofing Adelaide strategy and look at the graphs on pages 14 and 15, you will note that back in 2005 the strategy did indeed identify that under drought conditions Adelaide would run out of water about now—2007-08.

The Hon. K.A. Maywald interjecting:

Mr WILLIAMS: Well, I invite you to go back and look at the document, because there are two graphs that show that the supply under drought conditions actually does not meet demand at this point in time, and that was identified several years ago.

The Hon. K.A. Maywald interjecting:

Mr WILLIAMS: Look at the graphs on page 14 and 15 of the Waterproofing Adelaide strategy, minister. It is interesting that you now suggest that Waterproofing Adelaide has been outdated by the drought. On my reading of it, it certainly did identify that there would be a shortage. Maybe your answer has a lot to do with hindsight on your part.

Minister, I now refer you to page 1602 of the Auditor-General's Report regarding South Australia's commitment of 35 gigalitres a year for the Living Murray project by 2009. It is my understanding that about 13 or 14 gigalitres of that water has already been put aside for that purpose. What is the timeframe for achieving the 21 or 22 gigalitre balance for this commitment? Why doesn't your government go into the current market and buy water and make available any allocation on those licences to help protect permanent crops in South Australia?

The Hon. K.A. MAYWALD: As the member should be aware, the Living Murray is water that has to be ring fenced for the environment. Under the rules of the business plan and the details of the Living Murray initiative, that water is only available for the environment. It is to take it out of production capacity and, if it is allocated to the Living Murray, it is not available for other consumptive purposes. That is made very clear in the initiative. It is our intention to achieve our target of 35 gigalitres towards the 500 gigalitres return to the environment by 2009.

Mr WILLIAMS: The very point that I asked about, minister. There is nothing to stop your government—given that it has given a commitment to go into the market and acquire that water, get it from somewhere—from going to the market today to acquire that water and use any portion of it which is allocated today to underpin the saving of permanent plantings in your own electorate and other parts of the Murray system in South Australia in the current irrigation season, and even in the next irrigation season, and then, in 2009, transfer those licences to the Living Murray project. I do not know whether you want to comment on that, minister.

The Hon. K.A. MAYWALD: Quite simply, under the process that is involved in the Living Murray, the purchase of water is an option, but it is an option that has not been preferred by most jurisdictions, except South Australia. We put it up as a proposition. We have indeed acquired 13 gigalitres of water. It currently sits on, I believe, the eligible measures register, and the South Australian government intends to achieve our 22 gigalitres through a range of measures: efficiencies on farm through to wetland management and savings, and also a portion of purchase of the water from willing sellers, of which 13 gigalitres has already been put up to be eligible measures.

As for going into the market and purchasing water at this point in time, the problem with that notion is that only a small portion of those licences are available for use, because the same rules apply for those licences as they do for irrigators. The purchase of permanent water in the marketplace at the moment will deliver only the 16 per cent that is allocated for irrigation. As we have said to the federal government over and over again, we believe it is important to support irrigators to be able to purchase water in the marketplace.

Both the commonwealth and New South Wales, and others, have said that they are not keen on the South Australian government getting involved in the water market directly. They would prefer to see support for irrigators to purchase water. Of course, the responsibility for drought relief lies with the federal government. We have been in touch and we have actually sent our special drought adviser over to Peter McGauran's office. Peter McGauran himself was not available; however, I have had a number of conversations with the federal minister for agriculture and also the minister for water security to try to secure a way in which our irrigators are able to get into the marketplace to purchase water but, at this stage, that particular proposition has not been supported.

However, we would welcome the opposition's support for the proposition that is being put forward by the irrigators to the federal government to enable them to get into the marketplace and purchase water so that they are able to keep their permanent plantings alive.

Mr WILLIAMS: Again, minister, I find your response interesting. What you are saying is that the South Australian government should not go into the market but that we should encourage the federal government to give money to irrigators so that they can go into the market to buy water

for exactly the same purpose. The irrigators will buy non-permanent water, whereas the South Australian government already has a commitment on the table to buy permanent water.

Your argument is just a way of saying that the South Australian government will not put any of its money on the table to help support irrigators on the river but that, of course, it is the responsibility of the federal government. I see your argument, minister, but I just think that the irrigators on the river have every right to be very disappointed in a state government that has already made a commitment to purchase this water. However, it will not purchase it now, when it is damn well needed; it will purchase it in two years' time when, hopefully, the drought has broken.

I turn now to page 1602. The Auditor-General talks about the \$4.1 million the South Australian government has paid to the Victorian government—again, as part of the Living Murray project. Can the minister confirm that this payment is towards the Goulburn-Murray water recovery package; if so, what is her government's attitude to the Victorian government's plan to build a pipeline over the Great Divide to pipe 75 gigalitres of water per year out of the Murray-Darling Basin to supplement the Melbourne water supply—a project we are funding or helping to fund?

The Hon. K.A. MAYWALD: First, in response to the previous comments on water purchase, I wish to clarify the record. The water purchase for the Living Murray is about environmental water and its permanent allocations. The permanent allocations purchase out of the marketplace of \$2,500 a megalitre at the moment to deliver only 16 per cent is a very expensive way to try to get water back into the marketplace.

The irrigators themselves have put forward a proposition to both the federal agriculture minister and the federal government to support longer term loans to enable them to access the marketplace. They believe that an active market is important, and they also believe that the government should stay out of the marketplace because they need to be in there purchasing water for their own benefit.

This government has put in place \$70 million worth of support to enhance the federal government's package. The federal government has been providing drought relief, as it is its responsibility for the major role of drought relief across the nation. Billions of dollars have been invested by the federal government through the Exceptional Circumstances program. State governments generally manage fire, flood and other natural disasters, whereas drought is the responsibility of the federal government.

I believe that it is irresponsible for members of this house to try to shift the blame because their colleagues federally are not actually recognising that there is a significant difference in relation to drought in broadacre and drought in irrigation communities. I will continue to support not only irrigators in my electorate but also South Australian irrigators throughout the length and breadth of the River Murray to lobby the federal government to get support in what is a very difficult time.

As to the other question in relation to the Goulburn-Murray investment of \$4.1 million in the Victorian Goulburn-Murray package, that is a different project from that being proposed by the Victorian government to pipe water into Melbourne. The South Australian government is not investing in the project to pipe water to Melbourne.

Mr WILLIAMS: But is the \$4.1 million being invested in the Goulburn Valley water recovery project—a project that the Victorian government argues is freeing up water, which then allows it to take out 75 gigalitres and pipe it into Melbourne?

The Hon. K.A. MAYWALD: They are two separate projects. The project in which we are investing is not the project that will pipe water down to Melbourne.

Mr WILLIAMS: But is the \$4.1 million we are investing, through the Victorian government, into the Goulburn Valley, being spent in the Goulburn-Murray water recovery package?

The Hon. K.A. MAYWALD: No; there are two projects the Victorian government is investing in: one is the Goulburn-Murray water recovery project under the Living Murray; and the other one is called, I understand, the food bowl improvement program, which is a different project and is not one in which we are investing.

Mr WILLIAMS: So, which one are we investing in?

The Hon. K.A. MAYWALD: The South Australian government is investing in the Goulburn-Murray water recovery package, which has been registered under the Living Murray initiative and which is a separate project to what I think is called the food bowl improvement project,

or something like that. It is a project that is being invested in and is not one which has been registered with the Living Murray or one in which the South Australian government is investing.

Mr WILLIAMS: Another part of my question was: does the minister have an attitude about the Victorian government's plan to withdraw 75 gigalitres of water per year from the Murray-Darling Basin and pipe it to Melbourne?

The Hon. K.A. MAYWALD: The South Australian government has a very strong view that we need to ensure that all water extractions from the River Murray are sustainable within each jurisdiction, and that is why we have supported in full the federal government's \$10 billion plan to deal with overallocation in the Murray-Darling Basin regions. It is very important that any water taken out of the system is fully accounted for. We are not investing in the project to take water through to Melbourne.

Mr PEDERICK: Can the minister explain what the government is doing to ensure full accountability in the Department of Water, Land and Biodiversity Conservation? There are many references in the Auditor-General's Report, from pages 1594 to 1599, that draw attention to inadequate control and accountability across the whole department. For example, on page 1594 it states that the DWLBC 'further acknowledged that it was yet to fully develop certain control frameworks and in some instances had not implemented desired controls or not rigorously applied some existing controls'. Again on page 1594, it states, 'Key payroll controls were not consistently operating as intended.'

On the same page it states that limitations were apparent in DWLBC's system, resulting in interest not being applied to outstanding water levies and penalties as required by the NRM Act 2004. On page 1594 it also states that 'inaccurate water licensing revenue and debtors balances had flowed through to the general ledger without appropriate adjustment'. There are many statements in these pages, but one in particular raises much concern. On page 15.95—budgetary management—the review noted that DWLBC's budget management system incorporated budget expenditure targets which exceeded that approved in the Department of Treasury and Finance's budget system.

The Hon. K.A. MAYWALD: The Auditor-General's opinion on internal controls indicated that, apart from certain matters raised in relation to control environments, specific control matters, the natural resources management fund, and payments from the administrative grants funds, the controls exercised by the department were sufficient to provide reasonable assurance that the financial transactions of the department had been conducted properly and in accordance with the law.

The recommendations made by the Auditor-General refer to leading practice recommendations, which are improvements on systems that will ensure that the department can achieve leading practice processes rather than just the prescribed processes under Treasurer's Instructions. So, this moves beyond that to ensuring and providing recommendations for improvement. The Auditor-General has not said that they were insufficient, just that they could be improved, and that is what the department has taken these recommendations to mean. I have confidence in the department to deliver on improving the processes to ensure that we can adapt to these leading practice recommendations.

The CHAIR: I now call the Attorney-General, Minister for Justice and Minister for Multicultural Affairs to the table.

Mrs REDMOND: The first area that I want to examine—and I want to clarify, first, that it is examinable in this particular section—relates to the Auditor-General's section. I refer to Volume 1, page 243.

The CHAIR: What aspect are you querying?

Mrs REDMOND: I guess I need to explain the question that I want to ask, Madam Chair. If you look at page 243 on the notes to and forming part of the financial statements, the objectives of the department are as follows:

The Department's main statutory responsibilities are to audit the public accounts and the accounts of public authorities and to report the results to parliament...

It goes on to state that within this program class there are two programs: prescribed audits, which includes all audit work to be undertaken for agencies, and special investigations, which is specifically requested to be undertaken by the Auditor-General. My question is about what does not appear in here. I refer to the top of page 240, 'Communication of audit matters'.

