

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY**Thursday 1 May 2008**

The SPEAKER (Hon. J.J. Snelling) took the chair at 10:30 and read prayers.

LEGAL PROFESSION BILL

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) (10:32): I move:

That the sitting of the house be continued during the conference with the Legislative Council on the bill.

Motion carried.

STANDING ORDERS SUSPENSION

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite—Leader of the Opposition) (10:32): I move:

That standing orders be so far suspended as to enable me to move the second reading of the Adelaide Park Lands (Facilitation of Development of Victoria Park) Amendment Bill forthwith.

The SPEAKER: I have counted the house and, as an absolute majority of the whole number of members of the house is not present, ring the bells.

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

The SPEAKER: There being an absolute majority of the whole number of members of the house present, is the motion seconded?

An honourable member: Yes, sir.

The SPEAKER: Does the Leader of the Opposition wish to speak to the motion?

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: Yes, I do, sir. I put to the house that this bill, listed well down the *Notice Paper*, must be brought forward and considered first in proceedings this morning. I do so, Mr Speaker, because the government has announced a very expensive infrastructure proposal for Victoria Park involving a \$20 million temporary grandstand, which will be used only as a corporate box during Clipsal 500 races. It is doing so because the government has walked away from a better proposal—a \$50 million government commitment—for a much larger proposal to build a stand that would be genuinely available to all people because it would be used on 30 occasions a year by the South Australian Jockey Club for twilight racing.

This bill would enable the government to acquire a lease of the Parklands area so that it could go ahead with its original proposal. The bill has passed through the other place; all that is required is for the bill to pass through this house and the parliament and the government can have its wish, that is, to go ahead and build a grandstand and joint-user facility at Victoria Park.

We need to debate this bill this morning, Mr Speaker, because the government is out there blaming the council. Well, the council has to represent its ratepayers. The government, through this bill, has an opportunity to represent the people of not only the whole of the City of Adelaide but the whole state, and what they want is infrastructure in the Parklands so that they can be used. We have an opportunity to debate this matter this morning, but what must occur is that the government must understand—

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, my understanding is that the Leader of the Opposition is speaking on a motion to suspend standing orders to allow this item to be debated: he is actually debating the substance of the bill. We are quite happy to give leave for this bill to be debated, but I think the Leader of the Opposition is out of order.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: We are happy for you to debate it.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Premier will take his seat. I have listened to what the Leader of the Opposition has been saying, and I do not think he has said anything so far in terms of debating the bill. I do remind the Leader of the Opposition that he does need to speak just to the motion to suspend.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I will continue because I will not know until the end of my remarks whether the government will allow this matter to go on.

The Hon. K.O. Foley interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: Is that an iron-clad commitment?

The Hon. K.O. Foley interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: All right; so we will deal with it now.

The Hon. K.O. Foley interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: Well, if the government is prepared to allow this debate to proceed, I am happy to proceed, but it must be dealt with immediately.

The Hon. K.O. Foley interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: Okay.

The Hon. K.O. Foley interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! One other member can speak. Normally, it would pass to the other side. The member for Mitchell is standing, but I will give precedence to a member on the government side if the government wishes to respond.

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: If I give the member for Mitchell the call, he is the only other person who can speak on the motion to suspend.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: This is a matter for the government and the opposition, sir. I would like to take the call.

Mr HANNA: On a point of order, Mr Speaker: before we deal with that, I thought that the point of having another speaker on a procedural motion like this was to have a debate for and against, rather than two speakers in favour of the motion.

Members interjecting:

Mr HANNA: It is not Stalinist Russia, Mr Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Order! Just before the Deputy Premier speaks, I take the member for Mitchell's point. Perhaps it is something that is lacking in the standing orders; however, I think that the government does need to be given an opportunity to respond even if it is just to agree with the motion. If I were to allow the member for Mitchell to respond, the government would not be able to have a say. I apologise to the member for Mitchell for that. There seems to be a shortcoming in the standing orders that perhaps we should have a look at. The Deputy Premier.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Sir, the government supports the opposition's right to have this issue debated.

The house divided on the motion:

AYES (42)

Atkinson, M.J.
Breuer, L.R.
Conlon, P.F.
Fox, C.C.
Griffiths, S.P.
Hill, J.D.
Key, S.W.
Maywald, K.A.
O'Brien, M.F.
Pengilly, M.
Portolesi, G.
Redmond, I.M.
Thompson, M.G.
White, P.L.

Bedford, F.E.
Caica, P.
Evans, I.F.
Geraghty, R.K.
Gunn, G.M.
Kenyon, T.R.
Koutsantonis, T.
McEwen, R.J.
Pederick, A.S.
Piccolo, T.
Rankine, J.M.
Simmons, L.A.
Venning, I.H.
Williams, M.R.

Bignell, L.W.
Chapman, V.A.
Foley, K.O.
Goldsworthy, M.R.
Hamilton-Smith, M.L.J. (teller)
Kerin, R.G.
Lomax-Smith, J.D.
McFetridge, D.
Penfold, E.M.
Pisoni, D.G.
Rau, J.R.
Stevens, L.
Weatherill, J.W.
Wright, M.J.

NOES (2)

Hanna, K. (teller)

Such, R.B.

Majority of 40 for the ayes.

Motion thus carried.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. I ask for your ruling as to whether this is a money bill, given that this is bill No. 118, and given that it requires the Treasurer to be involved in leasing and authorising the use of the land for motorsport, horse racing and other functions, which would involve expenditure by the government. Is this a money bill that can be introduced only by a minister of the Crown?

The SPEAKER: My knowledge of constitutional law is a little bit rusty. I will have a look at it. I do not think it is a money bill, but I will have a look at it and take some advice. In the meantime, I will allow the debate to proceed.

**ADELAIDE PARK LANDS (FACILITATION OF DEVELOPMENT OF VICTORIA PARK)
AMENDMENT BILL**

Second reading.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite—Leader of the Opposition) (10:50): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: When you do that you start speaking.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: Actually, you wait for the acknowledgement of the Speaker, Attorney; you should know that. Perhaps you would be manager of government business in the house if you were better informed.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Point of order! The government has given the opposition priority passage. Can the member please just debate the bill?

The SPEAKER: Order! There is no point of order. The Leader of the Opposition has the call.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: The redevelopment of Victoria Park was proposed by the Treasurer and the Premier as a win for horseracing, a win for car racing, a win for major events, and it was a win for the Parklands. The Treasurer was going to beat up the council; he was going to get his grandstand no matter what. He was to achieve this by proposing a better public facility for horseracing to replace the dilapidated buildings that are so visible from Fullarton Road.

He was to achieve this for car race fans by ensuring a top-class central facility—an underground infrastructure for easier to assemble temporary facilities. We were to have the sort of facilities that every other state enjoys. That was the vision. The Treasurer is hoist with his own petard. He has staked his reputation on the fact that this grandstand would go ahead—it was a great government initiative. The Premier was right there with him along with the whole of the Labor Party and the government backbench. For 3½ years we had the promises, the threats and the bravado—it was all going to happen.

It is an extraordinary tale, a tale of delay and disappointment, and it began when the SAJC proposed significant changes to the area in which it has conducted horse-racing since the 19th century. But right from the beginning—

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I rise on a point of order. The government has—

The SPEAKER: There is a point of order. The Deputy Premier.

Mr Hamilton-Smith: What is your point of order?

The SPEAKER: Order! Let us get on with it.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I am not one of your privates, Marty, that you can order around.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I am not one of your privates that you can order around.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Premier.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Members will be quiet. Let us hear the point of order so that we can move on. The Deputy Premier.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Sir, I simply ask that the Leader of the Opposition not shout. We are actually listening in silence.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is no point of order and the Deputy Premier has to be careful about making frivolous points of order. The Leader of the Opposition.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: In typical Rann government style, the project became bogged down in bureaucracy and uncertainty. Then, of course, there was some opposition to the whole proposal from within the very heart of the government, wasn't there? The member for Adelaide: favoured goods, special produce—she is a protected species. She did not like it, did she? She did not like the Treasurer's proposal; she thought it stank.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I rise on a point of order. This is not a frivolous point of order, sir. What I ask is that the leader not refer to the member for Adelaide as 'she', that he in fact address her with appropriate parliamentary courtesy and refer to her as the member for Adelaide.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I do not uphold the point of order. 'He' or 'she' is a reasonable way to refer to members opposite.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: He does not like it, Mr Speaker. He does not like it one little bit. It is not a good feeling when you are the Deputy Premier and Treasurer and you get duded by your own Premier. It ain't a good look. The member for Adelaide goes up to the Premier and says something along the lines of, 'If this goes ahead, I'm out of here.' We do not know what was said; we do not know whether she threatened to leave the Labor Party or whether she threatened to vote against the measure; we just do not know. Perhaps the government would like to tell us.

However, it was very clear where the Premier's favours lay: not with the Treasurer but with the member for Adelaide. And guess what? They lined up, one after the other, in cabinet to back the Premier and the member for Adelaide, and out there, hung out to dry, was the Treasurer. He had been out there puffing up and beating his chest, with hairs everywhere. He was going to roll over the council, and then all of a sudden it is a case of: well, I have gone from being an Indian chief to a feather duster. Welcome to the realities of politics! We know what happened: he was duded by his own side. What sort of a signal does that send to the people of South Australia?

There are two important things that the government needs to understand about the Parklands. The first thing is that they are a precious jewel, owned not by Adelaide City Council, not by the ratepayers of Adelaide but by all South Australians, and they need to be protected and preserved. The Parklands also need essential infrastructure so that they are not abused: everything from toilets, water and power to pathways and seats. All sorts of infrastructure is needed to retain the beauty of the Parklands.

There needs to be a better vision for the Parklands. Part of that could have been getting rid of these dilapidated old buildings and replacing them with a bit of world-class infrastructure. The Treasurer does not like this because he actually agrees with what I am saying: we all know that. He just got duded. He got duded by the members sitting opposite. He probably got duded by the member for West Torrens. He got duded by all of them sitting over there, because the Premier hung him out to dry. The member for Adelaide was given special dispensation.

If the member for West Torrens crosses the floor or goes out publicly against the Labor Party he will get kicked out of the party, but not the member for Adelaide; she can tippy-toe about over on the other side whenever she likes. She can write to the council with her own plan for the Parklands. She can disagree with her party; that is all right. Protected species are like that, they are allowed to flutter about within their party and do whatever they like. This matter has really exposed, at its core, some fundamental flaws in the way this government works. More importantly, it has left Adelaide, the tourism industry, those who love the Parklands and those who want to see this city prosper and grow, wondering where this government's vision is.

What we could have had is a facility that could be used on 30 occasions a year for twilight racing; not a corporate box structure but a facility available for ordinary punters to go to the twilight race meetings. Who would come to such meetings? They would be young people and people living not only in the seats of Adelaide, Norwood, Bragg and Unley, but also people in the inner west of the city, all coming to the twilight races and having a ball. That would be great for tourism, great for the city and great for racing, and that was always part of Colonel Light's vision.

Instead what we are going to get is \$20 million, according to a media release put out by the Treasurer, spent on a temporary grandstand, which looks as though it will be the same size as the one that was proposed anyway. Will it be for corporate boxes? Yes, it will, because racing will not be held there now. The racing industry said, 'To hell with this government.' It has thrown up its hands and walked away from Victoria Park. It has abandoned the site. It has gone away in disgust, like a lot of people who want to see a future for this city. It has walked away from this government, saying, 'Sort your mess out. We can't hang about.' It has gone, and 130 years of racing in the Parklands has gone with it.

We keep getting told by this government that Adelaide is open for business. It is not open for business under this government. It is not open for business at all, and here is an example of that. This bill—moved by us, the opposition, in the other place and passed in that place, gives the Treasurer what he wanted. It gives him a 99-year lease over the Parklands, with the authority to secure the development he wanted. The Treasurer can secure access to the site either by negotiation for a lease with the Adelaide City Council or by notice in the *Gazette*.

This would be for a specific period. The Treasurer can grant occupation rights to other entities like the SAJC or the SA Motorsport Board. Reasonable steps for negotiations with the council would be needed, but essentially the government could go ahead with what it said it wanted if this bill is agreed to this morning.

Instead, what will happen, because of the member for Adelaide—because the Treasurer got duded—is they are all going to oppose the measure. It just goes to show that when you stick your chin out and you are all hairy-chested and you try to be Mr Tough Guy and then you get duded by your own team, it is a very—

Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: Well, the Treasurer is finding out all about it.

Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: Member for West Torrens, I have been here for the same length of time as you, and look where I am and look where you are. So, before you open your mouth, you had better just get your facts right. You will probably be further up the back soon. If you want to have a go, keep them coming.

I would say this about the Parklands. The opposition believes in returning significant amounts of open space to the Parklands. The master plan predicted that some 56,000 square metres of land would be made available to use as open space. We supported the planting of a thousand trees. This would have created a smaller footprint on the Parklands than what is there at present, and we believe in that, because we love the Parklands and we want to see them made better and we want to see them protected. What is there at the moment is a disgrace.

We believe in Victoria Park realising its potential as a special events and entertainment hub. It was always envisaged that way by Colonel Light. In 1837, Colonel Light declared that the area now known as Victoria Park should be used for horseracing and public relations activities. That was always in the plan. Our bill supports Light's vision by helping to give racing and other activities a future in this unique inner-city venue.

This bill is good for the environment of the Parklands, for motorsport, for horseracing and for Adelaide. I call on the government to do what they said they wanted to do and support it. I want to expose the absolute furphy that this is the council's fault. This is his way out: blame the council. 'What can I do? The council said no.' Well, what a wimpish, pathetic effort from a Deputy Premier and Treasurer—the one who said he was going to bury the council somewhere over the back of Bourke. He was going to put them on a boat to China, and all of a sudden he is beaten to a pulp by the council. What a load of nonsense!

He has been beaten to a pulp all right by the member for Adelaide, his good friend, who managed to get the Premier and all the others over there to agree that she was right and he was wrong. It is a very sad exposure of a weak government.

What Adelaide needs is a little bit of vision and a little bit of drive. It needs a range of things, and I just suggested to the Treasurer and Deputy Premier that he look at the Liberals' master plan for Adelaide, that he look at the roads infrastructure and the developments proposed in it: our plans for City West, the CBD, the Parklands and a range of other measures and start to get something happening in this city.

This is a signal that the government has given up. It is a signal that the government has lost the plot. Do not blame the council. They were elected by their ratepayers to do a job and to represent their ratepayers. They have every right to support or oppose the measure and to do their duty to their ratepayers. It was a case that needed leadership; it needed a government to step up on behalf of everyone living in the Parklands. If you live in the northern suburbs or in the seat of Bright, the seat of West Torrens, Gawler or Morialta—you are all here, and your constituents have as much right to use those parklands as those living in North Adelaide or the city.

Mrs Redmond: He lives in Springfield.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: Even if you live in Springfield, you have a right to use the Parklands. That is the point that this government does not get. But it is not too late. By passing this bill, it is all over red rover. By passing this bill the government can have exactly what it said it wanted. By passing this bill, the Treasurer could hop in his car and go down to the jockey club this afternoon and say, 'Everything is all back on the table,' and it could all be happening. But he will not, will he? He will wander off, pitter-patter off and hide under the bush, because he has been duded.

The fact is that it is not the council's fault, but it is this government's fault, this Premier's fault, this Deputy Premier and Treasurer's fault, and it is the Labor Party's fault for losing its ticker. You are arguing among yourselves WorkCover. You have Labor MPs on TV bagging the party line. You have the union movement at your throat. You have Labor luminaries scratching each other's eyes out. You have the member for Adelaide having a poke at the Treasurer and winning. It is pretty obvious that she should move up a couple of benches here. Perhaps she needs to find her way up a little bit. Perhaps the Treasurer should go off and get that highly paid job in the private sector that he would probably like, because her star is on the rise and his star is on the way down the toilet.

That is very clear: it is a lack of leadership and commitment. It also exposes a government that is prepared to talk tough, but when the going gets tough it goes weak at the knees and falls onto the floor. This bill needs to be supported. This bill is needed to create a smaller footprint on the Parklands than what we have. It will mean that people can actually use the Parklands, and it will be popular—according to *The Advertiser* poll and many other polls—with people right across the city of Adelaide. The presumed wisdom, by the way, that the majority of the people in the city of Adelaide do not want this, you need to check. You need to do some homework, because you are wrong. Support the bill.

The SPEAKER: The member's time has expired. The Deputy Premier.

Mr Koutsantonis: Let Martin be Martin!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Port Adelaide—Deputy Premier, Treasurer, Minister for Industry and Trade, Minister for Federal/State Relations) (11:07): Yes, that is our campaign slogan for the next election that I can announce today: 'Let Marty be Marty.' I am not sure which tactical genius—perhaps those in the gallery—thought it was a really clever idea to alienate the people of North Adelaide and to alienate the people of the city of Adelaide. That clearly could well be a tactical masterstroke.

I cannot yet quite work it out, but perhaps by abusing the people of North Adelaide and the south-east corner of the city and riding roughshod over them it is a good political tactic. Maybe members opposite are right, although I myself cannot quite see it. For the experts up there laughing and clapping at their beloved leader, perhaps this is their piece of political genius; good luck to them.

As I said in a press conference the other day, this is a better outcome than what was originally proposed by me. In hindsight, I was wrong to suggest that the permanent structure that, finally, was the compromise structure was the best way to go. I now accept the argument that this is a better process. I said that in a press conference on Monday and I will say it again today. When given an opportunity to consider all design options, the experts have come up with a design that gives us a better facility than the compromise (which would have been the fixed structure) and it also allows us to put shade over all the seated grandstands for the public.

Mr Williams interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I would like to have this debate calmly. I do not need to yell and shout like the leader. We have given the opposition the opportunity to debate the bill, unlike what members opposite would have done to us when we were in opposition.

Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Fancy the Leader of the Opposition saying to the member for West Torrens, 'I'm over here.' He is in opposition and we are in government. We are able to cover at least 24,000 seats that we could not afford to do under the previous proposal. In fact, it is estimated that we will do this for \$20 million instead of \$53 million. It is a significant cost saving for taxpayers.

It is a much cheaper option. We get a better facility than what was the compromise proposal (which would have been the fixed structure). We get to cover all the seated areas. I accept that I was wrong to be critical in the way I was of the residents of the south-east corner. I like a robust debate and I play the game hard. In hindsight I was wrong to have been as vitriolic and full-on when it came to commenting on the residents of the south-east corner of Adelaide.

If any of my remarks offended those people, I apologise to them. I am prepared to apologise on the public record for comments I made in the heat of debate against people who reside in the south-east corner of Adelaide. This process has been a very good learning curve for me in my development as a minister. What is important is that this process delivered a better outcome than would have been the case had I got my way.

I also want to say that the member for Adelaide is a very good local member of parliament. Within the rules of government and the rules of the Labor Party, she was able to represent her constituents outstandingly. I put on the public record, because it needs to be put on the public record—

Mr Williams interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for MacKillop will come to order.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: It needs to be put on the public record that the member for Adelaide never at any stage wavered, either inside or outside cabinet, in her total support of the residents of the City of Adelaide. Never once did she feel that she was overwhelmed by the debate. Never once did she flinch when I was putting forward a very strong case to get my way. While the honourable member and I may have had disagreements internally on the way forward, I am prepared to put on the public record that the member for Adelaide was right and I was wrong.

The constituents of Adelaide—whether they be those residents living in the south-east corner of the city or those residents living in North Adelaide whom the Leader of the Opposition has just criticised and degraded—can be confident in knowing that their member was prepared to stand up in cabinet and at party forums to argue their case and strongly disagree with the Treasurer of this state. In so doing, she was able to represent her constituents, as well as carrying out her bona fide duties as a cabinet minister and member for Adelaide. She was able to win an argument and convince a government that her position was the right position. I am prepared to put on the public record that I was wrong.

From my point of view, I am actually very delighted with what the member for Adelaide has been able to achieve. It is a better structure than what the compromise permanent structure would have been. Some 24,000 people at the next race will be able to sit under shade rather than being further exposed to the sun. The grandstand will be erected in perhaps about four weeks, maybe five. Hopefully, we can get that tighter so that it will be a put-up and pull-down time similar to the current demountable structure, except of course in the first year when we will have to get certification and a lot of underground work done.

The people who live in the state electorate of Adelaide can be confident now that their local member stands up for the people of Adelaide. Whether it is the Treasurer of this state—who, I might say, has a history of strongly putting a case and not liking it when he loses and not liking it when he gets his own way—this was never a personal issue for the member for Adelaide, this was an issue that was passionate for her elected constituents. She was elected to represent the constituents of Adelaide and in this case she represented those constituents outstandingly well and, in doing so, was able to show me and government there was a better way forward.

I do not think electors of Adelaide could ask for any better representation than they had from the member for Adelaide. I am not someone who is noted for saying I was wrong. I am not someone who is noted for heaping praise on someone because they were able to present a better argument than me. But in this case it deserves to be put on the public record and the people who vote at the next election in the state seat of Adelaide need to know that when the going got tough on this issue, when the second most senior minister of the government was absolutely determined to get his way, the member for Adelaide stood between me (the Treasurer) and getting my own way, and she was able to ensure that her constituency won the day.

What do we have here from an opposition? We have an opposition that wants to legislate, to make it law, to trample over the people of Adelaide, to trample over the people of the south-eastern corner, to trample over the people of North Adelaide. There is clearly only one choice at the next state election. If you want an elected member of parliament who will stand up to the most powerful people in government, to make sure the people of Adelaide get what they want, you vote Jane Lomax-Smith and Labor. If you want a member for Adelaide who will trample over the people of Adelaide you vote for Martin Hamilton-Smith, the Leader of the Liberal Party. A simple choice.

Time expired.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher) (11:17): This is a silly bill, silly in many respects because the game is all over in terms of what is going to happen in Victoria Park and I think it is a good outcome. I was one who did not support the permanent structure, and I must say that what has eventuated in terms of a quality temporary facility, demountable, I think is an excellent outcome.

I will elaborate on that point. I think the Leader of the Opposition is trying to adopt the role of the kamikaze kid, because I just cannot understand the logic of the Liberal Party in opposing something which is now a fait accompli, and alienating voters in the seats of Adelaide, Norwood and Unley. I do not know what happened to the word strategy, but maybe some people need to look at the word strategy in the dictionary.

I think the SA Jockey Club made a good decision to go to Morphettville. That is where it should have decided to go ages ago. Alan Scott—who is one of the smartest, shrewdest people in the racing game and in the business world—long ago said that Victoria Park for horseracing was really not viable and not an option.

I want to just knock on the head a couple of points that have been raised. First, I refer to this furphy about no-one uses the Parklands. I have the figures here. A survey done back in 2007 by the Adelaide City Council reveals that, on average, every day in the Parklands there are 28,000 people using them and that does not include people attending the Adelaide Botanic Gardens. So 28,000 people on average every day of the year—that is averaged over the year—use the Parklands. So, this idea that there is a couple of people from South Terrace with a chihuahua walking through the Parklands as their exclusive property is a nonsense.

The other point people at other levels of government seem to forget is that the Adelaide City Council spends \$9 million a year looking after the Parklands and that is not something that I have often heard people at the state level of government talk about picking up the tab for. That needs to be put in context.

Other figures were revealed and made public yesterday and the ERD Committee is disseminating them, but I will share them with members. Professor Chris Daniels, who is a professor from the School of Natural and Built Environments at the University of SA, in a presentation yesterday highlighted the fact that Adelaide ranks amongst the worst in the world in terms of green open space. If you look at what we have in Adelaide, we have 5.5 per cent total green open space in the metropolitan area. That compares with Beijing, which has 47.5 per cent; Brisbane, which has 11.57 per cent; New York, 14.4 per cent; Toronto, 21 per cent; Moscow, 50.9 per cent; and London, 30 per cent.

The point is that Adelaide does not have a lot of green open space and the Parklands are very precious for that reason, because sadly, the Parklands have been used as an excuse for not providing extra open space in the rest of the metropolitan area.

I oppose this bill. I think it is silly and I think the Liberal Party is doing itself a disservice by even raising it and, rather than seeing things dug in the Parklands, I think they are digging a big hole for themselves at the next election.

Mr O'BRIEN (Napier) (11:21): This bill proposes that the state Treasurer would be given the authority to secure access to the site approved for the Victoria Park master plan DA/500/2007 through negotiation for a lease with the Adelaide City Council, or by notice in the *Government Gazette*. The main justification of this bill is to provide government with the ability to bypass a consultative process in relation to facilitating development on the Parklands areas of Adelaide.