Of course, the Auditor-General's office is actually audited by Edwards Marshall because the Auditor-General obviously cannot audit the Auditor-General's office. In its management letter it advised that there were no significant issues arising from the audit. That strikes me as odd, given that we know from estimates—and I cannot tell where it appears in here—that the Auditor-General (not the current one, but the one recently retired) expended \$100,000 overnight engaging a firm of lawyers and a series of barristers to take to the Supreme Court an ex parte application in an attempt to prevent the DPP from filing a report with the parliament.

Quite apart from the fact that the application to the Supreme Court was always bound to fail and was a ridiculous waste of money, it seems that, on the basis of the statement that appears on page 243, to which I have referred, the statutory responsibilities are to audit the public accounts and that there are two programs—the standard audit of the department and the things specifically requested.

That expenditure of \$100,000 by the Auditor-General does not come clearly within anything that is said on page 243 as to the functions of the Auditor-General's office. My question is: how then can it be that he has expended \$100,000 on an absolute waste of taxpayers' money on a wild goose chase in his fight with the DPP, yet the auditors Edwards Marshall say that there are no significant issues arising from the audit?

The CHAIR: Member for Heysen, my question relates to the reason you are bringing it up now. We do not have any information to contradict your bringing it up now, it is simply that in estimates matters relating to the Auditor-General fall within the Premier's area.

Mrs REDMOND: That is why my first question was: am I able to ask that question within this line, as it were, because I cannot see anywhere else that it would come, other than under the Attorney-General for the audit purposes.

The CHAIR: Indeed; we do not have any clear information here. Does the Attorney have an opinion?

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: Not really, but I would certainly commend to the Economic and Finance Committee that they have a careful look at the former Auditor-General's Report on how he spent that money and also on the expenditure of money on Ball Public Relations by the Office of the Director of Public Prosecutions. I urge a full examination of that by the Economic and Finance Committee, and I hope the opposition would support that.

The CHAIR: Do you wish to go to other places, member for Heysen?

Mrs REDMOND: Yes, I think it might be easiest to go to other places at this stage. I turn to page 171, which is within the Attorney-General's area. At the very top of the page there is a listing of remuneration of employees. I am seeking an explanation as to how it is that last year we had one employee earning \$230,000 to \$240,000; for some reason one at \$380,000 to \$390,000; and one at \$390,000 to \$400,000, yet this year two of those have gone up to over \$400,000 and one to \$500,000 to \$510,000. I am seeking an explanation as to what has caused such a dramatic increase, given that it appears—and maybe I am misreading it—that last year the highest paid of the employees was sitting under \$400,000 but this year it has gone to over \$500,000, which represents an increase of 25 per cent in remuneration in the period of one year.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: That is a question I will have to take on notice because, clearly, Mr Pallaras, the DPP, would be within one of those bands, but he does not appear in 2007 and I am not sure why that would not be. My guess is that one of them is the Solicitor-General, Chris Kourakis QC—well worth every dollar he is paid by this government, an outstanding Solicitor-General—I think the other would be Ted Mullighan who has retired from the Supreme Court and who is conducting the inquiry into children in state care, and again I think even the opposition would say that Ted's work is value for money, but we will take it on notice.

Mrs REDMOND: There is a reference somewhere around these couple of pages to judicial officers earning over \$100,000. Can the Attorney confirm for me that there would not be any judicial officers earning less than \$100,000 in this state.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: Certainly there are judicial officers earning less than \$100,000, and they are Her Majesty's special justices who are volunteers who were removed so cruelly from the courts by the Liberal government and who have now been brought back into service. However, regarding stipendiary judicial officers, alas, they do not come under \$100,000 any more, and if we appointed any more than we currently have, no doubt the parliamentary Liberal

Party would condemn us for appointing fat cats—that is, public sector employees of more than \$100,000—although speaking for myself, I would like a few more.

Mrs REDMOND: Perhaps while we are on page 171, I did have a question out of sheer curiosity. About three-quarters of the way down the page under 'Other expenses payable to entities within the South Australian government' there is 'Betting Services.' I am curious about, first, what it is; and, secondly, why it went from 22 last year to six this year?

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: That is minister Caica. It is not, as the member for Heysen might have thought, the Attorney-General's tipping service. However, if she had rung me on the morning of the first Tuesday of November, she would have been given one tip and one tip only—No. 6.

Mrs REDMOND: I take it that the Attorney was a happy chappie on Tuesday afternoon then.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: Certainly was—I've still got the wad.

Mrs REDMOND: I turn to the issue of the Public Trustee at pages 188 and 189. First, below the two graphs on page 188, I notice that in 2006-07 there was an increase of \$4 million in current assets to \$11 million, which is over a 50 per cent increase basically on what was there previously. I note that there is also a reference to the building having been sold. At the top of page 189 it refers to the building having been sold for \$7.6 million. I take it that is the building in Franklin Street.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: It is.

Mrs REDMOND: First, does that completely explain why there is so much more money in current assets? Was the money kept from the sale of that building? Is it set aside for the Public Trustee, did it go into general revenue, or what? What is happening in terms of accommodating the Public Trustee if the building has now been sold?

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: My advice is that the Public Trustee was allowed to keep the proceeds of the sale. It was a condition of the sale that they remain there for three years as tenants—which they are. They may remain longer.

Mrs REDMOND: Is there a financial statement anywhere—I could not find one—as to the financial outcome of selling a building and then occupying it under a lease?

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: That analysis does exist. It is not in the financial statements. I will give my earnest consideration to sharing that information with the member for Heysen.

Mrs REDMOND: Could the Attorney-General indicate whether there is a financial benefit in some way to the government? It looks like selling off the farm. A building that has been owned for generations and occupied by the Public Trustee for a long time—and it may not be the most modern building in Adelaide but it was sold for \$7.6 million—is a significant asset. I am curious as to what prompted the government to sell that property and lease it back?

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: It was a broader policy in government to dispose of these assets, but it was done on condition that there be no financial disadvantage to the Public Trustee—and that will be fulfilled.

Mrs REDMOND: Will the minister explain the broad policy of government to sell off these assets? Is it connected in any way with the reference to the acquisition of the old Stock Exchange building?

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: My advice is that it is a policy of the Premier's department, which may usefully be taken up on the Premier's appearance in this committee.

Mrs REDMOND: I refer to page 189, which states that the trust funds which reflect significant increases are deceased estates, trusts, court award orders, and so on. Some are going up by huge amounts, but, in particular, for administration matters there is a 54 per cent increase in the trust funds—which is significant, indeed. What exactly is involved in administration matters? I assume, because of the other headings, it is not dealing with the deceased estates, trusts, court award orders, protected estates and powers of attorney that are otherwise listed. What is covered by administration matters? How did they happen to increase by so much?

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: The two factors that lead to an increase in holdings by trusts are more clients, and share market investments and other investments doing well. I do not know the answer to the question, but I will get an answer for the member for Heysen.

Mrs REDMOND: On page 202, item 15, 'Other reserves', just below the table, it states:

The reserve for deficits and other losses was created to cover losses made during the administration of estates. Payments amounting to \$229,000 were made from this reserve and recoupment of previous years' payments amounting to \$83,000 were made to the reserve.

I seek an explanation. Where does one make a loss during the administration of an estate? I am not familiar with that particular reserve.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: We do not know the answer, but we will get an answer. My first thought is that the Public Trustee has a legal obligation to act as executor for people who make wills making it the executor, and the Public Trustee invites that by writing wills for people, provided that the Public Trustee is made the executor. In other cases it becomes an executor of last resort.

Mrs Redmond: I never made a loss administering any estate.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: That is because the member for Heysen had the ability to refuse certain jobs. She did not have a legal obligation to take on estates which had almost nothing in them or which comprised onerous property.

Mrs REDMOND: That is why I recommended that people leave their will with the Public Trustee.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: The interjection illustrates the point I am making, namely, that the Public Trustee becomes the executor and administrator of last resort. My thinking on this—and I will have it confirmed when we get an answer for the member for Heysen (my, won't my department be busy)—is that the Public Trustee must take on many jobs that lead to its making a loss on the transaction—dealing with tiny estates, difficult estates and estates containing only onerous property, which result in a net loss for the Public Trustee. That is part of its community service obligation—something it does. It gives of itself for the people of South Australia—and, accordingly, you will never see that on *Today Tonight*.

Mrs REDMOND: Perhaps we will try another area of interest. I refer to the Courts Administration Authority, page 305. Just below the table at the top of the page, it states:

The total current and non-current judicial benefit expense (i.e, aggregate judicial benefit plus related on costs) for 2007 is \$3,692,000 and \$5,196,000 respectively. For 2006, the expense was \$2,650,000 and \$5,361,000 respectively.

In the next little section under 'Correction of Errors' is a reference to an overstatement from last year of \$360,000. However, the expense for 2006 was \$2,650,000 and \$3,692,000 for this year, which is a difference of over \$1 million. Even taking into account that \$363,000 referred to in the paragraph below, I am curious as to what has caused that difference.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: The member for Heysen continues to earn her keep by asking detailed questions, and we shall have to get a reply for her on that. What I do know is that the judges are led by a militant shop steward, known as Justice Bleby, who certainly makes demands on the taxpayers of South Australia that are out of all proportion to the capacity of the state to pay. He has no regard for the productivity of the economy and, to some extent, he has prevailed over us.

Mrs REDMOND: While we are on that page, I have another odd question because I have not seen the term before. Is the Supreme Court suitor account (and I notice that on the next page there is a District Court suitor account and a Magistrates Court suitor account) like a trust account that is held in the Sheriff's office? Is it the same thing? Is it where, for instance, moneys paid into court are held? I have not come across the name before.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: Yes, it is a classic trust account.

Mrs REDMOND: I go back to the Attorney-General's Department at page 173. I have just a couple of questions in relation to figures where there seems to be a fair discrepancy from year to year. In particular, on page 173 about halfway down under item 50 'Payables-Administered Items', the first figure for creditors went from \$2,476,000 last year to more than \$4 million this year, and accruals went down conversely from \$1,041,000 last year to only \$32,000 this year. Is there an explanation for where those amounts have changed so much and why?

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: My advice is that it is end of year reconciliation with Treasury; but, again, we will get a detailed reply and it will be prompt.

Mrs REDMOND: At the same time could I get a reply to the other areas on that page where there are major discrepancies such as the employee on-costs, which reduced significantly from \$34,000 to \$12,000 this year and, again, payables to SA government entities where similar figures appear and significant discrepancies appear from one listing to the next? Could I ask for that to occur?

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: My advice is that the state rescue helicopter has come into AGD administered items.

Mrs REDMOND: With respect to Public Trustee, at the bottom of page 202 there is a listing for operating commitments that did not exist last year. Am I correct in assuming that that operating commitment of one year or less, \$638,000, and later than one year but no longer than five years, \$1,267,000, is in fact because of the leasing of the Public Trustee's building by Public Trustee?

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: I would read the note underneath that entry in the same way as the member for Heysen.

Mrs REDMOND: I again refer to Public Trustee; page 186. There were several matters with respect to financial management and control (about halfway down the page) where some concern seems to have been raised. I had the impression, from something that I read elsewhere, that some of these matters had been outstanding for some little time. The matters raised included: the need to update policies and procedures to reflect current control processes; a number of estate files were not provided in a timely manner for audit review purposes (that one particularly concerned me); and the need to ensure that documentation associated with estate files was complete and filed in a manner which facilitates file review. I will not read the others out.

After reading that, and a couple of other things elsewhere in relation to Public Trustee, it sounded to me as though there had been what I guess one would describe as a degree of sloppiness in relation to the management of Public Trustee files. Does the Attorney-General have any comment in relation to that matter?

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: Audit has identified that policies and procedures did not accurately reflect some of the current control processes. This is mainly owing to a new asset management system being in its transition phase, replacing the old asset management system. Although policies and procedures have been updated, they remain in draft stage until the system goes live, in six days' time. They will become active as of 19 November.

Staff had not completed 11 out of 100 requests for estate files in a timely fashion, as they were still actively working on these estates. Staff have been reminded that they must provide files in a timely manner and, if there is a need to retain the file, this must be communicated swiftly. There has been a large increase in workload in both the personal estates and estate services branches.

The increase is owing to the increased complexity of estates, including family conflict, legal issues and family property settlements and an increase in estate numbers. The overall workload increase has created pressure on resources and, as a consequence, some tasks, such as filing and file management, were deferred in the interests of maintaining client services.

Public Trustee has since temporarily employed additional staff to manage the increased workload, and a major review of workload and work practices is well advanced. Temporary staff have been engaged to remove the backlog. We have a new Public Trustee, Mark Bodycoat, and I have every confidence in him.

The CHAIR: The time for examination of matters relating to this report having expired, I call the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education, the Minister for Science and Information Economy, the Minister for Youth and the Minister for Gambling.

Mr GRIFFITHS: I must admit that I always look forward to reading the Auditor-General's Report but, unfortunately, it has not given me very much to work with in the minister's department. However, I will see if I can keep us busy for half an hour. I refer to page 527. I will start with the perennial question about the number of people who are earning above \$100,000. I note that that has increased from 108 employees last financial year to 141 in the 2006-07 year. Interestingly, the real growth has occurred in the number of people earning up to \$130,000, which has gone from 75 employees in the previous year to 109. Can the minister explain why such a significant number of people are now earning above \$100,000?

The Hon. P. CAICA: I thank the honourable member for his question and I find it very interesting that he looks forward to the Auditor-General's Report. He might find more interesting things in life, but it is part of our job, isn't it? He is right to identify that the number of employees paid \$100,000 or more has increased by 33 in the current year, and there is a variety of reasons for that. In the previous year, 53 different employees were paid \$100,000 or more in the 2006-07 financial year and they were not included in the previous year's total.

When doing an analysis of the numbers, we know that 19 of that total of 33 fall into the area of educational manager level A and principal lecturers. The 3.5 per cent salary increases under the PSM act and TAFE act put those people who are just under \$100,000 just over \$100,000.

In addition to that, it has been offset by seven employees included in the 2005-06 financial year totals having terminated their employment, including four with TVSP packages. That was in the previous financial year. In total, it is true that we have increased the level of wages identified by the honourable member. I think we have had the debate in the chamber previously about whether or not people in these categories—and it has not been mentioned by the honourable member but by people on that side—fall into the category of 'fat cats'. They are actually being paid an appropriate level of remuneration for the very important responsibilities that they discharge. As I mentioned, with increases in award increments within those classifications, it is certainly an expectation that others who might fall under the \$100,000 category this year will transition into that category the next year.

Mr GRIFFITHS: I understand that it is important to attract the best possible people to work within the department and that they need to be paid an adequate level of remuneration, but in looking at the report it highlighted to me that, last year when I was asking questions about this, I noted that there were eight people who were included in last year's figure who had left during that year and took lump sum figures, so I am presuming that that lump sum payout in some cases would have pushed them above the \$100,000 mark, therefore they would have been included when normally they would not have.

This year it was only one person. If you discount those components of it, it equates to an increase by 40 in the number of people who are earning over \$100,000 (or 40 per cent). Given that that is a significant increase (and I think anybody would agree with that) it is a large jump within a department to have a 40 per cent increase in those earning more than \$100,000.

Minister, could you provide details of the areas within the Department of Further Education, Employment, Science and Technology in which people earning more than \$100,000 per year were deployed for the 2006-07 financial year and for 2005-06 for comparison?

The Hon. P. CAICA: I am happy to provide a table that shows the 2006 total of the number of employees and those from 2006 who were not in the 2007 count, which also shows movements across the bandwidths that also detail the net increase or decrease with some note references.

The CHAIR: Are you saying that it is purely statistical in nature?

The Hon. P. CAICA: It is purely statistical.

The CHAIR: Under the old system only one page was allowed.

The Hon. P. CAICA: It is purely statistical with respect to the front page. With respect to the notes, I will provide that to the honourable member for his information. So, the front page is for insertion in *Hansard* and the other pages for the member for Goyder.

The CHAIR: Will it make sense to future readers of *Hansard* without those notes?

The Hon. P. CAICA: I believe it would.

The CHAIR: We are satisfied that these are explanatory notes and can be incorporated in *Hansard* if you so wish.

Leave granted.

Attachment 1				
	2006 Number of Employees	2006 Resignations	In 2006 not in 2007	In 2007 not in 2006
\$100,000-\$109,999	58		(7)	46

Attachment 1				
	2006 Number of Employees	2006 Resignations	In 2006 not in 2007	In 2007 not in 2006
\$110,000-\$119,999	13		(3)	2
\$120,000-\$129,999	4		(1)	3
\$130,000-\$139,999	7		(1)	-
\$140,000-\$149,999	7		(2)	-
\$150,000-\$159,999	6		(2)	-
\$160,000-\$169,999	4	(1)	-	-
\$170,000-\$179,999	-		-	-
\$180,000-\$189,999	-		-	1
\$190,000-\$199,999	1		-	-
\$200,000-\$209,999	1		-	1
\$210,000-\$219,999	2		-	-
\$220,000-\$229,999	1		(1)	-
\$230,000-\$249,999	2		(1)	-
\$240,000-\$249,999	-	-	-	-
\$260,000-\$269,999	1		(1)	-
\$290,000-\$299,999	1		-	-
	108	(1)	(19)	53

Attachment 1 (cont)				
	Movements across bandwidths	2007 Number of employees	Net Increase/ (decrease)	Note reference
\$100,000-\$109,999	(30)	67	9	(a)
\$110,000-\$119,999	20	32	19	(b)
\$120,000-\$129,999	4	10	6	(c)
\$130,000-\$139,999	(2)	4	(3)	(d)
\$140,000-\$149,999	1	6	(1)	(e)
\$150,000-\$159,999	2	6	-	
\$160,000-\$169,999	-	3	(1)	(f)
\$170,000-\$179,999	4	4	4	(g)
\$180,000-\$189,999	1	2	2	(h)
\$190,000-\$199,999	(1)	-	(1)	(i)
\$200,000-\$209,999	-	2	1	(j)
\$210,000-\$219,999	(2)	-	(2)	(k)
\$220,000-\$229,999	2	2	1	(l)
\$230,000-\$249,999	-	1	(1)	(m)
\$240,000-\$249,999	1	1	1	(n)
\$260,000-\$269,999	-	-	(1)	(o)
\$290,000-\$299,999	-	1	-	
	-	141	33	

(a) The net increase of 9 is due to the:

- 7 employees who were paid a remuneration in 2006 within this bandwidth but did not get paid \$100,000 in 2007
- 46 employees who were paid a remuneration in 2007 within this bandwidth but did not get paid \$100,000 in 2006
- 30 employees who are shown in a different bandwidth in 2007

(b) The net increase of 19 is due to the:

- 3 employees who were paid a remuneration in 2006 within this bandwidth but did not get paid \$100,000 in 2007
- 2 employees who were paid a remuneration in 2007 within this bandwidth but did not get paid \$100,000 in 2006
- 20 employees who were shown in a different bandwidth in 2006

- (c) The net increase of 6 is due to the:
- 1 employee who was paid a remuneration in 2006 within this bandwidth but did not get paid \$100,000 in 2007
 - 3 employees who were paid a remuneration in 2007 within this bandwidth but did not get paid \$100,000 in 2006
 - 4 employees who were shown in a different bandwidth in 2006
- (d) The net decrease of 3 is due to the:
- 1 employee who was paid a remuneration in 2006 within this bandwidth but did not get paid \$100,000 in 2007
 - 2 employees who are shown in a different bandwidth in 2007
- (e) The net decrease of 1 is due to the:
- 2 employees who was paid a remuneration in 2006 within this bandwidth but did not get paid \$100,000 in 2007
 - 1 employee who was shown in a different bandwidth in 2006
- (f) The net decrease of 1 is due to the:
- inclusion of 1 employee who resigned in 2006
- (g) The net increase of 4 is due to the:
- 4 employees who were shown in a different bandwidth in 2006
- (h) The net increase of 2 is due to the:
- 1 employee who was paid a remuneration in 2007 within this bandwidth but did not get paid \$100,000 in 2006
 - 1 employee who was shown in a different bandwidth in 2006
- (i) The net decrease of 1 is due to the:
- 1 employee who is shown in a different bandwidth in 2007
- (j) The net increase of 1 is due to the:
- 1 employee who was paid a remuneration in 2007 within this bandwidth but did not get paid \$100,000 in 2006
- (k) The net decrease of 2 is due to the:
- 2 employees who are shown in a different bandwidth in 2007
- (l) The net increase of 1 is due to the:
- 1 employee who was paid a remuneration in 2006 within this bandwidth but did not get paid \$100,000 in 2007
 - 2 employees who were shown in a different bandwidth in 2006
- (m) The net decrease of 1 is due to the:
- 1 employee who was paid a remuneration in 2006 within this bandwidth but did not get paid \$100,000 in 2007
- (n) The net increase of 1 is due to the:
- 1 employee who was shown in a different bandwidth in 2006
- (o) The net decrease of 1 is due to the:
- 1 employee who was paid a remuneration in 2006 within this bandwidth but did not get paid \$100,000 in 2007

Mr GRIFFITHS: I refer now to page 513 regarding hourly paid instructors. I note that the 2006 enterprise agreement provided that hourly paid instructors' weekly teaching hours should not exceed 15 hours per week. The Auditor-General's Report goes on to note that a number of hourly

paid instructors had worked in excess of 15 hours per week for a significant number of weeks. My comment is that the procedures in place are a bit flawed and DFEEST has failed to monitor records to ensure that the conditions of the employment manual are being met.