The government will not support this bill. Why would you have a bill to provide all these powers to a government when the government has already announced that it will spend in the order of \$20 million for a demountable pit building, shade structures and other track and site improvements for the Clipsal event? These structures will be of the highest quality and are the most advanced temporary buildings available in the world. Eight new shade structures will provide a more comfortable event for 24,000 spectators.

Rather than play politics, the government is more interested in providing essential and practical support to ensure the future success and growth of this important event for the state. The argument made by the Hon. Terry Stephens in the other place in originally moving this bill is that the South Australian Jockey Club is 'unsure about its racing future at Victoria Park'. However, this is not the case. The South Australian Jockey Club chief executive announced in late March that the club would be concentrating its presence at the Morphettville racecourse and terminating its tenancy at Victoria Park.

Why does the bill revisit the SAJC issue when the club itself has already made its decision to relocate to Morphettville? At best, the opposition is trying to find a solution to an issue that has already been resolved. The bill submitted by the opposition provides an ability for the Treasurer to fully occupy the Victoria Park precinct by gazettal, and then grant not only rights to the SA Motorsport Board and the SAJC but also rights for other events. In addition, in the other place, the mover of the bill stated that 'where the government is not using any of the land for the purposes described, the surplus land would be returned to the Parklands'. The government will be opposing the legislation.

Mr HANNA (Mitchell) (11:24): I briefly explain why I will be speaking only briefly to this legislation. It is a proposal by the Leader of the Opposition to facilitate built development at Victoria Park in our Adelaide Parklands. The member has previously introduced the bill and he sought to bring it up for debate this morning ahead of the precedence of other members, and I opposed its being brought forward as a matter of urgency on that basis because it did not go with the usual protocol followed in this place. However, now I move on to the substance of the bill.

The proposal is something I cannot support. If I had my Parklands file with me, I would be able to refer to copious notes in support of a passionate commitment to preserving the Parklands. They need to be preserved for the people of South Australia, not with particular preference to any section or interest. I must say one of my constituents, Ms Kath Crilly, has particularly kept me informed of developments in relation to these Parklands and also parklands developments interstate, and I am grateful for that. The Leader of the Opposition's proposal essentially allows for a government takeover of a very significant part of the Parklands, that is, Victoria Park.

I do not trust this government or the next government, or any government, with those sort of powers: the power to build things virtually unfettered. The bill specifically provides that there would be no compensation payable in respect of exercising government power under the legislation. There is a \$25,000 fine for anyone who hinders the building of a development, and I suppose that is there to take care of protesters. The real solution to the Parklands issues is to have a completely independent body to administer the Parklands and to govern development upon them. There needs to be a Parklands trust or authority, completely separate from government so that no minister and no government of the day can interfere with the supervision of the Parklands. That supervision should be under the principles of preserving as much open space as possible and not preferring the interests of any particular commercial or sporting body, nonetheless providing for adequate recreational space for all South Australians. For these reasons, I must oppose the bill.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite—Leader of the Opposition) (11:28): I thank members for their contributions. I begin by addressing the remarks of the member for Mitchell and the member for Fisher. I make the point to them that preservation of the Parklands and appropriate development within the Parklands are not inconsistent. If the logic that there should be no development in the Parklands was carried through, we would bulldoze the Adelaide Cricket Ground; we would remove the zoo; we would take away all sporting infrastructure—there are already stands at the University Oval—and we would remove toilets, park benches, pathways and other developments in the Parklands because they are all developments in the Parklands. We

would not allow any road access through the Parklands and we would allow it to revert to native bush. That is a ridiculous proposition and it is a proposition that was never envisaged or foreseen.

I re-emphasise to the members for Fisher and Mitchell and the house as a whole, that everyone in this house wants to see the Parklands preserved and conserved and made into all they can be—and they will be, I can assure you. We will have some exciting ideas on that to take to the next election, let there be no doubt, but that does include appropriate developments in the Parklands, the very position the Treasurer was arguing for when he first raised this issue: isn't it better to bulldoze old buildings in the Parklands—dilapidated, ugly buildings—and replace them with something which is up-to-date, more comfortable, less of a visual eyesore and which has a smaller footprint?

It makes sense. I will not be voting for the bulldozing of the Adelaide Cricket Ground or for the removal of the zoo, and I will not be voting for a whole lot of other nonsense. However, what I will be voting for is appropriate developments in the Parklands so that, as in every Parklands in every other major capital in the world—whether you go to Central Park or whether you go to European parklands—they are available for people to use and, whilst they retain their beauty, there are facilities to make it safe and appropriate for them to be used.

The other thing I want to say to the Treasurer and to other members is that this presumption that every single person—men and women of all ages—hates the idea of better infrastructure in the Parklands, particularly the grandstand that was proposed, is wrong; it is fatally wrong. If you listen, there is a group of people who, very legitimately, do not want any development in the Parklands. Some of them want the Adelaide Oval bulldozed and the zoo removed. If you talk to that group, great. Go and talk to the younger demographic, go and talk to the people who come to the Clipsal and the twilight racing, and go and talk to others in the seat of Adelaide—we have—and you might just find a different story, and I draw members' attention to *The Advertiser* polls on this.

Can I make another point to the Treasurer? Is it really up to the seat of Adelaide alone? If the Treasurer's benchmark is that, if any individual member decides that this is a die in the ditch issue for him, the government should immediately abandon what is in the best interests of the whole of the state and follow the wishes of that individual member—if that is the way the government is working now—it is going to be a very rocky 18 months.

We have these debates all the time on our side, and I am sure the government does as well. Do you know what we generally do? At the end of the day, members are mature enough to vote for what is in the best interests of all South Australians, and people make compromises. There are many occasions when individuals on our side would love to oppose a particular measure—and I am looking at the grandfather of the house here. There are many issues in the seat of Stuart that the member for Stuart would like to die in a ditch on, but he is part of a team, and he goes along with it, as we all do.

I just say to the government that it needs to think about the best interests of the whole state. This exposes the government's failings. This bill would have delivered the government exactly what it wanted, which it has now backed away from. This bill exposes that it is the government's decision and the government's alone; and it is the government's failure, and the government's alone. There is no-one else to blame but the Premier, the Treasurer and this government for this whole farrago. The fact that they will not support this bill indicates that they are in a dither and in a mess on the issue and that they got it wrong from start to finish.

Let us test the floor—I see the member for Adelaide coming into the house—let us test the house, and let us see where members sit on this. Let us have the matter decided.

The SPEAKER: Before we take the vote on the second reading, I will make a ruling on the earlier point of order by the member for Fisher. I have examined the bill and note that it does not contain any provisions to impose a tax, rate or impost. Therefore, its introduction conforms to standing order 232.

The house divided on the second reading:

AYES (14)

Evans, I.F.

Gunn, G.M.

McFetridge, D.

Pengilly, M.

Goldsworthy, M.R.

Hamilton-Smith, M.L.J. (teller)

Pederick, A.S.

Pisoni, D.G.

Griffiths, S.P.

Kerin, R.G.

Penfold, E.M.

Redmond, I.M.

Venning, I.H.

Williams, M.R.

NOES (29)

Atkinson, M.J.

Bedford, F.E.

Bignell, L.W.

Breuer, L.R.

Caica, P.

Conlon, P.F.

Foley, K.O. (teller)

Fox, C.C.

Geraghty, R.K.

Hanna, K.

Hill, J.D.

Kenyon, T.R.

Key, S.W.

Koutsantonis, T.

Lomax-Smith, J.D.

Maywald, K.A.

McEwen, R.J.

O'Brien, M.F.

Piccolo, T.

Portolesi, G.

Rankine, J.M.

Rann, M.D.

Rau, J.R.

Stevens, L.

Such, R.B.

Thompson, M.G.

Weatherill, J.W.

White, P.L.

Wright, M.J.

PAIRS (2)

Chapman, V.A.

Ciccarello, V.

Majority of 15 for the noes.

Second reading thus negatived.

COOPER DISCOVERER CRUISES**The Hon. G.M. GUNN (Stuart) (11:41):** I move:

That this house notes that the proprietor of Cooper Discovery Cruises, Mr Peter Ware, is being unfairly treated and calls on the Minister for Environment and Conservation, and the department, to immediately withdraw the 10 per cent charge on business turnover and allow this important tourist venture to continue.

The role of government is not to persecute, penalise or make life as difficult as it possibly can, particularly in relation to small, isolated business activities and particularly when the enterprise is providing a service to tourists in the most isolated part of South Australia. We have someone who has gone up there and constructed a punt to take tourists down the Cooper Creek to enjoy the amenity of the area. Why would we want to have people standing on the bank counting them?

Why would we want to make it as difficult as we can for that person? Why would we want to make it hard for him to get a site so that he can put a shed on it when, at the same time, the national parks service constructed a weekender—a very large building on the side of the hill—without any approvals whatsoever? Mr Ware's business activity is seasonal. I understand that the department has said that he is making a profit out of a national park. Heaven help us—what a terrible thing! How can he operate if he does not make a profit?

At the end of the day, do we want tourism? Do we want tourism developers to go and do the right thing? Look at all the nonsense that took place at the time of the construction of the new motel units—an outstanding development at Innamincka and great for the tourism industry in South Australia. During winter, a huge number of people move through from Victoria, New South Wales and elsewhere to enjoy the services provided there.

What many people do not understand is that people want to travel the Outback, but they also want services, and they want things that they can see and do. Why would we want to charge someone 10 per cent of their turnover? It would be bad enough if it were 10 per cent of their profit, but 10 per cent of their turnover is outrageous.

The poor man now faces the threat of debt collectors chasing him out of it. On at least three occasions I tried to ring the person who wrote some of these objectionable letters to Mr Ware, but I could not get an answer. They are in isolation. They are obviously petrified of dealing with the public. I have a quote from a letter that Mr Ware sent out to people. This is what he had to say:

...I have been forced to seize my cruise operation on Cooper Creek at Innamincka.

The constant financial harassment from National Parks and the continual demand for 10% on my turnover—which is far greater than the percentage incurred by the majority of operators...combined with a lack of help from Tourism SA over the past six years has forced me into the position of having to cease operations.

Unfortunately, there seems to be no incentive to operate in these harsh, remote environments—just very large disincentives...my attempts to negotiate...have all failed. If you wish to pen a letter...

He wants people to write to the federal Minister for Tourism and the federal Minister for the Environment in relation to these particular matters.

This house should immediately support Mr Ware. We should attempt to convince the minister and those who surround her that common sense should apply. At the end of the day they are claiming some \$3,000 or \$4,000 from Mr Ware out of a budget of about \$12,000 million. If there was a safety issue with the boat—if there was a charge—no-one would object, but that is not the case. It is purely a desire to dip the hands into his pocket no matter what the circumstances or whether it is fair, reasonable or just.

This matter goes back a long way. It was of the many outstanding features of minister Kotz. She started it and minister Gago has finished it. Together, they have a lot to be proud of in this exercise. The bureaucrats have continued to dud them. I make no apology for what I said. What has gone on is an absolute public outrage and a disgrace. It is unnecessary and it is contrary to the best interests of the people of this state. We should be actually encouraging small operators to get involved, to create opportunities and more employment.

If you stay overnight at Innamincka, it is a nice thing to go down to the creek. Why would you want to plunder the poor bloke's pocket? I think he made a turnover of \$50,000-odd. You cannot say that that is a fortune, but there have been National Parks officers in the past—I am not including the current ones—who have done everything they can to harass tourists up there. It is unreasonable behaviour. They are trying to tell people that they cannot camp in certain areas. There have been private operators up there at the hotel and the shops who have done a great job.

There is a history of failure to understand the needs of Innamincka. I well recall when they took away those unallocated freehold blocks up there. The local community at the time went to the then minister and tried to convince her that it was a foolish escapade and said, 'Don't do it'. But, no, Sir Humphrey knew best. Well, now there are not enough blocks. If people want blocks they cannot get them. That is one of the hassles that Mr Ware has had. He has to be able to have a base from which to operate. I am calling on this house to show a bit of common sense, a bit of compassion, and to give him a go.

At the end of the day, as a small average operator, he is at a great disadvantage when dealing with these people with fixed views. I do not know whether they think they have acted in the best interests of the people of South Australia by driving him out of business. If they think that that is a good outcome, well, I would be appalled. That is the end result. They cannot see that. When you look around and see other operators have had massive financial assistance—which is a good thing that I support—so that they can develop their business and create attractive operations for people to enjoy and utilise, that is a great thing.