Minister, can you please provide me with details of how many hourly paid instructors is meant by 'a number' and details of the exact number of weeks that is meant by 'a significant number of weeks'?

The Hon. P. CAICA: The honourable member has clearly identified that section of the Auditor-General's Report and he has faithfully reported that component of it. I know that the member for Goyder has a close relationship with the TAFE system within his electorate and I have been his guest in his electorate at Kadina and further south. By way of explanation, as an organisation we still have a responsibility to ensure that those people who have signed up for various courses have the ability to not only finish those courses but ensure that their scheduled program of lectures takes place as and when a program has been promulgated.

As a consequence of that and because of there being limited people in some regional areas with the required skills to ensure that classes are delivered, the number of hours accumulates to more than the recommended 15 hours per week. In answer to the specifics of the question, I do not have the details of how many at this point in time. I will provide those specifics to you once I have them. I will take that component of the question on notice.

Mr GRIFFITHS: As an extension of that—and I probably have the answer in my head anyway—as a result of these people working above 15 hours per week, were there any additional costs, or were those costs just absorbed as part of the programs to provide the courses with no additional wage impost to the department?

The Hon. P. CAICA: They are casual employees and, from time to time, there will be a cost impost regarding any additional hours that might be worked. The variances that apply there is that if, due to sickness, they have to come in to replace a full-time employee—who still continues to quite rightly be paid when they are sick—this will be in addition to the costs that would ordinarily be incurred by that particular course. So, there are variances there, and there are other occasions when there will not be a cost impost. It may be an HPI being replaced by an HPI, and those would have been budgeted for anyway.

On the matter of the hourly paid instructors, there were recommendations within the Auditor-General's Report and in correspondence from the department to the Auditor-General in response to those comments. From a departmental perspective, we will further investigate the issue of hourly paid instructors to seek a response to those specific issues that were deemed to be of non-compliance from the institutes as well. We would expect the institutes to comply with the appropriate procedures, and a review of the employment manual will be undertaken to ensure that tighter controls are put in place to ensure that any non-compliance is either eradicated or minimised. In addition, we are also in the process of preparing regular reports for use by educational managers to assist them in the management of the HPI and their industrial obligations under the management of the HPI system.

It should also be noted that, on occasion, local institutes will seek the approval of the Australian Education Union to enable HPIs to be engaged for periods in excess of 15 hours per week, as per the conditions of the employment manual. So, as we have said, the focus is on managing staff in such a way that, at the end of the day, those people who are signed up to do courses are not disrupted by our inability to stick to the letter of the law with respect to the employment manual.

Mr GRIFFITHS: I certainly respect the fact that the important outcome is the training opportunity to be provided. There is no debate in my mind about that. I certainly also appreciate the fact that, in regional areas, and in some of the metro colleges, it must be very hard to attract the HPIs actually needed to undertake those courses. So, if I discount the regional component of it, if there is an opportunity for information to be provided at a later date about the metro campus system where HPIs are a bit above, I would appreciate that.

I refer to page 512, 'risk management', which is an interesting one. The Auditor-General's Report notes that in the previous year DFEEST had committed to certain risk management activities, including the establishment of an audit and risk management committee, and risk management training sessions were to commence in the early part of 2006-07. However, I note with some concern that the first meeting of the Audit and Risk Management Committee was not until June 2007—very late in the financial year—and that the implementation of the risk management framework policy is proposed for early 2008. Minister, can you explain why the Audit

and Risk Management Committee's first meeting was not held until the very end of the financial year, when it was intended to be established in 2005-06?

The Hon. P. CAICA: The honourable member is quite correct in identifying that the Audit and Risk Management Committee did not meet until late in the 2007 financial year. The terms of reference for a DFEEST Audit and Risk Management Committee and a related risk management framework were finalised in 2006. As was pointed out, the inaugural meeting was held on 6 June. Given the time frame taken to finalise external membership, because we brought in people from outside, there was a delay in securing not only the external membership but the people whom we believed were appropriate to sit on this particular committee.

The chief executive has referred the draft risk management framework to the committee that has been established, and significant work has been undertaken to develop the software package and align the methodology to report against DFEEST's strategic objective. I can inform the shadow minister that approximately 200 managers and supervisors undertook introductory risk management training conducted by SAICORP. A revised training approach is being developed as part of an integrated whole-of-department approach to risk management and assessment. This training has been specifically designed to reflect the needs of DFEEST and will target key director contacts and senior executives as part of the software rollout.

It is our view—and certainly the department's view, as I am advised—that this will help to ensure a consistent approach to risk identification, management and reporting across our organisation. So, whilst I can stand before you and say that it has taken some time, certainly we were mindful of making sure that the proper structures were in place before that committee was convened. I am further advised that, since that time, the committee has met three times, with its fourth meeting to occur in December.

Mr GRIFFITHS: I thank the minister for his answer. I picked up on the fact that he mentioned that 200 staff were involved in training at middle management level. That was going to be my next question: had the training sessions actually commenced? Is it intended that those people at that level are the only ones who will be trained, or will there be an awareness program and training opportunities for people below that level?

The Hon. P. CAICA: Whilst the training has occurred for the 200 I mentioned, there are, in addition to that, key contacts or, if you like, key champions who are above that classification and who play a role in that training. In addition, I am advised that there will be more training at a lower level classification than those 200 who have undertaken training to date. Of course, what we want is for the organisation as a whole to reflect the appropriate level of adherence to and understanding of risk management procedures as they permeate through the organisation.

Mr GRIFFITHS: I am pleased with the answers the minister has given because I suppose they were a little prompt for my next question, that is, based on my review of the Auditor-General's Report, I had an assumption that the department showed little interest in risk management. I was going to ask you whether that was true. You have alluded to a slightly different perspective, and I am pleased about that, as it is important that the culture of an organisation understands the importance of it, too, and ensures that it is managed as best as possible.

I move now in my line of questioning to page 516 and some of the financial issues involved. One thing that tweaked my interest was that, in the income lines under Interest, in the 2005-06 financial year it showed interest earned of \$2,976,000; however, last financial year it was down to \$77,000, or only 2.57 per cent of the previous year. Can the minister provide me with details of why there is such a significant reduction in interest earned?

The Hon. P. CAICA: Before doing so, I note the comments of the member for Goyder. Of course, it goes without saying (but I will say it anyway) that I as minister and my department take the Auditor-General's Report very seriously. I think that in this financial year the Auditor-General's Report has reflected well on the department to the extent that we have taken on board what was identified last year and put them either into practice or into a process whereby they will be put into practice. The point I make in agreement with member for Goyder is that we want that same type of culture with in the organisation that you spoke about.

It is also quite clear that the serious nature of the Auditor-General's Report is such that it provides us with advice and direction about how we can improve all aspects of our financial management of our organisation, and we welcome that. I just make that particular point. In regard to the specific question about interest—and again, as I would expect from the member for Goyder, he nails the point and gets the issue is quite correct—I am advised that the reduction in interest

received was caused by the policy decision of the Department of Treasury and Finance no longer to transfer interest revenue to South Australian government agencies.

Mr GRIFFITHS: I am nodding my head in agreement because that is what I thought the situation was; however, I had not actually read it anywhere, so I am grateful for the clarification.

The Hon. P. Caica interjecting:

Mr GRIFFITHS: So that I can ask a question about it and feel like a dill when I know the answer already. On page 512, under Financial Management Reporting and the audit comment and the departmental reply, I note the interesting comment, in relation to the general ledger and data recording, the closing comment of dot point 2 in the middle of the page. It states, 'Despite the variances, the accuracy of management reporting was not materially affected.' That is the departmental reply to the Auditor-General. Can I have more specific information on that? Does 'not materially affected' mean in relation to the budget you are responsible for, that it was less than 1 per cent, or is there a dollar figure you are able to relate to as to the variances between the budget lines? That intrigued me a bit.

The Hon. P. CAICA: I am advised that the organisation put in place a range of new initiatives aimed at a far more rigorous reporting mechanism than existed previously, and that, whilst this series of plans was put in place for that exact reason, in essence they had not been detailed to the extent that the Auditor-General would have been completely satisfied with how these committees were operating. As a consequence they have been subsequently ratified, and we will be making sure that we are able to put in place reporting lines that reflect what it is that we are actually undertaking at this time. As the Auditor-General pointed out, there was never really a material variance or difference; it was a matter of timing.

Mr GRIFFITHS: I refer to page 518—statement of changes in equity. I note that it was necessary to make two error corrections for the 2004-05 and 2005-06 financial years. Can you provide me with details about that, please?

The Hon. P. CAICA: Throughout the 2006-07 financial year a number of incorrect accounting treatments were noted throughout DFEEST operations. Examples of some of these treatments include the expensing of items that meet the asset criteria of the Australian accounting standards and DTF's accounting policy framework and balances in the general ledger that cannot be substantiated or were incorrect. The main prior year adjustments that were made included recognition of airconditioning assets that have been previously expensed, totalling \$9.3 million, and net errors in accounting treatment noted from performing reconciliations and reviewing object code balances, totalling \$0.8 million.

Mr GRIFFITHS: To clarify that, I am presuming that the costs were actually put down as expenses instead of capital, so, therefore, they did not go on the asset statement. Is that what we are talking about?

The Hon. P. CAICA: The quick response would be yes, to your view. But interestingly, of course, when they were not incorporated they were not identified or picked up by the Auditor-General during that year's report also. Those corrections have been quite rightly made.

Mr GRIFFITHS: Minister, in the few minutes remaining I will ask questions for the member for Morphett in regard to science, innovation and information economy. He has a variety of questions, but I will pick out a couple that can be answered relatively quickly. What is the remuneration level of board members of the Premier's Science Research Council?

The Hon. P. CAICA: I do not have that information with me. I will take it on notice and get back directly to the member for Morphett.

Mr GRIFFITHS: Similarly, the minister might have to get back to the member for Morphett about the remuneration of board members on the Information Economy Advisory Board.

The Hon. P. CAICA: Yes. The only information that I have available is that which you would have seen previously, which relates to all members under DFEEST boards whose income entity falls within a certain bandwidth line, so I cannot identify the specifics within that. But, in relation to the IEAB, I will undertake to do exactly as I said I would for the previous question.

Mr GRIFFITHS: My last question on behalf of the member for Morphett is therefore again under grants and subsidies on page 520—science, innovation and information economy. Can the minister please provide a breakdown list of the \$16.7 million for science and innovation and

information economy, across those two areas in grants and subsidies, that was provided in 2007, and explain what has changed in comparison to 2006?

The Hon. P. CAICA: I do apologise and I know that we have moved on from that. I think that is a question that is more appropriately asked during the estimates committee. But given my very nature, I will give an undertaking to provide a briefing to the shadow spokesperson on science and information economy to the extent that that would satisfy his queries, but it is an estimates question.