But why would you want to be so vindictive, so narrow-minded and so out of touch with reality to put him out of business? Then they had a bureaucrat write him letters and threaten him with collection agencies and all those things. Okay, if that is what they want, in my view, they have acted unreasonably. That is why this matter is on the floor of the parliament this morning. What other the alternatives are there? That is why there will be investigations by a parliamentary committee—thank goodness for it. That will take a lot of time.

Surely, if the minister was on top of her portfolio and really understood what common sense is, it would never have come to this. At the end of the day, what is \$3,000 or \$4,000 to the government of South Australia? Is it so important that they get their clutches into this man's pockets and put him out of business, or is it important that they allow a small operator to continue to provide a service to the tourists whom we should be attracting to South Australia?

Innamincka is one of the most isolated spots in the community. I have tried very hard to get the government to raise the causeway so that it is not isolated. It will not do that. Sir Humphrey will not provide the money. What you have to clearly understand is that the bitumen road is coming very close to the border coming from Queensland. Do you want everything to go to Queensland, or do you want to have some facilities there to help this community? Mr Ware is only a small operator in part of the year, and they have driven him out. Who will be next? Who will they have their clutches on next?

Mr Goldsworthy: Probably the pub.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: Well, they gave the pub a pretty hard time when he was trying to put up 24 wonderful motel units to provide a great opportunity. It was a very large investment. There is an excellent shop there. What they should be doing is providing money to seal the airstrip—that is what should happen—so that people can fly in and out and not be isolated. So, I

put this on the public record. I look forward to a sympathetic, reasonable response from the government.

It has already been brought to the minister's attention in the other place, and she obviously did not know anything about it. There is a poor track record of ministers in the past in relation to this matter, who have been insensitive to the needs of the small operator. I commend the motion to the house.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mrs Geraghty.

WORKCOVER CORPORATION: MEMBER FOR BRIGHT

Mr PENGILLY (Finniss) (11:53): I move:

That this house condemns the member for Bright for supporting the state government in cutting WorkCover entitlements, and for—

- (a) not taking any interest in the blow-out in WorkCover's unfunded liability since taking office;
- (b) not taking any interest in WorkCover's poor return to work results;
- (c) not informing the public until after the federal election that WorkCover entitlements to injured workers would be cut; and
- (d) not examining alternatives to cutting workers' benefits as part of WorkCover reform.

I am somewhat stupefied, to say the least, that the introduction of the WorkCover bill and—

The Hon. R.J. McEwen interjecting:

Mr PENGILLY: Stupefied, member for Mount Gambier—stupefied that, with respect to the WorkCover bill which came into parliament just recently and on which members on this side spoke at some length, there was not one single contribution from the member for Bright, bearing in mind that her electorate covers an area where there are significant numbers of Mitsubishi workers and significant numbers of people working in other manufacturing areas, all of whom rely on the WorkCover system to carry them through.

I would suggest that those people down in the electorate of Bright would not be impressed by the fact that this has occurred and that the member for Bright made no effort in this parliament on their behalf regarding the WorkCover bill. I suppose that what really threw me on this was that on Monday I received a phone call from a constituent in the electorate of Bright who three times had tried to make an appointment to see the member for Bright and had been turned down. This person wanted to speak to the member for Bright.

Ms Fox interjecting:

Mr PENGILLY: 'Who?' the member for Bright asks. I will tell you who the constituent is: the constituent is a former Labor Party member who was a former Labor candidate for a lower house seat, and three times this person had been to that office and three times was—

Members interjecting:

Mr PENGILLY: All right. It was a Mr Christopher Battams, who some years ago was a Labor candidate for the seat of Davenport. Three times he attempted to go in to talk about his issues with WorkCover and he was refused the opportunity to talk to his local member. So, if you think this is coming from hot air, it is not. I have got it all down in writing and I would be happy to show your colleagues the correspondence on the issue.

If you are going to come into this place, there are things that you are going to like, things that you are not going to like and things on which you might want to duck for cover on. Well, you cannot duck for cover all the time in this place. You have got to stand up and be counted. Quite clearly, on this WorkCover issue, the member for Bright and various other members opposite have refused to be seen.

So, what do we have today? I have just been in the other place and as I walked out I saw another collection of unionists up there sitting around waiting for the WorkCover legislation to be discussed in that chamber some time today. We had this curious issue on the radio this morning where the government, through the leader of the upper house, was trying to convince the public of South Australia that the parliament, and more particularly the Legislative Council, was trying to impede the progress of this bill. What a lot of nonsense!

Let me tell you that this issue is well and truly alive out there in voter land. I only have to put up Mr Christopher Battams' name. Three times he wanted to see his local member and he was

turned down three times. He has documented that and has come to see us. As I have said, he is a former ALP candidate. So, I put that issue forward in the parliament for it to be digested by members.

The other matter involved in my motion is the fact that the member for Bright does not appear to be taking any interest in WorkCover's poor return to work results. The member for Bright had every opportunity to stand up in this chamber and make considered—indeed, profound—utterances on the WorkCover bill, but she did not do so and, quite frankly, she was found wanting on that matter.

We on this side of the house know how members on the other side get here. If you are not put up by a union you are done and dusted. You cannot get in unless you are here courtesy of one of the unions. We all know that, and that is the way the Labor Party works. We are actually a bit more democratic than that. Let us face it, we all have fights, and good fights, to get preselection. However, the fact of the matter is that on the other side of the house you have to come through the union movement. That is the way things are and we accept that, but there are a lot of unions asking questions about a lot of members who are sitting in this place with an ALP jacket on their back.

I reckon there is a lot of unrest out there. Just from the utterances and rumours circulating around this building, particularly during the two weeks that we discussed the WorkCover legislation, we know that this matter is alive and well and will go on for some time. You have the opportunity to stand up here and speak. The member for Bright should have risen from her seat and spoken on a number of these issues and made her feelings known. However, she did not, and so her electorate will take issue with her on it.

The third point I would make is on the federal election held last year. We knew it was going to happen, we knew roughly when it was going to happen, and everybody on the other side stayed very quiet. They did not want to stir up any trouble whatsoever. You could not buy a fight with them in the lead-up to the federal election. They sat over there like a mob of stunned mullets. They were not going to say boo. They were not going to jeopardise Kevin's chances in any way, shape or form, and that took its course.

However, the fact is that the member for Bright and many of her colleagues did not make public until after the federal election the fact that there were going to be cuts to workers' entitlements. I think they should stand condemned for that and the member for Bright has to take her place in standing condemned along with the rest of her colleagues. It is most unfair. You put your hand up, you stand up and if you are going to an election you should tell people what you are about. This is the crowd that did not want the GST, let us not forget. They railed against the GST: now they absolutely love it.

They think it is wonderful. They did not want this, and they did not want that. I reckon we could see anything happen with this outfit. You have seen this nonsense happen this week with the Victoria Park grandstand and the way that the Treasurer was duded. Perhaps the Treasurer went out and said what he thought and has been duded by his own party, but I say that the member for Bright should have told her constituents and the people of South Australia that there were going to be cuts to workers' entitlements.

She should have told them. She is in government, and she knew what was going to happen. You cannot tell me that members opposite do not know what is going to occur in this parliament. The simple fact of the matter is that the member for Bright failed dismally to alert her constituents to the fact that WorkCover was going to be changed substantially and workers' entitlements were going to be cut.

Once again, I think the member for Bright stands condemned on that and time will tell. March 20, 2010 is not very far away at all. Bring it on, I say; I can't wait for it. It is only 600-odd days away, and I am really looking forward to it. The member for Ashford will probably still be here afterwards, but I reckon there will be a few vacancies on the other side. We will fill them up. We will put all our people over there and I reckon we might take Bright with us as well. In fact, I look forward to it. We would like to have Bright back and a few others, and we are working pretty hard on that.

Why has not the member for Bright examined alternatives to cutting workers' benefits and brought them to the house and stood up in this chamber and told us her views on how we could do it differently? This is the place where you can do that. You can do it perfectly safely. You might earn the ire of your colleagues and you might have the 'gang of three' in the front come and slap

you around the ears afterwards but at least you should have the courage of your convictions and stand up here and do it.

There are a couple of members opposite, who will remain nameless (but everyone knows who they are) who actually stood up here and asked a few questions and put a few things together on what they thought. Brave souls! I reckon the 'gang of three and a half'—perhaps four, but I reckon he is only a half!—would have taken them out and slotted them afterwards, quite frankly. I reckon they would have got the greatest flogging of all time because they have gone against what the Almighty said had to happen.

How many people run this government? Three and a half, four. That is how it appears to us on this side. You have the ridiculous situation yesterday where you have the member for Light asking a question and the Premier, the Deputy Premier and the Minister for Infrastructure laughing and carrying on and making noises while one of their own members was asking a question. I just could not believe it. I found it a gross discourtesy and a reflection of the arrogance and disgust that the general South Australian public is starting to feel with this outfit.

They do not like it. You only have to get around the paddock outside, walk around and go to functions, and you will find out what people are thinking. They are not happy; they have had an absolute bellyful of this lot. The momentum is growing and it will continue to grow and we will do all we can to encourage it—trust me!—which includes speaking in this place on motions such as this.

It may seem to the member to be a slap in the face with a wet lettuce leaf, but I can assure you that we are quite serious about this and my good friend the member for Kavel is going to make his thoughts known on another member shortly, but my efforts are around the fact that the member for Bright has significantly failed to serve her constituents on the WorkCover issue. She has failed to tell them what was going to happen, and she has failed to meet with at least one that I know of who rang me.

I just found it absolutely extraordinary to have a phone call from a former Labor candidate because he could not get an appointment with a member on his own side. It is just remarkable. Members opposite can scoff and laugh and giggle and carry on—they can do what they like—but let me tell the house that people are not happy, and when they are not happy they need to be able to go to their local member.

The Hon. R.J. McEwen interjecting:

Mr PENGILLY: Harvey Norman: four years, no interest. I rest my case. They are not happy and they should be able to go to their local member and talk to their local member and raise issues, if they do not like something on the WorkCover legislation. I will guarantee that when we are in government, there are plenty of people on our side who do not like things that the Liberal government has done over the years—probably myself included from time to time, but that is something else; now we are here we will fix it all up. But the reality is that you should be able to go and talk to your member and discuss and raise these issues.

I condemn the member for Bright for her inaction. She should have taken more interest in this blow-out that was some \$60 million in 2002 and is now over \$900 million, not taking into account the \$400 million for the Public Service unfunded liability. Shades of State Bank! Rob Lucas and Stephen Baker fixed up an almighty mess after 1993, and here we go again. Our mate Kevvy is going to blow it. He can't count.

We have the absolutely ridiculous situation where the minister sits there and blames everybody except himself. He takes no responsibility whatsoever for this: he blames the board, blames the Public Service, blames this, blames somewhere else, and all the time he has done nothing about it. It is ludicrous.

How can the government possibly have a minister sitting there who has blown around a billion dollars and done nothing about it and accepts no responsibility. Blind Freddy knows that you do not do that. Had it been someone on our side who had done anything like that, they would have been out the door years ago and sitting back here somewhere, or back on that side somewhere—sitting up next to the member for Enfield, probably.

It is my belief that the member for Bright has failed her constituency and stands condemned on her inaction and lack of contribution and a whole lot of things to do with the WorkCover bill.

Ms FOX (Bright) (12:07): I acknowledge the remarks of the member for Finnis. I acknowledge the shallow posturing and personal slurs. I also acknowledge the fact that in this

place the member for Finniss has claimed that a person has attempted to contact me three times. I have spoken with both my personal assistants, neither of whom have any record of any desire by this individual to meet with me personally. Excuse me, Madam Deputy Speaker (because I am fairly new in this place), but that does seem to be a wild untruth and I am not very happy about it.

I point out that the member for Finniss in his two years in this place has to my knowledge never asked a question about WorkCover until after he gave notice of this motion. Member for Finniss, you voted exactly the way I did. There is nothing that you accuse me of that you yourself have not done in this place. So I hope you feel a little bit uncomfortable. Once again, Madam Deputy Speaker, I ask for your guidance in this matter, but I feel this is a little hypocritical, if I may say so.

Mr PISONI (Unley) (12:09): The difference between the member for Bright and the member for Finniss is that the member for Finniss speaks up for his constituency (the farmers, the retirees and the young people), the residents of Finniss and, of course, those who support the Liberal Party. The member for Bright in her maiden speech in this place said:

Without the encouragement of the Shop Distributive and Allied Employees Association, the Australian Labor Party would not have won as convincingly as it did in Bright. Thanks particularly to Don and Nimfa Farrell and their family. I am proud to have been supported in my campaign by a union which is now fighting harder than ever before to defend the rapidly eroding rights of many working Australians.

That is what the member for Bright said in her maiden speech, yet at the first opportunity she does the dirty on them: 'Thank you union members. Your contributions have helped to push me up the union pyramid and got me into parliament. I know there is a huge problem with WorkCover, but I have no idea how to deal with it. Someone has suggested that we cut workers' benefits. Oh, that will do. I will do that. I do not care that I got into this place crawling over the backs of working South Australians, taking their union membership to fund my campaign. I do not care that I did all that to get to where I am today. This is an easy option. Let us cut workers' benefits. Let us run a campaign, defending workers in an election environment, but at the first opportunity we get to shaft them we will.'

That is the easy option. It is much easier than managing WorkCover in a better, sustainable manner, like the Liberal Party did when it was in government, with a small unfunded liability—which has continued to grow under the management of Michael Wright.

I think it is important that union members and the constituents of the electorate of Bright understand that Chloe Fox, their local member, would do and say anything to get elected but will not deliver when she gets here. She has had every opportunity to do that and to, in her own words, 'fight harder than ever before to defend the rapidly eroding rights of working Australians'. But what did she do? She voted to cut their entitlements under WorkCover, and not once has she raised her concern about the bad management of WorkCover and the way in which it has been run by minister Wright and the board and CEO he appointed, and the changes he made to the way in which claims and legal affairs are managed in WorkCover. Not once has she done that.

Instead, we hear speeches about railway sleepers and peak oil. That is all we hear from the member for Bright. These are real issues for the trade union movement. The member for Bright has chosen not to raise them in this parliament but, rather, chosen to cut the entitlements of South Australian workers.

Mr RAU (Enfield) (12:12): I am coming to look forward to Thursday mornings because we have several more of these motions. We have had the pinch hitters out for the last couple of weeks. We have been warned that the member for Kavel is next and we are sitting here ready. Today was yet another in a series of extraordinary contributions from members of the opposition on the subject of the WorkCover bill.

Now, I will say something that I would not normally reveal openly in parliament. I did ask the whip whether it would be in order for me to amend the member for Finniss's motion to substitute the word 'Finniss' for the word 'Bright', but I was told that because I had not discussed it with my colleagues I should just get on with it—which is what I am doing.

The point is well made because there is nothing, as the member for Bright said, that the member for Bright did that the member for Finniss did not do. It would seem to me that if, as is stated in the surprisingly similarly worded motion from the member, I might say, that the member for Bright is guilty of all these dreadful things, then I assume he himself is admitting guilt for all those things—which, I guess, is a very noble thing to do.

As I understand it, what he is saying, by reference to the way in which he voted in the parliament, is that he does not take any interest in the blow-out in WorkCover's unfunded liability, that he does not take any interest in the poor return-to-work results, and that he has not examined alternatives.

I have listened to the debates that have taken place in here, and I remember very well that the member for Mitchell put up a great many proposals to amend that bill. I have to say that I thought a number of those proposals could have borne considerable extra debate and extra time because a lot of thought went into what he did.

I did not agree with all of those things, obviously, but did I hear any amendments coming from members of the opposition? No. I have to say that the member for Stuart and (it surprised me actually) the member for MacKillop, in an act of unspeakable heroism, walked across the floor to join the member for Mitchell in asking that all employers let trade union officials come into their property any time of the day, any day of the week, any week of the year to inspect the place to ensure it was satisfactory on an occupational, health and safety basis.

I am still waiting for a copy of *The Worker* to see the member for MacKillop on the front page. It is May Day, for God's sake; why isn't he out in the parade—why isn't he leading the parade? It is as though one of those epiphanies struck him. Here we are late one evening debating WorkCover and the member for MacKillop is overcome by this epiphany. Finally he has got it. Good on the workers, but—

The Hon. S.W. Key: He will be there Saturday morning.

Mr RAU: He will be there Saturday morning, I understand. But as much as I admire him, the member for Finniss did not join him. Why is that? Let's judge them not by what they say because, with the greatest respect to the member for Finniss and those who have preceded him and no doubt those who will follow him, the basic law of physics applies to their contributions: air rushes in to fill a vacuum and, as the air rushes in, what comes out is waffle. It has no relevance whatsoever to the debate. It is simply an opportunity just to say a few words, a stream of consciousness that goes on for a few minutes and then it is all over. But let us look at what they have done. They voted for the government bill—every single provision—except, as I said, the member for MacKillop and the member for Stuart (two people of principle on the other side), but everybody else just toed the line. Why did they toe the line? I have been lying down for the last couple of weeks thinking about this and a couple of weeks—

Members interjecting:

Mr RAU: No, I can't think of anything else. I have not been able to eat; I have not been able to do anything. I have been worried sick about this, and eventually I was sitting down the other night watching a show called *Medium* on TV. I do not know if anyone has seen this show, but *Medium* is a show where there is a lady—

An honourable member interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr RAU: —who goes to sleep and, when she goes to sleep, she has all these vivid dreams which recount things that are either happening or have happened, or things that will happen. It must have been the influence of that, because I had this dream.

I had a dream (not like Martin Luther King; it was different), and in my dream the Leader of the Opposition is sitting in a room and he is surrounded by people from the business community of South Australia—Mr Vaughan and various other heavy hitters from the business community. There are people with big bags of money dropping or dangling them luringly over the campaign coffers of the party opposite, and the leader is sitting in the corner and they are saying to him, 'Marty, what's wrong you with, mate? Why don't you just support it? What are you characters doing in there? We want this. Why are you delaying it?' And Marty's going, 'I don't know, I don't know, but it's the only thing I could think to do.'

This dream keeps coming back to me, so I think I have actually been channelled into a very private session of the Liberal Party somewhere where their supporters are actually telling them, 'Please stop doing what you're doing. Please, member for Finniss, member for Kavel, member for Hammond, stop making yourself look stupid in the parliament by criticising other people for doing what you do, and just let the thing pass, because we all want it.' And the fact that you voted for it is because they all told you they want it. If you had either some backbone or a genuine difference of opinion, you would have got up and moved amendments, like the member for Mitchell did. You

would have at least voted with him. Only two of you had the spine to do that—the member for MacKillop, who does care about unionists getting into workplaces, and the member for Stuart who, as some people would say, is unique (he does have his own views, and he is the champion of the small person).

The other thing I say is that either you are going to fix it or you are not. You are either happy with the unfunded liability, in which case you can go on and say how dreadful it is that any of these amendments are being made, or you are not and you are going to fix it, and you voted to fix it and that is to your great credit, although, why you are not taking credit for it I still fail to understand.

Ultimately I put the question back to the member for Unley. He said, 'Oh, you're not looking after your mates.' That seems to be the big point of the member for Unley: 'You're not looking after your mates.' The member for Finniss: 'You're not looking after your mates.' No doubt we will hear that from the member for Kavel shortly. But I ask you: if you want to be a government one day, what is the responsible thing to do? Is it to look after your mates, or look after the state's finances? If your answer is the responsible thing is to look after your mates, I sincerely hope you stay over there for a very long time, because you do not deserve to be anywhere else.

If you say, 'No, the responsible thing to do as a government and as a parliament is to look after the state's fiscal position,' then you would support the government. What you are trying to do is have it both ways. You are trying to support the government and get the credit for being fiscally responsible and then abuse government members for doing exactly what you are doing. It is a real test of responsibility and I am afraid that, to be throwing up questions like, 'Are you looking after your mates or not?' is a very disturbing aspect of what is being put in this chamber. You are not here to look after your mates: you are here to do the right thing. And if you do have the encourage to do the right thing, or if it is just because your business mates have bludgeoned you into it, for God's sake just do it in good humour. Get on with it, vote for it and let us move on, and encourage your colleagues up there to do it.

The Hon. R.J. McEWEN (Mount Gambier—Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, Minister for Forests) (12:22): The business community is just shaking their heads in disbelief at this particular political strategy. I understand what they have now said to the leadership team in the Liberal Party is, 'For God sakes, put your stupidity in the lower house behind you and now move with courage and a degree of urgency to allow the bill to pass through the upper house.' The business community is concerned that, every day the opposition says one thing and does another, they provide more ammunition to be used against every Liberal candidate in the next election.

The business community has every right to be concerned in that regard. This strategy, quite frankly—and I know many opposite personally agree with this—makes absolutely no sense. This strategy makes absolutely no sense, other than to give ammunition to other parties to simply point to the fact that the Liberal Party says one thing and votes another way—and the record is here, on and on. They support what is being done, but for some reason they want to turn this into some short-term political stunt to their long-term political damage. I am telling you what the business community is telling me about the present leadership of the Liberal Party and their total and utter lack of understanding of what the strategy is.

I watched the member for Unley this morning. I watched his body language when he was saying, 'What the hell is the political strategy?' in terms of bringing on that bill. Many opposite, I am aware, cannot believe the position that the shadow minister took in relation to the GM bill. On so many fronts, people in the business community are saying to me, 'What is this mob really on about?' But today and these motions are the best possible example. This is allowing the Liberal opposition continually to reinforce the fact that they do not come in here to do what they believe is right: they come in here to play games. So why don't they simply drop this crazy strategy and say to themselves, 'It was done from the outset. We have exposed ourselves because we did not even have a single amendment to the bill. The bill was so good it stood in its own right without amendment. This is so good for the state. On balance, a difficult position has been struck between the needs of competing parties.'

That is what politics is about: it is about finding an acceptable compromise in a difficult set of circumstances. If they had just simply said that and left it, they would have been given credit. The problem they now have is that every day they reinforce the fact that they say one thing and mean another. Do you know that, at the end of the day, you need to be judged not on what you say but on how you vote on this issue and every other issue from now on—

Mr Venning interjecting:

The Hon. R.J. McEWEN: The member for Schubert knows this. The member for Schubert knows very well how embarrassed he is about this.

Mr Venning: Me?

The Hon. R.J. McEWEN: The member for Schubert—

Mr Goldsworthy interjecting:

The Hon. R.J. McEWEN: I am looking forward, I might say, to a question on GM because I do think it is important that, at some stage, we put on the record the fact that views opposite are broad on this and that what the shadow minister said publicly is not well supported on that side of the house. That is not the point for this debate. The point for this debate is to say that it is extremely damaging and not a smart political stunt for any party to continue to say one thing and act differently. Every day you move another one of these motions, you reinforce the fact—

Mr Goldsworthy interjecting:

The Hon. R.J. McEWEN: You are going to in a minute—that you do not believe what you say, because, when you have a chance to vote, you do not vote that way. If you think people out there do not understand the silly stunt that you have been trapped into and the fact that it is not reflecting on you individually but it is reflecting on you collectively in terms of your leadership, then sooner or later you will get the message, because they are telling me, and I know they are telling some of you. The smart thing to do is to acknowledge it has backfired; it was damn dumb. You moved not one single amendment; you supported the bill in its entirety; and how you voted is on the record. I suggest to you that this is a silly stunt, it has backfired; and every time you move another one of these motions, you will continue to make it worse, and I know that the business community is telling you what they are telling me.

Motion negatived.

WORKCOVER CORPORATION: MEMBER FOR NEWLAND

Mr GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel) (12:28): I move:

That this house condemns the member for Newland for supporting the state government in cutting WorkCover entitlements, and for—

- (a) not taking any interest in the blow-out in WorkCover's unfunded liability since taking office;
- (b) not taking any interest in the WorkCover's poor return-to-work results;
- (c) not informing the public until after the federal election that WorkCover entitlements to injured workers would be cut; and
- (d) not examining alternatives to cutting workers' benefits as part of WorkCover reform.

I preface my comments in relation to the member for Newland's stance on this particular legislation by making a couple of brief comments about some contributions we have just heard: one from the Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries and the other from the member for Enfield.

I have a reasonable regard for the member for Enfield. I think he is a good man, and he brings matters of relative importance to the attention of the house from time to time. He has been pilloried by his own colleagues in doing that, for having the courage and conviction to bring issues to the house that he thinks are important; for example, the position he took in relation to the review and investigatory report into the performance of local government that he made public, and also the matters he raised regarding the real estate industry, in particular, the manner in which auctions are held for the sale and purchase of residential real estate.