The ACTING CHAIR (Mr Koutsantonis): The examination of this line has expired.

The Hon. P. CAICA: I move:

That the sitting of the house be extended beyond 6pm.

Motion carried.

The ACTING CHAIR: The Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Finance, Minister for Government Enterprises and Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing has a time of 30 minutes allocated.

Mr WILLIAMS: I refer to page 790 of the Auditor-General's report concerning SafeWork SA health and safety workplace partnership program. Given cabinet approval for the scheme to provide \$3 million to unions to improve OH&S practices in the workplace, what analysis did the minister undertake to determine the potential effectiveness of this program? For example, have there been or are there such programs in existence in other states and, if so, are there any published results of such programs?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: The honourable member has asked about the analysis, what happens in other states and whether any results have been published. As I have said previously, this is a very important component of trying to ensure that we have greater safety in the workplace. We have done a number of things since coming to government and this is a further policy position that we have adopted: \$3 million over three years in grants to unions to make workplaces safer builds on what we have done previously, including things such as having more inspectors. We have obviously changed legislation; we have now embarked upon an advertising campaign. The type of analysis to which the shadow minister refers was undertaken in regard to what we have already put in place and where we want to be. Obviously we want to continue to improve in making our workplaces safer.

From memory, one of the interesting statistics is that the number of deaths for the last financial year was six compared with approximately 17 or 18 either in the year before that or in preceding years. That is still six deaths too many. We really need to be better, and this is what this particular program is all about. Regarding the other couple of questions asked by the shadow minister, I would need to check whether these programs exist in other states and I would also need to check whether there are any published results as well. I will come back to the member regarding the two questions he asked in respect of whether or not these types of programs exist in other states.

Mr WILLIAMS: Referring to the same program, on what basis did the minister refuse to fund the administration of the program from a portion of the monies approved by cabinet? The recommendations to the minister mentioned by the Auditor-General on page 790 of his report included a recommendation that, as the administration would fall to SafeWork SA, a financial contribution from the funds be made towards the cost of administering the program. That came to my attention via a copy of the letter to the minister to which the Auditor-General refers and which I obtained under freedom of information. Subsequent statements from the minister's office confirm that the full \$3 million had been allocated to unions. Consequently, I am of the belief that none of the money approved by cabinet for this program was put to the administrative task.

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: The shadow minister will let me know if I am not correct in my clarification, but I think he is asking why I did not allow money to be allocated for administrative purposes in respect of that \$3 million.

Mr Williams interjecting:

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: Yes, as was requested. I was of the view that this money was best spent by being allocated. I was also of the view that SafeWork SA had the administrative capacity to be able to administer these grants so that we did not have to take money out of that \$3 million, which, of course, would mean less money being spent at the coalface doing what we

want to do—that is, making workplaces safer. It was a conscious decision and obviously a discussion was held in regard to it, but we thought that SafeWork SA did have the capacity to be able to administer these grants without taking money out of the program.

Mr WILLIAMS: I now refer to page 816, the SafeWork advisory committee. Minister, given that the committee has a statutory role of providing advice to you regarding grants for OH&S improvement and OH&S programs, why was the committee not consulted regarding the workplace partnership program?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: The member has asked me that question before but I am happy to answer it again. I have answered it actually. In part, I answered this question with my first answer to your first question. We saw a vacuum and a need to provide some additional resources so that we could do better when it came to workplace safety. We have put in place a number of measures since we first came to government in 2002. We are seeing more inspectors on the ground and more prosecutions. We have tougher legislation and money for advertising. This particular grant money, which is allocated to those sectors where there is the highest percentage of injury, we thought was a no-brainer.

As a consequence, it was a policy decision taken by government. Governments do that from time to time. They make policy decisions and that is what being in government is all about. It is not to underestimate the value of the SafeWork SA Advisory Committee. I know it states 'council' here but it is the SafeWork SA Advisory Committee. As the shadow minister would agree, it is made up of some very good people, including Don Farrell, Janet Giles, Maurie Howard, Martin O'Malley and Tom Phillips. They fulfil a very important role. By the way, Don Farrell has resigned. He is going onto greener pastures, as the honourable member would be aware.

Mr Griffiths: No. 1 on the Senate.

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: I think he has a chance of getting elected. Mind you, with the Labor brand, I think this time a lot will get elected, especially in South Australia.

Mr WILLIAMS: Minister, given your last answer—indeed, all your answers on this matter—how is it you have given \$3 million of taxpayers' money to unions to run OH&S programs when the unions represent less than 17 per cent of the workforce in the private sector in South Australia? How do you hope to get to the other 83 per cent of the workforce? How do you hope to achieve improvement in OH&S in the workplace for the other 83 per cent of the workforce?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: One only has to look at the various unions and the areas for which they have constitutional coverage. The list includes the Independent Education Union, the Australian Services Union, the Liquor Hospitality and Miscellaneous Union, the Communications, Electrical and Plumbing Union, the Australian Manufacturing Workers Union, the Australian Workers Union, the Textile, Clothing and Footwear Union, the National Union of Workers, the Shop Distributive and Allied Employees Association, the Australasian Meat Industry Employees Union, the Construction, Forestry, Mining and Energy Union and the Transport Workers Union. It is a broad cross-section of people at the coalface.

As I said earlier, we are hitting those targets. Off the top of my head, something like 83 per cent of injuries occur in the sectors where this money is being spent. I think it is a good thing. I know the honourable member thinks differently. That is fair enough and he is entitled to do so. Whether it be a state government or a federal government (where money has gone to employers for good reason) we think this is for good reason. Already, I have launched one program. For example, the SDA has put together a brilliant DVD about safety in the workplace. I launched it a few weeks ago. Employers were there and they were rapt in it. I think members opposite will see this money being well spent.

Mr WILLIAMS: Is it a condition of these grants to the unions that the unions will provide OH&S training to non-union members, as well as union members? Is it a condition that they will provide the training at the same cost, given the taxpayer will be subsidising the programs? I have logged onto the websites of most of the unions and I have looked at programs they run in the OH&S area, and they have a differential charge for non-union members. The question is: was it a condition of payment that, where they run a program that is available to both their members and non-union members, there will be no differential charge? And I refer page 790 where the Auditor-General talks about the partnerships program.

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: I need to check that for the honourable member. It would depend on the conditions of their funding agreement. I understand there are 12 of them and some 11 have been put in place already. I do not know the answer. I will come back with the detail for the

honourable member. Whether it be this particular program or other programs—and I speak with some experience—unions are about not only educating their members but also trying to attract members to their union. That does not necessarily answer the question, but it gives a clue as to what my suspicion is. We need to go back and check the individual funding agreements; and I will do that for the honourable member.

Mr GRIFFITHS: I want to pursue questions in relation to your role as Minister for Finance. I refer to Part C, 'State finances and related matters'. Page 39 talks about the nature of savings initiatives. There are several references in the report about shared services reform. Page 39 states:

[There is an] aim to save \$130 million over four years (including savings from Future ITC and associated changes) but involve implementation costs of \$60 million.

Can you tell us whether the shared services reforms are on track to deliver those budgeted savings?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: By way of background, the 2006-07 budget estimated savings of \$60 million from this reform and ICT procurement. Future ICT savings were \$25 million of that \$60 million per annum, and that has been achieved, leaving shared services with a savings task of \$20 million in 2008-09 and \$35 million ongoing from 2009-10. To answer the member's specific question, we are on track with regard to that. We are now in the pre-transition discovery phase, and we expect to be transitioning the first services in the first quarter of 2008.

Mr GRIFFITHS: I thank the minister for his answer. I have accessed the website recently and looked at the regional impact assessment statement that was undertaken and the electronic versions of the newsletters that are published by the officer in charge of that section. As someone who has unreservedly come into this place to try to protect the rights of people in regional South Australia—

Ms Breuer interjecting:

Mr GRIFFITHS: —the member for Giles confirms that—I want to focus for a little while on the information that is out there now about the job cuts that are to occur in the regions. My understanding is that 558 government jobs, which equates to 256 full-time equivalent people, will be affected as part of the shared services reform. I know it is anticipated that some changes will happen in the first quarter of 2008. In answer to a question in the house previously, the minister used the term 'in scope'. From my point of view, I just want to really make the minister appreciate the fact that 'in scope' is not just numbers, it is actually people, because it is an important issue for me.

The Hon. M.J. Wright: Yes, I agree.

Mr GRIFFITHS: Given that the minister understands that (for which I am grateful), what will happen to those people who will be told that their jobs no longer exist? What transitional arrangements will be in place?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: I agree with what the member is saying, and we do not underestimate the significance. We are talking about approximately 250 full-time equivalents, which of course is more people than that (which the member fully understands), from the regional areas. Those jobs will be moving to Adelaide.

We will be working with those people, and regional employment principles and processes will be put forward. We will work with the individuals and the agencies. If it is the case that a person will not come to Adelaide, that is where we will need to work closely with the individual and also with the agency to see what other options might be available.

Mr GRIFFITHS: Some examples have been quoted to me where, as part of a full-time equivalent position, for instance, 0.4 of a person's role is devoted to an issue that will be caught up within the shared services reforms. Those people will then face the choice of deciding either to move to Adelaide if a position is available for them or to stay where they are, where that component of their role is no longer there. With respect to the people who might lose a percentage of their position, is it the intention to allow them to backfill somehow through some further rationalisation, or will only the remaining portion of their role be available to them?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: It would depend upon what proportion of their job is in scope. If there is a high percentage of it in scope, they would be expected to move. However, if it is a low percentage, they may not be expected to move, particularly if it is not envisaged that that other percentage will come into scope. That is generally the way in which it will work.

Mr GRIFFITHS: Just so that I am very clear in my own mind, therefore, will they be able to retain only that portion of the role that still exists for them? If they were full time, now they suddenly become 0.5 or 0.6, whatever is left, and that is all they can get; there is nothing else for them?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: I will take that part of the question on notice and obtain clarification for the member. I will come back with some greater detail for him.

Mr GRIFFITHS: I appreciate that, because the minister would understand that multi-tasking and multiple skilling is an important role in all workplaces. I am sure that a lot of people will be caught up in this, so it is an important aspect for members of the opposition to understand.

I again focus on the regional issues as it relates to shared services. I understand that the health department is estimated to be losing 186 full-time equivalent positions and DFEEST 43 full-time equivalent positions. It is probably an objective thing, and I know that the challenge is, therefore, upon those departments to manage their roles within their respective service areas. However, as the minister responsible for the shared services reforms, is the minister completely confident that there will be no impact on the quality of services provided, in this case, to hospitals and TAFE colleges in the regions?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: That is an important question and a good one. The whole rationale of shared services is that there will not be a decrease in the services provided and there will not be a decrease in the services provided to the regions. That is obviously one of the challenges. As to those numbers that you refer to, different agencies will have different numbers—some higher than others because of the size of their departments—but it is very much the policy that the services will not diminish as a result of shared services. The savings will be turned back into front-line services.