The member for Enfield is a courageous man, and he has been pilloried by his own colleagues. Unfortunately, I do not think he will make it to the frontbench in the foreseeable future, even though he is deserving of it. I think that when he comes into this place he is a better lawyer—that is, he is better able to argue a point—than he is at supporting what he is saying. He is a good bloke, but he is a better lawyer.

The key point he has obviously neglected is the position government members took on this issue, such as the position the member for Newland took on this legislation. We all know exactly what has taken place here: it was a fight between the left and the right of the Labor Party. Do you know what it came down to? Who had the most money within the Labor Party/union structure—and we know that as an absolute fact—and it comes down to one person who has just been elected to the Senate, that is, the benefactor of the right wing of the Labor Party—we like to call him dear old

Uncle Don Farrell. It has come down to that specific point: that the strongest union, the union that had the largest financial backing, won the day, and all the Labor Party members fell in behind.

The only person—and she is protesting now, I can see—who had any courage of their convictions was the member for Ashford. She was prepared to question the minister, as well as the shadow minister for industrial relations, the leader and a whole host of opposition members, and the member for Mitchell. The member for Ashford was the only person; we did not hear a peep from the member for Newland. No; Tom, a good bloke, just sits quiet as a mouse up there on the back bench. We hardly hear him make any contribution, really, in the house, apart from the occasional gripe on something, but, unfortunately, not many people take a lot of notice.

To get back to my point, the only person who had the courage to question the minister on aspects of the legislation was the member for Ashford. She was a great minister and she is a tremendous person in her own right, but I have a pretty good idea that the position she took during her term as a minister led to the movement within the Labor Party ranks to see her relegated to the back bench, because she has had the courage to stand up for what she believes in—not the member for Newland.

You know, Tom, I will give you a lesson. I know you have been around politics for a fair while, mate, but you really do not have a handle on what your job in here is, mate: it is actually to represent your constituents.

The Hon. R.J. McEwen interjecting:

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: Don't you worry, Minister for Agriculture, if I get time, I'll come on to you, too, mate. Don't you worry about it, you'll get your turn in a minute, so I wouldn't pipe up too much.

Mr PEDERICK: I have a point of order, Madam Deputy Speaker. The Minister for Agriculture is interjecting and is not in his seat.

The Hon. R.J. McEwen interjecting:

Mr PEDERICK: I think the point of order stands, Madam Deputy Speaker.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: All those things are correct; however, the volume coming from the members on my left has been entirely unacceptable, and it has been ignored. So, I ask everyone to behave, including the Minister for Agriculture.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: Thank you for that ruling, Madam Deputy Speaker. What do we see from the member for Newland? One of his primary responsibilities is to represent concerns and issues that are important in his electorate. Obviously, the concerns in his electorate relate specifically to the WorkCover legislation. What do we hear from the member for Newland in relation to the WorkCover legislation? Nothing; not a peep, not an absolute sound. Why? Because he is a member of the right faction and he is beholden to Don Farrell and the money from the SDA, or whatever it is. I am not really interested in unionism, particularly when it influences the outcomes on the Labor government side. He is beholden to the SDA and the funds that are channelled in to his election campaign. He is beholden to Don Farrell and the cash. It comes down to the cash, doesn't it, Tom?

Do you know what we do on this side of the house? We have to go out and raise our own money. We have to raise our own funds. We do not have the luxury of a union boss shovelling tens of thousands of dollars into our election campaign funds. We do not have that luxury. We have to go out and work solidly for a four-year period to get a bit of money in our party accounts to run our campaigns, and they are very successful campaigns, I can tell you, particularly in my electorate. If you want a lesson in campaigning, come up to the library and I will have a one-to-one chat with you.

Mr Kenyon interjecting:

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: Yes; come up. You only live down the road in Bridgwater. The member for Newland actually has to drive past my electorate office to get to his electorate. He has to drive through Lobethal, past my electorate office, to actually travel down—we do not want to talk about it too much, because I know it is a sensitive issue for the majority of Labor Party members—

Mr Kenyon interjecting:

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: Yes, I do; but they are circumstances beyond my control. We will come to that, too, if we have time. We will come to the influence that I will have in relation to your

election campaign, mate, because half of your newly-defined electorate will be coming up into the Hills—good, solid Liberal areas, Tom. You are sitting on only 5.5 per cent and, the way the swing is going, it has been nice knowing you. It has been nice knowing the member for Mawson; I sit on a committee with him. It would be good to see if we can get a second term out of him, but I do not think we will get a second term out of him, or the member for Light.

I have a piece of interesting information concerning the Parliamentary Committee on Occupational Safety, Rehabilitation and Compensation inquiry relating to workplace injuries and deaths. Madam, do you know who the chairman of that committee was? None other than the distinguished member for Newland. He was the chairman of the committee when it looked at WorkCover related issues and OH&S related issues. He was the supposed champion of this committee. What have we seen him do? What contribution have we heard from him during the WorkCover debate? As I said, nothing, not a peep. He has been as quiet as a mouse on it, because uncle Don says, 'Tom, you're not allowed to say anything because, if you do, we won't give you any money for your campaign.'

I can tell the member for Newland that he will need three times as much money than he did last time to try to hang on to that seat. He will need three times as much—if not more—cash shovelled into his Labor Party electorate accounts to try to hang on to that seat, because, as I said, the members for Newland, Mawson and Light, and a whole host of others, will be one-termers. It has been nice knowing you.

Mr Bignell interjecting:

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: Like fun it will. What did we see here the other week in relation to union influence during the debate? We saw some union heavies in the speaker's gallery, obviously not from the right side of the union movement, because they were supporting it. We know that Steph Key, the member for Ashford, is from the left. She was the only one who had the courage to stick up for it. I think the member for Mawson is a member of the left faction. Why wasn't the member for Mawson sticking up for his lefty union mates who were here in the gallery? Actually, they got booted out because of their untoward conduct. That is how well they know how to behave in a place where laws are made. They got booted out. I understand that some of those people were from the CFMEU.

Talking to some senior cabinet ministers—and I will not identify them—one particular person said that that union is on the way out. In five years' time, the CFMEU will be in an even weaker position that it is now. The left faction of the Labor Party was discounted in this whole process. The left unions were ignored, the CFMEU was ignored. That is why they were in here, perhaps, protesting so much. They got booted out for their misconduct in the house.

Liberal Party members also witnessed the pressure that was brought upon government members. We had retired Labor MPs in here—retired Bannon government ministers—trying to lobby Labor Party MPs into changing their position on the legislation. The whole left movement of the ALP was brought out in force. They even wheeled out the relics from the disgraced Bannon government years. Goodness, what a strategy! Talking about strategy, what a strategy to bring out those disgraced former Bannon government ministers who presided over the State Bank debacle. You wheeled out those relics of the past to try to influence an outcome. Well, it obviously did not work.

I can tell the member for Newland that, come election time, Tom, you have not stuck up for your constituency, you have not protected those working men and women who would have voted for you. You have shunned them.

Time expired.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (12:43): Yet again the member for Kavel is condemning the member for Newland for a bill he voted for. He then goes on in his remarks to say, 'You're abandoning people in your electorate'. To take that argument to its final destination, the member for Kavel is condemning himself as well; indeed, he is condemning every member of parliament who voted for the WorkCover changes.

Mr Rau: Except for the member for MacKillop; he had some courage.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: The member for MacKillop is the only one who has any dignity in this debate because he voted for the right of unions to enter workplaces. I have to say that the member for Kavel's hypocrisy today in moving this motion shows 1. how ridiculous the Liberal Party is, and 2. that they are irresponsible financial managers of this state, because they are delaying the

passage of the WorkCover legislation in the upper house, they are filibustering the WorkCover legislation in the upper house, and they are deliberately trying to delay the WorkCover legislation in the upper house. Why? Political opportunism. The Premier's mantra at the last state election was state before party. The Liberal Party's mantra, privately behind closed doors, is party first, state second.

For the member for Kavel to get up and condemn the member for Newland for voting for the same thing that he voted for is what it looks like, sounds like and smells like—hypocrisy. How can you do it with a straight face?

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. I understand that the use of the term 'hypocrisy' in the house is out of order.

The SPEAKER: No, the word 'hypocrisy' is not unparliamentary. It is unparliamentary to refer to another member as a hypocrite or members as hypocrites, but 'hypocrisy' is not an unparliamentary word. The member for West Torrens.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: The hypocrisy shown by members—

Mr Bignell: What did they show?

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: Pure hypocrisy. If I were to say the member for Kavel is a hypocrite that would be unparliamentary, and I would not do that because I rise above the level of members opposite. I am on the side of the angels—always have been, always will be. I will tell members one thing that I will not do: I will not get up and condemn a member of parliament for voting for the same thing that I did.

I had every right to condemn members opposite when they privatised ETSA after promising that they would not, because I promised that we would not privatise ETSA and I voted accordingly. I did not go out and say that I would never privatise ETSA to come in here in the dead of the night and sell off Tom Playford's legacy. I did not do that; I supported his legacy.

I did not come in here and say every day for six months, 'The WorkCover liability is out of control, something has to be done,' and then, when we act, vote for it and then condemn members opposite for doing exactly what members asked us to do. You have got to say to yourself, 'Why are they here?' Is it, as the member for Unley says: not his problem; not his concern; none of his business? Or is it, as the member for Newland said, that all members in this place who voted out of good conscience to do something about the unfunded liability were doing their job?

Those who voted against it voted with their conscience, and I congratulate the member for MacKillop and the member for Mitchell because they voted with their conscience. Good enough, fair enough, that is what they are here for.

Mr Rau: It was particularly hard for the member for MacKillop.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: The member for MacKillop showed rare courage and bravado in allowing the unions the right to enter workplaces as they please, when they please. I understand that they have taken down the picture of 'Red Ted' Theodore at the UTLC and put up the member for MacKillop's photograph. I understand that in Cuba they are changing Che Guevara Day to the Mitch Williams Commemorative Day.

An honourable member: A public holiday?

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: Yes, a public holiday for the member for MacKillop, because comrade Williams is revered in leftist countries for his convictions: to vote, to allow unions to enter workplaces at any time—unfettered access to workplaces—to make sure that, whether or not they are members of a union, workers can access workers' advocates—and I think he should be congratulated for that.

Personally, I did not agree with that amendment. I voted accordingly, but I understand that comrade Williams has a stronger feeling for that matter. I understand that the UTLC will be writing to people in the electorate of MacKillop—especially those small business owners who are donors of his—letting them know about comrade Williams' conviction in that matter.

These motions that the think tank on the second floor came up with to condemn members of parliament for voting the same way as those who move the motions speaks for itself. We will see more later. We will see the member for Hammond move a motion condemning the member for Hartley for voting the same way he voted, then the member for Finniss—

Mr Rau: He's already done his.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: He's already done his. He has already condemned someone for voting the same way he voted. The member for Unley spoke at length about condemning a member of the government for voting the same way he voted. So, let us get it straight. The Liberal Party wants us to act on all these issues, and when we act in the way they want us to act they condemn us, and when we do not act in the way they want us to act they condemn us. So, we are damned if we do and we are damned in we don't.

My advice to the opposition is that, if you are not going to offer any constructive, alternative advice, just get out of the way. Do as the member for Unley says: it is not his problem. Stand aside. Resign. Cause a by-election and say, 'Too hard for me. I'm not interested. Let someone else do the job.'

However, if members opposite are serious, the first thing they should do is to tell their colleagues in the upper house to stop supporting adjournments of the WorkCover debate and get on with it, because every day we delay—in the words of the Leader of the Opposition and in the words of the members for MacKillop and Bragg—the liability goes up.

So, why are they adjourning? Why are they delaying? Why? Because they are putting party ahead of state. They are hoping that the Labor Party will split. They are hoping that something will happen and that the party will have to withdraw the bill. They are hoping that the unions may convince us to do something other than what we want. I can tell members opposite that the Premier and the government will stand firm. We want this legislation passed. We want WorkCover changes to go through. We want to lower the liability. If you want to follow the member for Unley, because it is not your problem, fine; do not turn up, but do not delay us in getting on with the business of the state.

Think of this: Business SA—no friends of ours; the Liberal Party hold preselections in that organisation's building, Enterprise House—has put full page ads in the paper saying to the Liberal Party (their friends) 'Get on with it'. What do they do? They adjourn; they delay, speaking for hours; they filibuster. Why the delay? Do you need more time—is that what it is? You do not understand the legislation? You do not understand the liability? Do you want more briefings? Then ask for them. Otherwise there is no reason whatsoever.