Mr GRIFFITHS: The Auditor-General's Report notes that audit experience has shown that a lack of clarity in roles leads to failures in some control systems. Minister, can you confirm whether the planning and analysis of the shared services reforms which are to be implemented will ensure that clear guidelines are set out so that the program is successful in creating these savings? Can you also provide me with some examples of that?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: I think that the shadow minister is referring to the responsibilities of shared services and the responsibilities of agencies. A service level determination and a service catalogue will clearly state the services that will be provided, including the roles and responsibilities. Yes, what the shadow speaks about is important; there needs to be a clear delineation between shared services and the agencies, and we will achieve that as a result of the service level determinations and the service catalogues, amongst other things.

Mr GRIFFITHS: I would like to talk about audit plans now. You outlined the expenditure and the projected savings that will occur in future years, but are you able to give us any figures on the audit plans to review aspects of the progress of shared services reform? How much is going to be spent during the 2007-08 financial year?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: I think you are asking how much shared services is going to spend this financial year?

Mr GRIFFITHS: In reviewing the progress of it.

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: I would need to take that on notice and get an answer for you.

Mr GRIFFITHS: As an extension of that—and I understand the confusion in my question and I apologise for that—how often will audits be undertaken to monitor the progress of the project?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: With regard to auditing, what is done by the Auditor-General will be a matter for him but in regard to internal auditing, if you like, we have a governance committee in place comprising five chief executives on the chief executive steering committee. That meets fortnightly; so, if you like, that would be auditing on a regular basis. I meet with the Under Treasurer on a regular basis, so, to answer the question, it is probably being done at the moment as a result of the regular meetings. That chief executive steering committee comprises five chief executives from the bigger agencies, as you would expect. Also internal auditing will occur as we go along.

Mr GRIFFITHS: I will ask one last question on this section. I have noted the electronic newsletters that are in place on the website from the executive officer of the section but they are in reasonably broad terms; I know that they are there for a lot of people to read. But as to the

discussions that take place amongst this group of five people, especially where it reviews the progress of the shared services reform and whether it is keeping up-to-date, is that sort of information intended to be published on the web site and available to communities to review? From the first quarter of 2008, when it really starts to hit home about what shared services is going to mean in a physical sense to communities and people in the suburban areas, there is going to be a requirement for knowledge to be out there. Is that sort of detail intended to be included for information available to the community at large?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: I thank the shadow minister for his question. Obviously, communication will be very important, and it has been important already. A lot of communication has occurred, particularly with public servants. There has been a whole range of briefings and newsletters, as the member has referred to but, whether it be the decisions of cabinet or the decisions of the Chief Executive, Shared Services Steering Committee, to which I referred earlier, communication will continue to occur with public sector employees through monthly newsletters and regular updates to the website. So, for the general public, I think that will be an important form of communication: regular presentations to establish government and agency forums and with the appropriate unions. I know that there are regular meetings with the PSA, for example. So, you are right; as things roll out next year, there will be that need to ensure that the communication lines are open and that there is good and broad communication not only to the employees but to the broader community as well.

Progress reported; committee to sit again.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (YOUNG OFFENDERS) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 17 October 2007. Page 1077.)

Mrs REDMOND (Heysen) (18:09): It is my pleasure to rise to indicate the Liberal Party's support for this bill. I will be the lead speaker, but not the only speaker, on this bill. I guarantee that I will not keep the house for nearly as long as I kept it on the previous bill that I had the pleasure of dealing with in this place. This bill comes to the house following the report fairly recently prepared by Monsignor David Cappelletti at the request of the government, and I want to spend a minute or two on that.

It was largely engendered by this so-called gang of 49 which is, I think, an inept title but one that the community at large has adopted. How do we deal with youths who do not respond to the normal processes which largely work with young people who become involved in the juvenile justice system? I say 'largely work', because the evidence given to the Juvenile Justice Select Committee (on which I served for 12 months under the chairmanship of the member for Fisher, Hon. Dr Bob Such) made it apparent that probably 98 per cent of young people never come into contact with the justice system at all. Most of the very small percentage who do, get back on the rails—if they have gone off slightly—after one tiny touch of the justice system.

However, there seem to be recidivist offenders for whom sometimes the notoriety of being a part of the Gang of 49—or various other things that might happen—becomes something of a badge of honour, so they continue to offend rather than learn the lessons that most people learn in their contact with the juvenile justice system. The vast majority of people learn the lesson pretty quickly and get back on the straight and narrow, but there is a very small number of juvenile offenders who are truly recidivist and continue to offend. Sometimes they continue to offend in the face of previous convictions. More often, they continue to offend whilst out on bail awaiting trial for the offences with which they have been charged. Clearly, something more needs to be done to deal with this issue.

As I said, the government commissioned Monsignor Cappelletti to prepare a report. The first thing I noticed when I read his report was that he acknowledged right at the outset the work done by the Juvenile Justice Select Committee. Strangely, he came up with 46 recommendations; the committee came up with 43 recommendations and, largely, in both cases, the report endorsed the efficacy of the existing juvenile justice system, mostly embodied in the Young Offenders Act. It really looked at ways that it might tweak that system to more appropriately deal with the problems that were evident.

Just before I go on to deal with the detail of this bill, I will say that it is clear from both the Cappelletti report and from the recommendations and the report of the Juvenile Justice Select Committee that the key to nearly everything will be early intervention. We need to address the problems much sooner than we have to date for those very few young people who become so

engaged in criminal activities at such a young age that they not only come into contact with the juvenile justice system but end up becoming quite well versed in all of its aspects. This bill tries to address the issue of young recidivists essentially by making it possible for them to be treated as adults in an easier way than is the case at present.

In that regard I turn first to the Young Offenders Act and, in particular, section 17, which allows at the moment for young offenders to be dealt with as adults. Section 17(1) provides:

- (1) Subject to this Act, the Court will deal with a charge in the same way as the Magistrates Court...

Subsection (2) provides:

- (2) The Court may, even though a charge has been laid, refer the subject matter...to be dealt with by a police officer or by a family conference.

From the point of view of this legislation, the important subsection is subsection (3). It provides that, if the offence is homicide, an attempt to commit, or an assault with intent to commit homicide; if the offence is an indictable offence and the youth, after obtaining independent legal advice, asks to be dealt with in the same way as an adult; or if the court (that is, the Youth Court) or the Supreme Court determines, on the application of the Director of Public Prosecutions, that they should be dealt with in the same way as an adult because of the gravity of the offence or because the offence is part of a pattern of repeated offending:

the Court will conduct a preliminary examination of the charge, and may commit the youth for trial or sentence (as the case requires) to the Supreme Court or the District Court.

So, there is already clearly laid out in our statute the ability for the court, in certain circumstances, to deal with a young offender as an adult. We have not been provided with any detail as to how often that particular mechanism has been used. I would think it unlikely that it has been used very often in the case of a youth actually asking to be dealt with as an adult, although I stand to be corrected in my assumption. At this stage, we have no facts and figures before us on which to assess the usefulness of that provision. Certainly, it has been there for some time, this act having been passed in 1993, that is, 10 years before we began the juvenile justice select committee.

What happens in the proposal in the bill is that, instead of having to take an application to the Youth Court, the DPP can, in the first instance, elect to take it to the Magistrates Court. The DPP, in deciding whether to take the matter to the Magistrates Court, and the magistrate, in deciding whether or not to make that determination for further hearing of this youth and the offence as an adult, must determine whether 'the youth poses an appreciable risk to the safety of the community'. In order to consider that first the DPP, and subsequently the magistrate, has to consider five factors, which mostly concern prior behaviour and recidivism. These factors are set out in new section 15A to be inserted by this bill into the Young Offenders Act.

The factors are: the gravity of the offence with which the youth is to be charged (that is, not restricted to indictable offences, homicide, or attempted homicide, as is the case at present); if it is part of a pattern of repeated offences, that fact and the circumstances surrounding the alleged offence; the degree to which the youth has previously complied with undertakings or bail agreements; if the youth has been previously detained, his behaviour whilst so detained and any rehabilitation; and, lastly, if the youth has previously been released on licence, his compliance with the terms of the licence.

The new provision will sit alongside the existing provision. It is not intended to change the existing provision, but it makes the step a more direct one for the DPP. I am indebted to the minister's adviser for notifying me that the original advice I received in relation to the effect of this was wrong. I had thought that the danger of this provision was that a youth, who was subject to a consideration by the DPP and for whom an application under this new provision was made to the Magistrates Court, would at that point lose the anonymity that usually attaches to a young offender. I am advised that the provisions of section 63C of the Young Offenders Act will still be in place. Therefore, even if the DPP makes application to the Magistrates Court directly, relying on new section 15A, it will not involve the identity of the youth being made known at that stage. So, that really overcomes my only concern with that part of the bill.

Part 2 of the bill amends the provisions concerning aggravated offences, which appear in the Criminal Law Consolidation Act. One of the factors that already exists in relation to aggravation is that it is an aggravation to commit an offence in company with another person. Of course, the effect of an aggravation provision is that, if someone commits an offence without an aggravating factor, there will be a certain maximum penalty. If they commit it with an aggravating factor present, that maximum penalty may be increased. In his second reading explanation, the minister gave the

example of committing a robbery, where the current maximum penalty is 15 years. However, if it is committed in company (which is already an aggravating offence), that 15-year maximum increases to life imprisonment. So, there is a significant increase if an offence is committed with an aggravating circumstance attached.

As I said, it is quite clear that the legislation already allows for the committing of an offence in company to be an aggravating factor. What the amendment does is make clear that 'in company' can and does include being in company with a child or a person under the age of 18. I do not believe, in fact, that that amendment actually changes the law; it simply clarifies and puts beyond doubt the question of whether one is in company with a person and thus, subject to that aggravating condition that already exists, if one is in company with a juvenile.

One of the reasons behind this, of course—and I think Monsignor Cappelletti referred to it in his report and, from memory, the juvenile justice committee also referred to it—is that there are those in the community who deliberately engage with young people in the commission of offences on the basis that they take the view that the young person is less likely to face significant consequences if they are caught, so they do exactly what this is trying to stop them from doing, that is, they engage with these young people for the specific purpose of getting them to become involved in criminal activity.

Then there are others who are not necessarily engaging the young people in criminal activity, but are nevertheless presenting a role model which is completely inappropriate by engaging in criminal activity in the presence of these people. As I said, the second provision simply puts the matter of a child as capable of being within the term 'in company with another person' beyond any doubt so that, for the future, there will not be a question about it.

The third thing that the bill does is amend the Criminal Law (Sentencing) Act to ensure that any child witnessing a crime is a factor to be considered in sentencing. Under section 10(1) of the existing Criminal Law (Sentencing) Act, the impact on a victim, including a child victim, is already taken into account. But this new section requires that we take into account the impact on any child. You might have a child who is a child of an offender, or any number of other circumstances, and that fact has to be taken into account.

Even if the child is not a victim, if a child witnesses a criminal act then that will be taken into account in sentencing. It is worded in a slightly odd way. It talks about taking into account the impact on any child other than a victim. There is a technical reason for that. It is simply that, already in the other provision to which I referred, we are taking into account a child victim; so, it is to stop that child victim being counted twice and being a factor twice.

They are the three amendments, basically, that this bill puts in place. I think the government is guilty of having delayed unreasonably any response to the Juvenile Justice Select Committee, which as I said, came up with 43 recommendations, which Monsignor Cappelletti himself in his report indicated that he relied upon heavily in reaching his own conclusions. That report was initiated by the member for Fisher in 2003 at basically the 10 year anniversary of our young offenders legislation and our system of juvenile justice as we currently know it in this state. The committee then spent 12 months hearing evidence, and worked very hard and I think very well in coming to some conclusions about the juvenile justice system and its operation in this state.

It made several recommendations—43 in all—but, in particular it made some recommendations to the Attorney-General whilst it was still sitting, because it considered certain things were so urgent that they should be attended to. Yet, a year later the government failed to respond to the report. In fact, it was over a year later in about July 2005 that we finally brought down the report of the committee, having taken evidence for 12 months and having discussed and debated the terms of our recommendations for several months.

For more than two years this government sat and did nothing in response to what I think was a very significant report of this parliament, and then decided to excuse itself by engaging Monsignor Cappelletti to do another report which relied heavily on our work. Then they came out and said, 'We are urgently responding to the recommendations of Monsignor Cappelletti'.

Whilst supporting the bill, I do express some reservation with the concept of general deterrence that we seem to see increasingly in our sentencing provisions. Of course, there is already in our sentencing legislation a facility for taking into account the need for general deterrence in sentencing. However, there is the danger that you end up with a situation (which I know does not concern the Attorney, anyway) where people are not equal before the law and

where people can have exactly the same offence before exactly the same magistrate theoretically, yet might get very different outcomes if the magistrate is minded to make an example of someone.

That is the nature of general deterrence; that is, there is a concept that the person presiding over the case can decide that it is necessary for that person to be held up as an example of the consequences of not obeying the law. I think that is sometimes legitimate, but I do think we need to keep in the top of our mind the need to ensure that people are treated fairly and there should not be cause for someone to complain that they were treated very much different from someone else.

Lastly, I refer quickly to what I think we need to keep in the top of our mind when dealing with young offenders. For that purpose, I refer to the very beginning of the Young Offenders Act 1993. In section 3 of that act, under the heading 'Objects and Statutory Principles', it is important for us to keep in mind that the object of this act is 'to secure for youths who offend against the criminal law the care, correction and guidance necessary for their development into responsible and useful members of the community and the proper realisation of their potential'. I just wanted to remind the house that that is the opening statement, as it were, of our young offenders legislation.

I think sometimes we become consumed with how to deal with a very small number of young people and we forget that most of them are actually chronic over-achievers these days. They are far more serious about their studies and their work and all that sort of thing than most of us ever were at the same age. I do think that we need to bear in mind that most of them are reasonable people who get back on track pretty quickly. We do have a problem at the moment with a few recidivist offenders and we do need to think hard about how best to deal with them, so we are happy to support the government and we hope that this will have some effect in curtailing the recidivist tendencies of a number of young people, but without unduly damaging the prospects of others.

Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder) (18:31): I wish to speak briefly on this measure and to relate the comments back to how they probably affect my community of Goyder, which is made up predominantly of older people. I note that when I was doorknocking last year, prior to the election, I did not doorknock quite as many homes as the Attorney-General, but 7,000—

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson interjecting:

Mr GRIFFITHS: Very thorough, no doubt.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson interjecting:

Mr GRIFFITHS: Yes, I did. It is amazing, though, that in just about every street that I visited, issues such as safety within their homes and within their community were of concern to the older members of my community. The member for Heysen has talked about the fact that 98 per cent of young people do the right thing. I like to think it is actually higher than that; it would be an absolutely minimal number of people who are repeat offenders, and they are the people that this bill is targeting. However, it is certainly an issue that needs to be addressed.

The main concerns of the people to whom I spoke in Goyder last year related to hoon drivers, vandalism and break-ins because it affects their degree of personal safety. One lady I talked to in Kadina told me about a neighbour of hers who she is fairly sure had a heart attack because of the repeat efforts of hoon drivers. The degree of stress caused to them by that hoon driving caused one man to actually have a heart attack. Thankfully, he recovered from it, but if it can affect anyone in that way it is important that we do something about it.

I understand that it is not just the so-called Gang of 49 that this bill relates to; it relates to any area across the state in which there are repeat offenders. A few months ago I was at a service station within my electorate refuelling my car when a young man, who I would consider to be a repeat offender locally (and I did not know who it was) did a wheelie approaching the Mobil service station, pulled in and did another wheelie. I looked at him all the time as he drove up, and when he got out of the car he abused me for five minutes in such a way that I have never experienced in my whole life.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: Not even in here!

Mr GRIFFITHS: This is tame compared to what I copped there. My wife was with me. It is an area of concern for me because this person, who is about 17, knew who I was and he certainly knew what my profession is. I asked later and found out what his name was and I have spoken to the police about this young man since, as well. My concern is that my children are no longer at home any more and my wife is at home by herself far too often while my parliamentary

responsibilities take me away from home, so I found it difficult to actually lay a formal complaint. I know it is a challenge for the police force out there to try to ensure the safety of the community.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson interjecting:

Mr GRIFFITHS: Sorry?

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: He will be voting next year.

Mr GRIFFITHS: He will be. I do not think he will vote for me, but we will see. The challenge for the police force out there, to ensure that people live in safety, is an enormous one. It is appropriate that we ensure that the laws that we frame in this place are there to protect all people. Young people who are repeat offenders deserve the full weight of the law to be thrown at them. The details that I have been able to gather from the briefing paper prepared by the shadow minister show that the move by the government is a proactive one and takes some of its recommendations from the Cappo report. I trust that when these changes do come in the safety of South Australians will be improved and people will feel much more comfortable within their homes and on the streets.

Mr VENNING (Schubert) (18:35): I support the bill; and I support the comments of the shadow minister and the member for Goyder. This is a serious problem. We all noted with interest the Cappo report Breaking the Cycle with its recommendations. There are five or six factors in relation to the report which the Attorney-General said that we will address.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson interjecting:

Mr VENNING: I have always been very interested in law and order. We have taken safety and public security for granted in days past. I am extremely concerned that there are parts of Adelaide where one cannot walk alone, even as a male.

Mrs Redmond: Especially as a male!

Mr VENNING: I have never felt threatened because I could always defend myself.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: Where would that be?

Mr VENNING: There are several areas. It is a good move for the DPP to decide whether a juvenile will be judged as an adult and will be sent to the Magistrates Court rather than the Youth Court. Part of the problem is that the system works so slowly. A lot of these people know that, if they are charged, by the time the system addresses them they could be out on the street offending again. We need incentives for recidivist offenders who have no regard for the law.

This is the area in which I find most difficulty—and I am sure the Attorney-General would back me. Those in my generation respect the law. In fact, fear of the law creates boundaries for people to behave in what we call acceptable ways. The Gang of 49 could not give a fig about the law or the rights of others at any time. They are totally out of control and they have been doing it for some time. The member for Stuart has raised issues and problems at Port Augusta in this house and in our party room over many years. He has a strong point of view about how they should be dealt with. I know that the Port Augusta City Council has done certain things to address many of these problems. The problem has now moved into the city. It is a pity that a certain element is involved with this Gang of 49. That saddens me and it ought to be addressed.

Public security and safety is important. The public is demanding that we in this place do all we can to fix the problem. It will not be easy because there is no panacea for this problem.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr VENNING: I have been here for 17 years and I will go when I want to go. I have learnt a few things from the member for Stuart about surviving in this place.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: You have to be a street fighter.

Mr VENNING: You have to be a street fighter and you have to know where the votes are. You have to know how to count and you have to know what matters—and issues like this do matter. There is no doubt about it: people get really annoyed about matters such as this. During my time here we have dealt with housebreaking offences, and the laws that have been put in place over the years have been quite ridiculous where a person could be charged if someone broke into their house if it is self-defence. Someone could break into your house, fall over something left in the

passageway and actually sue you, even though they are illegally on your premises. Some of these laws are quite draconian.

Thanks to people such as Monsignor Cappo and others, and to a smaller degree the Attorney-General and the DPP, I think we can and should address a lot of these problems. It is not easy but I certainly support the bill and I hope it goes a long way to address these problems. I think we need to do a fair bit more.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson interjecting:

Mr VENNING: He had some concern about it. Measures such as this are welcome. Whether they go far enough, time will tell. We have a problem and it is up to many people in the community, particularly community leaders and elders, who have to step in and say, 'It is not acceptable as it is giving our people a bad name, fix it'. In large part hopefully this will go a long way towards fixing it. I support the bill.

Mr HANNA (Mitchell) (18:40): I have 20 minutes this evening to address the Statutes Amendment (Young Offenders) Bill introduced in this chamber by the government. As a preliminary point I express the difficulty that Independent members face when provided with details of the legislative program at the last minute. This piece of legislation was not scheduled to be dealt with today, but earlier this week I was provided with the advice that it would be on the agenda.

Although the legislation itself is not a complete mystery to me because it has been on the table for a short time in the House of Assembly, the parliamentary *Notice Paper* contains some 20 pieces of legislation and, because of the sheer volume of work, one tends to simply prepare what is necessary for the week ahead. When I was advised last Friday that this would not be coming up, obviously preparation for it was put to one side. The point I make is that I have had to work quickly today, in amongst other business, to be able to make coherent remarks about the bill.

I oppose the legislation. I do not believe it is necessary or founded on the recommendations of the Breaking the Cycle report prepared by Monsignor Cappo. It is sold as legislation that carries out the recommendations of what is called the Cappo report, and I do not believe it does that. I have had contact with some organisations that have expressed their concern about the legislation. I will go through a couple of those. I am pleased to note that the Children and the Law Committee of the Law Society of South Australia has provided me with a comprehensive response to this legislation, and a lot of that needs to go on the record. It expresses clearly the concerns I have about the legislation.