I understand that the Greens and others wish to have their say, and that is fine. Let the debate happen, but instead the Liberal Party spent most of yesterday debating private members' business. What is more important: private members' business or an unfunded liability that is growing out of control? What is more important? The Liberal Party says that private members' business is more important.

Mr Griffiths interjecting:

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: If the member for Goyder says that it is mismanagement, then support our legislation. Support the legislation that you voted for in this house. Convince your colleagues. Or could it be that the colonel does not control his troops? I have had phone calls from people who have told me that the Leader of the Opposition has said that he does not control the Hon. Rob Lucas, that he is a loose cannon.

If you do not control your colleagues in the upper house then say so, but do not come in here and waste the taxpayers' time by condemning us on motions seeking the same thing you voted for. It is pure hypocrisy and you know it. It is a stupid tactical move and you know it, but you have stuck to it because you have been told to. For some reason, you encourage us to do it down here and upstairs you filibuster. Why? Because you are morally bankrupt.

Time expired.

Mr KENYON (Newland) (12:53): I can tell the house that the Special Air Service has a motto, and it is, 'Know the enemy better than you know yourself'. It is quite obvious to me that the member for Kavel has not taken that motto to heart. All we saw was conspiracy theories. I think there are magazines that you can send these conspiracy theories to and they will print them for you, but I do not think *Hansard* is the place for them. So, bringing them into parliament was probably the second error, after moving the motion.

When I saw this motion on the *Notice Paper* I thought maybe the member for Kavel had been a speaker on this matter. I cannot recall it, but he has been here a little bit longer than I, so I went back through the record to have a look. I looked for speeches that the member for Kavel might have made in the grievance debates about WorkCover. Were there any? No, not one. I

thought maybe he had asked a question of the minister during question time. Were there any questions? Nada. Nicht. Zip. Not one.

Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:

Mr KENYON: That is correct. As the member for MacKillop would say, 'Nyet, comrade.' Did he ask questions on notice? Not a one. There are so many avenues open to the member for Kavel to have raised this issue in the house in the six years that he has been here (four years longer than I have). As I said, he was trying to lecture me. He must be vastly more experienced than I am in proceedings of the house. Was there anything? Not even a full stop. Not a thing! His sole contribution occurred after he had moved this motion.

The Hon. R.J. McEwen: And voted for the bill.

Mr KENYON: And voted for the bill, and I know he voted for the bill because he sat right next to me. We sat next to each other down there on the cross-benches literally shoulder to shoulder—because I made sure I pushed him right up against the end of the bench—and voted for the WorkCover bill. There is a word for that sort of behaviour.

Honourable members: Hypocrisy!

Mr KENYON: That is exactly right. As members on this side of the house rightly point out, it is hypocrisy.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr KENYON: And maybe it is a pity that the member for MacKillop is not here to inform us of the Russian word—or even Spanish (as Cuba, I think, is Spanish); he could have told us the Spanish word for hypocrisy if he did not want to use the Russian word. However, we have not seen that happen. All we have seen is delay, prevarication, hypocrisy and hold-ups all in the name of party politics and of trying to get some sort of political advantage as opposed to doing the right thing by the state. Even oppositions, with all their freedom of action, sometimes have to do the right thing by the state, but we have seen failure after failure from the other side on that particular issue of doing the right thing by the state.

I am opening up the paper and we are seeing full-page ads by the business community, day after day, each one costing \$20,000. The member for Kavel came in here and suggested that I might like to raise some money. I can tell members opposite that every \$20,000 that goes into that newspaper is \$20,000 that is not going into the coffers of the Liberal Party for the next election.

Not only are you doing the state a disservice, you are probably doing your party a disservice at the same time—not that I mind that, I must say. There are only two people on the other side of the house with any credibility on this issue and only one of them is in parliament, because the Hon. Angus Redford was unfortunately (in some ways) dispatched from this parliament, but mostly by his own decision-making.

Mr Rau interjecting:

Mr KENYON: That is right. The other one is the member for MacKillop. I think he was shabbily treated by his party because they got him to sit on the other side and vote against things that he had raised and he agreed with. I have a great deal of respect for the member for MacKillop, Comrade Williams. I think he has been badly treated by his party, having been hung out to dry when he is the only person on the entire other side of the house with any credibility in this matter.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr KENYON: And the member for Stuart; I apologise to him. When I was sitting up there in the Speaker's gallery as an adviser, the only person I saw raising this issue was the member for MacKillop. I did not see the member for Kavel raising the issue. I did not hear him saying anything about it. In his defence, the member for Kavel did have the good grace to look a bit embarrassed as he sat there talking today.

The SPEAKER: The person in the gallery is not allowed to take photographs. The member for Newland.

Mr KENYON: I have almost completed my remarks, but I will just say that the member for Kavel at least had the decency to look embarrassed as he moved this motion.

The SPEAKER: If the member for Kavel speaks, he closes the debate.

An honourable member: He is not in the chamber.

Motion negatived.

[Sitting suspended from 12:59 to 14:00]

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

The SPEAKER: I direct that the written answers to questions as detailed in the schedule I now table be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

WATER ALLOCATION

179 Mr HANNA (Mitchell) (31 July 2007). Has the impact on tourism revenue caused by reduced environmental flows to the Coorong and other water bodies been costed and taken into account in water allocation policy or other government policy?

The Hon. K.A. MAYWALD (Chaffey—Minister for the River Murray, Minister for Water Security, Minister for Regional Development, Minister for Small Business, Minister Assisting the Minister for Industry and Trade): I am advised that the impacts of the reduction in environmental flows as a result of the drought have been taken into account in setting water allocations and all other aspects of government policy on water resources management for the River Murray.

Even under the current extreme drought conditions South Australia has negotiated a position where 25 per cent of initial flows in the River Murray system above those needed to meet critical human needs are available for river restoration and dilution within this state. These flows will be utilised in the manner that delivers the greatest environmental, social and economic benefits to all parts of the river system in South Australia including the Lower Lakes and the wetlands along the length of the river.

A study was undertaken within government on the economic impacts of varying water levels in the Lower Murray on houseboat, tourism and recreational activities including the Hindmarsh Island and Goolwa areas in late 2006. Also, the Lower Murray Drought Impact Study Reference Group, a community based group oversaw a more detailed economic assessment, completed in February 2007, of the impacts of low water levels and reduced licence allocations. This assessment was funded by the Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries and focussed mainly on agricultural activities, as these were the most severely impacted activities over the past summer. However, the study included an assessment of impacts on fishing and tourism and recreational activities.

The findings of these studies have been used, along with many other inputs, to guide decision-making on water allocations and river management.

In addition, to ensure that everything possible is being done to alleviate the hardships caused by the low flows, water levels and high salinities, I have appointed Hon. Dean Brown as a Community Liaison Manager and regional drought consultative committees have been established to facilitate issues being raised with government.

Mr Brown's role is to ensure that local communities, including those involved in tourism activities, are provided with an avenue through which to raise issues and to work with Government to minimise the impacts of these issues to the best advantage of the whole community.

SA WATER

215 Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (31 July 2007). In June 2007, why didn't SA Water offer all residents in Garden Avenue compensation or stop valves to prevent future sewerage overflow damage?

The Hon. K.A. MAYWALD (Chaffey—Minister for the River Murray, Minister for Water Security, Minister for Regional Development, Minister for Small Business, Minister Assisting the Minister for Industry and Trade): I am advised pursuant to the *Waterworks Act 1932* and *Sewerage Act 1929* SA Water Corporation is not liable for damages caused by internal overflows, burst water mains and the like unless such damage arises directly from a negligent act by the Corporation or its employees. The circumstances regarding wastewater overflows in Garden Avenue Burnside provide no indication of negligence on behalf of the corporation or its employees.

Any approaches by insurers for recovery are denied; consistent with the provisions of the above Acts.

HEALTH REFORM PROGRAM

220 Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite—Leader of the Opposition) (23 October 2007). With respect to 2007-08 Budget Papers, what are the details of the Investing Initiatives Health Reform—ICT Infrastructure program, including a new nursing administration system that will cost \$83 million over the forward estimates?

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

The details that make up the system related initiatives that total \$83 million are referred to in Attachment A. I am advised that wastewater overflows in Garden Avenue Burnside were beyond the control of SA Water and its contractor United Water.

Attachment A

ICT SERVICES INVESTING INITIATIVES							
Link to strategies	#	Primary Enabling Program	Fin Year 2007-08	Fin Year 2008-09	Fin Year 2009-10	Fin Year 2010-11	TOTAL \$m.
3.1.1 leveraging Oacis	24	Pharmacy—Electronic Medication Management	1.35	6.68	4.40	3.23	15.66
3.1.3 Nursing	26	Nurse Management System	4.90	2.00	1.60		8.50
3.1.3 Nursing	25	Nurse Management System—Business Transformation	0.50	2.50	1.50	2.00	6.50
3.1.4 Access to Oacis	29	OACIS virtual Clinical Display rollout to Country Hospitals		3.70	5.94	4.10	13.74
3.1.6 Access to evidence	33	Radiology Management System (Kestral)				1.50	1.50
5.1.4 Patient Admin	50	Patient Admin System Business Case Development	0.60				0.60
5.1.4 Patient Admin	54	Hospital Admin Software Solutions (HASS) Operating Room System Upgrade—Incl Country	2.10				2.10
5.1.4 Patient Admin	53	HASS Emergency Department System Replacement				2.34	2.34
5.1.4 Patient Admin	56	Clinical Costing System (Trendstar) replacement		3.10	2.00	2.00	7.10
5.1.4 Patient Admin	52	Patient Admin System		1.40	9.57	9.57	20.54
5.1.5 Pharmacy	57	Pharmacy Management	2.01	2.01	1.01		5.03

ICT SERVICES INVESTING INITIATIVES							
Link to strategies	#	Primary Enabling Program	Fin Year 2007-08	Fin Year 2008-09	Fin Year 2009-10	Fin Year 2010-11	TOTAL \$m.
		System (Ascribe)					
			11.46	21.39	26.02	24.74	83.61

SCHOOL UNIFORMS

276 Mr PISONI (Unley) (23 October 2007).

1. What items of clothing are supplied by the Queensland firm, Uniform Management Services to the Unley High School and which items are manufactured in South Australia, interstate and overseas, respectively?

2. How did Uniform Management Services comply with section 24 of the Government Contracting Policy regarding conditions of tender prior to DECS awarding them contracts to supply uniforms to South Australian schools?

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH (Adelaide—Minister for Education and Children's Services, Minister for Tourism, Minister for the City of Adelaide): The Department of Education and Children's Services has advised:

1. The items of clothing supplied by Uniform Management Services (UMS) to the Unley High School include the range of girls and boys uniform items and physical education garments in the various sizes as specified in the tender document.

The introduction of the State Supply Act 1985 included the intention to provide every opportunity to Australian manufacturers and suppliers to compete for government contracts. The objective remains and its application has been extended to embrace New Zealand content consistent with the Australian New Zealand Government Procurement Agreement and where applicable, the United States/Australia Free Trade Agreement.

When assessing Tenders for goods such as school uniforms, the current State Procurement Board policy requires public authorities to apply a 20 per cent preference margin as a surcharge on the imported content. Accordingly, as there is no preference applied to other Australian State or New Zealand suppliers, the products or components produced in Australia or New Zealand are excluded from foreign content calculations.

In accordance with the above, Tenderers are required to specify imported content only. However, the origin of the UMS uniform items includes Australia, New Zealand and various overseas countries.

2. Tenderers were required to indicate the degree of compliance in their response against each item identified, which included the SA Government Contracting Policy. UMS indicated their full compliance with the SA Government Contracting Policy requirements.

YALATA FACILITIES

278 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (23 October 2007).

1. What is the projected construction cost of the Yalata swimming pool?

2. What are the additional projected costs for the Yalata multi-purpose community centre?

3. What is the timeframe for the construction of the multi-purpose community centre?

4. What are the details of any Government initiative to develop and implement a 'strategic and coordinated approach to reducing violence' at Yalata?

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):

1. \$1.542 million dollars has been expended on the construction of the Yalata Swimming Pool. The construction phase is now complete.

2. The funding provided by the Australian Government was insufficient to undertake both projects. Given this, the Yalata community expressed a preference for the swimming pool to be its priority, and the State and Australian Governments accepted this position. The State Government will continue to negotiate with the Australian Government for additional funding for that project to go ahead.

3. The State and Australian Governments will continue to work closely with the Yalata Council to explore other opportunities for this proposal.