I point out also that for organisations like the Law Society often not a lot of time is provided to respond to legislation when one considers the committee process. The fact that a group of lawyers voluntarily give up their time to meet once a month or as required, along with their busy practices, to come up with a comprehensive response is a big ask. However, I will cite some passages from this Law Society report, which in effect is a response to the government's legislation. The theme is the special care that needs to be taken with young offenders, because I suppose there is still hope that they will come good if they are treated in an appropriate way. It states:

We must also remember in all our discussions about serious repeat young offenders that they are a very small part of the population of young people in our community. Furthermore, offending behaviour is only one dimension of the lives of these young people. They cannot and should not be labelled as serious repeat young offenders, but rather be recognised as people with complex needs and in many cases significant disadvantage. We are concerned about the way the media has handled this issue. The committee is very concerned that because of the focus and labelling of these particular young people by the government and by the media that many of the other factors that influence their behaviour, such as child protection issues, homelessness and health issues, are not being addressed. Young people the subject of Operation Mandrake are being described as first and foremost 'a young offender; a recidivist'. The Committee is strenuously opposed to this objectification and categorisation of young people. Rather young people should be viewed for who they are.

I pause there to add my own comment. There is no debate that serious repeat offending by young offenders is a significant issue, and we need to address it. However, as is often the case with social problems, the simple legislative fix is not necessarily the answer, especially not the whole answer. So, the Law Society of South Australia there is highlighting that the environment of young offenders, particularly those who repeatedly commit serious offences, needs to be considered. Funding and programs need to be put in place to make sure that they see that they have other options.

I recall visiting South Africa many years ago. Even though the crime rate was probably less than it is now, when I went into the townships, where tens of thousands or hundreds of thousands of African people lived, it was an eye-opener to consider the choices that young people

made. In a society where they were considered outcasts by the government, and officially branded so in legislation, and where there is no social welfare, the decision to join a criminal gang became a rational decision. It became the best way that they could get on in life, by taking up a life of drug dealing and stealing.

That is an extreme case, and I am not suggesting that we have anything as desperate in South Australia. However, it is illustrative of the environment that we need to create. My point is that we need to create an environment with options so that young people see that it is better for them to comply with the law and stay out of juvenile detention centres or, indeed, adult prisons. I am afraid that, due to a lack of family support, poverty, child abuse (in some cases), and their experiences of contact with police and the justice system, some young people revel in the opportunity to take an outlaw approach. The question before us is whether, in fact, this legislation will help, and I seriously doubt that it will. The Children and the Law Committee of the Law Society further stated:

Law is not the vehicle to solve social issues. It is a blunt instrument, which is often counter-productive, can produce unintended consequences, and often harms. Many of the suggestions that have been made by the Government, such as harsher penalties, mandatory penalties, and trying more young people as adults, do not give primary consideration to the best interests of the child as the Convention on the Rights of the Child requires.

The question must always be asked, to what end are these measures suggested? Simply to put these young people away from the community, 'out of circulation'? To act as a deterrent, which is against the objects of the Young Offenders Act? To be seen to take a more punitive, 'tougher' approach? Or to take the opportunity to provide therapeutic evidence based interventions in an intensive way in a secure environment?

I pause again to reflect on what is, to me, the most significant part of our current Young Offenders Act. I refer to subsection 3(1), which provides:

The object of this act is to secure for youths who offend against the criminal law the care, correction and guidance necessary for their development into responsible and useful members of the community and the proper realisation of their potential.

They are profoundly worthy and even beautiful sentiments, and they are expressed in our law. When I compare the government legislation before us to those worthy ideals, I find that the legislation fails to measure up. I find that the legislation is probably contrary to that very object. As an aside, I underline the fact that when I sought to introduce that principle of rehabilitation for adult offenders in our community in this parliament it was voted down by the Labor government just a month ago.

I note that the Children and the Law Committee of the Law Society has backed up its general statements with a careful analysis of the statistics of youth offending. Consider this fact, for example: in 2005 South Australia had the lowest number of juveniles apprehended in the past nine years, that is, recorded from 1997 to 2005. So, it is not as if we have some crisis point that needs to be headed off by this parliament with a new law. The number of cases finalised by the Youth Court has remained steady. There is nothing to suggest that things are getting out of control there.

Also, 87.4 per cent of family conferences in the Youth Court were finalised successfully, that is, all undertakings were complied with. I think that just about all members know that these family conferences involve the young offender concerned, often with their parents and often, where appropriate, coming face-to-face with the victim and being guided through to a realisation that the offending was in fact wrong. Generally, the outcome involves some sort of undertaking by the offender. It might be to clean up graffiti, or it might be to apologise and compensate a victim, and so on.

That is a very high success rate with respect to the family conferences that we conduct in the Youth Court. The implication of those figures is that, by and large, our youth justice system is working. There is a small hard core of offenders. I am aware of that, and obviously the Attorney-General, Premier Rann and the media are aware of that. But we are talking about maybe 3 per cent of the offending youth population (you could argue it is 2 per cent, you could argue it is 5 per cent), but that is a percentage of the offending youth population, which itself is a minority of the overall body of teenagers in our society.

In terms of sheer numbers, we are talking about a pretty small problem. I am aware on the other hand that the victims of a crime by a young person—perhaps a 16-year old who has smashed their window or taken their car—is not likely to be readily calmed by such statistics. Nevertheless, in the House of Assembly you expect the Attorney-General and members to work on the basis of the statistics rather than a gut emotional reaction. Unfortunately, newspapers are in the

business of selling more copy, and if they can provoke a gut reaction in their readers they will do so with the way they write the story.

The Children and the Law Committee of the Law Society goes on to talk about how better support might be put in place for young people. The principle of restorative justice is stressed as an important factor in turning around the psychology of young people. The options other than legislating in this way are clearly spelt out. Just to give a little more detail, I will cite from this Law Society report in relation to the agencies which, I believe, need more funding so that they can better care for young offenders. The report states:

It is currently difficult for members of the legal profession to source services and programs for clients to undertake while matters progress through the Youth Court. The Committee is aware that CAMHS and IDSC have extremely long waiting lists, and that services offered by non-government organisations are often limited in scope due to the stringency of funding guidelines. We suggest greater resources be provided to government departments such as Families SA (Wraparound, Remand Inc, Metropolitan Aboriginal Youth and Family Services, Special Programs for Youth, Youth Adventure Recreation Services, Panyappi) and non-government agencies such as Kumangka Aboriginal Youth Service, Service to Youth Council, and OARS that have a proven track record of providing evidence based therapeutic interventions for young people at risk, young offenders and young adult offenders.

So, I am not dealing only in generalities: I am talking about specific agencies with programs that need more funding. I will not go further in detailing the response by the Law Society but, once again, I pay tribute to its thoroughness.

The Youth Affairs Council, as I understand it, is opposed to this legislation. In their correspondence with me, they have referred to the Cappelletti report, formally known as the Breaking the Cycle report. The Cappelletti report specifically deals with serious repeat offenders. Quite clearly there are provisions in this legislation that are inconsistent with recommendations of the Cappelletti report. I will give one example. Recommendation 7 of the Cappelletti report states:

That where there is serious concern that the actions of a young person are placing the community at risk, the current provisions of section 17 of the Young Offenders Act 1993, be used to try the young offender as an adult...Legislative change in this regard should only be pursued if these provisions are demonstrated to be unworkable.

I am putting to the House of Assembly that it has not been demonstrated that those provisions are unworkable. The case has not been made out for more young offenders to be tried as adults. Those young people who go to juvenile detention centres deserve that response by and large. They go there to receive care and rehabilitation, I would hope, although I am not sure that that is always the case. But the government in any case relies on a recommendation like that to justify this legislation and it is overkill.

As I am running out of time, I will not go into the Cappelletti report in detail but I state again that there are a number of recommendations in the Cappelletti report which I believe warrant spending more money on appropriate government agencies rather than treating young offenders as adults as far as the court process is concerned. We come back to the object of the Young Offenders Act, and that is to secure the care, correction and guidance necessary for youths' development into responsible and useful members of the community and the proper realisation of their potential.

There are some serious cases which are difficult, but we find that those offenders are already sent to juvenile detention centres, often with a number of conditions about their behaviour, education and so on.

So, I would say the government has not made out the case for this legislation and it will make good headlines, and I am sure the government will seek to use my speech against me in some way in the community. But, above all, our care should be for the young people and potential victims of offenders, whether young or otherwise. I am not sure that locking up people without the addition of resources for rehabilitation and restorative justice is going to achieve the objectives stated by the government.

Debate adjourned.

MOTOR VEHICLES (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

ELECTRICITY (FEED-IN SCHEME—RESIDENTIAL SOLAR SYSTEMS) AMENDMENT BILL

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

- No. 1. Clause 1, page 2, line 3—Delete 'Residential'
- No. 2. Clause 4, page 3, before line 1—Insert:
qualifying customer means—
(a) a domestic customer; or
(b) a small business customer;
- No. 3. Clause 4, page 3, line 2—Delete 'domestic customer' and substitute:
qualifying customer
- No. 4. Clause 4, page 3, after line 9—Insert:
small business customer means a customer who acquires electricity primarily for the purposes of—
(a) a business—
(i) where not more than 20 persons are employed (and, for the purposes of this paragraph, the relevant number of persons will be determined by counting people who work full time in the business, or full time equivalents); and
(ii) where the business does not form part of a larger business; or
(b) a business that satisfies other criteria (if any) prescribed by the regulations for the purposes of this definition;
- No. 5. Clause 4, page 3, line 18—Delete 'domestic customer' and substitute:
qualifying customer
- No. 6. Clause 4, page 3, line 23—Delete 'domestic customer' and substitute:
qualifying customer
- No. 7. Clause 4, page 3, line 24—Delete 'domestic customer' and substitute:
qualifying customer
- No. 8. Clause 4, page 3, lines 31 and 32—Delete 'domestic customer' and substitute:
qualifying customer
- No. 9. Clause 4, page 3, lines 35 and 36—Delete 'domestic customer' and substitute:
qualifying customer
- No. 10. Clause 4, page 3, line 37—Delete 'domestic customer' and substitute:
qualifying customer
- No. 11. Clause 4, page 3, line 39—Delete 'domestic customer' and substitute:
qualifying customer
- No. 12. Clause 4, page 3, line 41—Delete 'domestic customer' and substitute:
qualifying customer
- No. 13. Clause 4, page 4, line 1—Delete 'domestic customer' and substitute:
qualifying customer
- No. 14. Clause 4, page 4, line 4—Delete 'domestic customer' and substitute:
qualifying customer
- No. 15. Clause 4, page 4, line 6—Delete 'domestic customer' and substitute:
qualifying customer
- No. 16. Clause 4, page 4, line 18—Delete '2013' and substitute:
2028

At 19:02 the house adjourned until Wednesday 14 November 2007 at 11:00.