4. There are a number of varied and interrelated initiatives in place that are having a significant impact on reducing violence at Yalata. For example:

- SAPOL has two sworn police officers and two community constables based at Yalata.
- SAPOL and the Yalata Community Council have agreed on a preferred site for a new police station to be built since the former police station was burnt down. In the mean time, the Yalata Community Council has allowed SAPOL to utilise the former CDEP office as a temporary police station.
- There is a greater exchange of information and collaboration between SAPOL, Families SA, DECS and Tullawon Health with respect to identifying children and youth at risk and putting in place interventions to minimise any risk.
- TAFE is running a Family Wellbeing Program at Yalata to support residents with overcoming, and dealing with their grief and trauma whilst providing a basis to support and build upon the capacity of families.
- The Aboriginal Lands Trust (Yalata Reserve) Regulations 2005 complimented by the Ceduna Liquor Accord are designed to reduce the volume of alcohol illegally finding its way into Yalata and thereby reduce the number of alcohol related domestic violence incidences.
- A West Coast Senior Officer's Group will be established soon to supersede the work of the Yalata Community In Crisis Main Table in order to continue strategically coordinating and integrating whole of government activities including but not limited to family and domestic violence.
- The Yalata Youth Working Group continues to provide structured recreational activities for children and youth to overcome boredom and apathy and substance misuse, such as camps, movie nights, discos, use of the swimming pool, electronic games, football and netball.
- The Attorney General's Department (Cth) through its Restorative Justice/Crime Prevention program funding is developing, in partnership with the Yalata Community Council and with key State Government agencies Community Safety Action Plans.

VETERANS AFFAIRS MINISTER

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) (14:01): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: This morning, His Excellency the Governor, Rear Admiral Kevin Scarce, swore in the state's new Minister for Veterans Affairs. I asked the Attorney-General, who has returned from representing the state at commemorations at Anzac Cove at Gallipoli, to take on this role. I am advised that the Attorney-General will be only the second state veterans affairs minister in Australia after Victoria.

We have established this portfolio following requests from the RSL and the ex-service organisations. Indeed, today's swearing-in ceremony at Government House was witnessed by representatives from a number of the state's ex-service organisations. Those attending the ceremony included Mr Jock Statton OAM, State President of the RSL; Mr Bob Ellis, President of the Vietnam Veterans Federation; Mr Harley Doyle, Vice President of the Vietnam Veterans Association; Mr Greg Blyth, President of the TPI Association; Mr David Kerr, President of the Naval Association; Mr Bill Schmidt AM (who survived Changi as a POW), Deputy Chairman of Consultative Council of Ex-Service Organisations; Mr David Helman, President of the RAAF

Association; Mr John Spencer OAM, Honorary Secretary of the SA Peacekeepers RSL Sub-Branch; and Mr John Jarrett, Korean and South East Asian Veterans Association. Each of those veterans is remarkable, as is the contribution of every man and woman whom they represent, and their support for this appointment is most welcomed.

South Australians who served our country have earned our eternal respect and thanks, and we have a responsibility to care for the health and wellbeing of veterans and their dependants. We are committed to delivering the best services for our 50,000 veterans, and the Minister for Veterans Affairs will provide assistance in order to make it easier for veterans to access all our services. Right now, many different departments provide services to our veterans, including health, ageing, disability, mental health and transport, amongst others. If issues arise, rather than having to deal with different departments, the new Minister for Veterans Affairs can become a focal point to help save time and improve services.

The minister will work with his federal counterpart, help to coordinate funding of veterans issues and oversee veterans' events, including memorial projects and education programs. No new department will be required. The existing ANZAC Day Commemoration Council will advise the minister, and the minister's staff will support him to assist veterans. The new minister will establish a broader-based advisory body, comprising representatives of veterans organisations. His chief adviser on veterans affairs will be Lieutenant Colonel Bill Denny AM, a Vietnam veteran who chairs the ANZAC Day Committee and the ANZAC Day Commemoration Council. He has been heavily involved in veterans and ex-service matters since leaving the Army in 1990.

The government is committed to honouring the memory of those who died for their country, as well as honouring the service of South Australians who served overseas. As well as the Attorney-General representing the state at Gallipoli last week, the Minister for Education and Children's Services attended the ANZAC dawn service at the Australian National Cemetery at Villers Bretonneux in France, accompanying the five winners of this year's ANZAC School Prize. Can I say how moved I was to receive a card from those students yesterday.

Since coming to office, the government has demonstrated its commitment to supporting veterans. That commitment has included carrying out a \$4.3 million upgrade of the Torrens Parade Ground building and also the parade ground itself; saving the graves and memorials of war veterans in Centennial Park's Derrick Gardens and the RSL Walls; providing funding for the Vietnam Veterans' Memorial at the Torrens Parade Ground; expanding the Repatriation General Hospital with a new \$10.5 million 30-bed aged mental health care facility; and introducing the Premier's ANZAC Prize to give young South Australians each year the opportunity to visit battlefields and graves and to attend services in remembrance of those who lost their life at war.

The government has passed legislation to protect ANZAC Day traditions and to establish the ANZAC Day Commemoration Council. Also, of course, there was an intervention in terms of allowing the playing of two-up on ANZAC Day, because we must always honour the sacrifices made by the men and women who put on a uniform and defended our country and protect peace around the world.

PAPERS

The following paper was laid on the table:

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

Health and Medical Research in South Australia, Review of—Report May 2008

GLADSTONE EXPLOSION

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT (Lee—Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Finance, Minister for Government Enterprises, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:07): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: On 9 May 2006, a major explosion occurred at Quin Investments Pty Ltd, an explosives factory located at Beetaloo Valley, near Gladstone. Three workers at the factory were killed and two were injured. On the day of the incident and in the days immediately following, the site was the subject of an emergency response involving SA Police, CFS, SES, SA Ambulance Service and SafeWork SA. At the conclusion of recovery activities undertaken by the

emergency response team, control of the site was passed to SafeWork SA to investigate possible causes of the explosion.

The scale of devastation at the scene meant that the investigation was going to be challenging and require expert analysis. Reproducing the sequence of events that may have led to the explosion has been a meticulous and time-consuming process, involving the examination of more than 2,000 items of debris, including parts, machinery and chemical residue. The unique nature of explosive production activity demanded the involvement of forensic experts in metallurgy and chemical products.

SafeWork SA engaged national and international experts to provide specialist assessment of the processes and activities that may have contributed to this tragic event. Of particular note was the involvement of Professor John Price from Monash University and specialists from Cranfield University in the United Kingdom.

The investigation has determined that there were potentially serious breaches of the Occupational Health, Safety and Welfare Act 1986. Of particular concern to the investigators was the attention given to the maintenance and repair of critical items of plant in the factory. In light of these concerns, SafeWork SA has now referred the matter to the courts.

Yesterday, SafeWork SA filed charges in the Magistrates Court alleging that Quin Investments, as the company in control of the manufacturing process, has failed to ensure, as far as reasonably practicable, the safety of workers at the factory. Charges have also been laid against the company's responsible officer, Mr Nikolai Kuzub.

In coming months, the court will be asked to make a determination in relation to the alleged breaches of the workplace safety legislation. It is entirely appropriate that in a serious matter such as this that the court is presented with the facts and then has an opportunity to deliberate on the circumstances which led to and caused this tragic event. In due course, the public will be presented with the court's findings, particularly as they relate to the causes of this incident.

In light of the judicial processes now under way, it is not appropriate to comment on specific issues or to speculate on potential outcomes. A key endeavour in this process is to identify those factors which contributed to the explosion. This will afford some certainty and closure to the people involved. It is imperative at these times not to lose sight of the human impact of traumatic incidents in the workplace.

Our thoughts remain with the families of those who lost loved ones or suffered an injury because of the explosion at Gladstone. Our efforts are directed at bringing some closure to the families involved, and we will continue to provide them with support and assistance as this matter moves to its next stage. I ask that all involved afford the family members affected by this tragedy with the respect and dignity they deserve.

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: I advise members of the presence in the gallery today of students from Kapunda High School, who are guests of the member for Stuart, members of the ALP sub-branch, who are guests of the member for Reynell, and students from Whyalla High School, who are guests of the member for Giles.

QUESTION TIME

ICT CONTRACTS

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite—Leader of the Opposition) (14:11): My question is to the Premier. Has his government wasted \$51 million through ICT contracts in a bungled Health Department computer deal? Documents released under freedom of information reveal that Microsoft Office software was purchased by the Minister for Infrastructure for 16,000 computers at a cost of \$675 per computer.

The documents further reveal that the minister subsequently found that only 4,000 of these computers actually needed the software, the remaining computers being used for monitoring and other medical purposes. The documents estimate that the blunder may have cost the Health Department up to \$51.4 million over five years.

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Kaurana—Minister for Health, Minister for the Southern Suburbs, Minister Assisting the Premier in the Arts) (14:12): I am not sure what documents the leader is relying on. I will certainly get a full report and report back to the house.

ICT CONTRACTS

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite—Leader of the Opposition) (14:12): My question is again to the Premier. Has the government's cost-saving ICT deal for a network management contract with Dimension Data come in at \$4.52 million—double the price of the previous contract—costing the Health Department an unbudgeted \$2.18 million, a figure confirmed in the same documents obtained under FOI?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Port Adelaide—Deputy Premier, Treasurer, Minister for Industry and Trade, Minister for Federal/State Relations) (14:12): I will get a report back to the house. I am proud to report the ongoing breaking news that the great work of the Minister for Infrastructure—

Ms Portolesi: I wouldn't go that far.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: You wouldn't go that far? We have renegotiated ICT contracts from the former government under its all-of-government outsourcing deal to EDS. We all remember the EDS contract with great fondness.

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: We're still losing money on the building.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Oh, that's very good. We can remember how the EDS contract negotiation for the building—on which we are losing money—was used as an instrument by the drivers in the Liberal Party to knife Dean Brown and bring him down. The deputy leader is nodding her head. She is right. It was the then Premier Dean Brown who wanted to see a crane in the sky. We, in government, of course, get cranes in the sky through good economic management. The Liberals got a crane in the sky by entering into a subsidy deal with EDS that locked us into the most expensive office accommodation that this state had ever seen at that time. So, if you want to talk about losing money on an IT deal, have a look at that one.

What I can say is that this government is very, very good when it comes to renegotiation of Liberal blunders. Our renegotiation with IT outsourcing—and I am happy to get the exact figure for the house—is on track to deliver to this government a \$30 million per year saving on ICT costs. We are doing a lot to run this economy well. Not only are we managing the economy well on all fronts—be they mining, defence, the AAA credit rating—we are also managing internal costs very well.

We are taking bad Liberal contracts and we are turning them into good Labor contracts. I am happy if the leader would like to ask more questions about EDS, because I had a pivotal role in those days in assisting the Liberal dries to bring down the then premier, Dean Brown. I think things then turned around and the wets helped you, Premier, and Patrick and others to bring down John Olsen. It was a sort of mutual elimination pact between the factions over there. It did make for an interesting period in opposition, didn't it? Please, ask me more and more questions about EDS; I love them.

PREMIER'S BE ACTIVE CHALLENGE

The Hon. S.W. KEY (Ashford) (14:16): My question is to the Minister for Education and Children's Services. What support is being provided to schools to help them take part in the Premier's Be Active Challenge?

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH (Adelaide—Minister for Education and Children's Services, Minister for Tourism, Minister for the City of Adelaide) (14:16): I thank the member for Ashford for her question. I know that she is keenly interested in physical activity and health for students in schools and promotes these measures in her own electorate. Last year, the inaugural Premier's Be Active Challenge resulted in 7,500 students receiving a medal for successfully completing their four weeks, 60 minutes a day of physical activity.

This year, the involvement has increased with more than 22,000 students already registered and more expected. This year, schools will find the enrolment and maintenance of records easier to organise, since we have simplified the system for students recording their activity levels. We are also supporting schools with \$500 grants, as part of a share of the \$100,000 investment which is being distributed to the 202 schools that are sharing this sum. These are schools that have more than 100 students registered or more than 80 per cent enrolment in small schools.

I am pleased to say that this challenge support will help to buy new sporting equipment and also help with professional development for physical education teachers. Furthermore, following

the success of the reading ambassadors in the Premier's very successful Reading Challenge, we have introduced the concept of 'challenge ambassadors', using prominent South Australian sportspeople to visit schools and inspire children to be active.

The people involved to date are Brett Burton from the Adelaide Crows, who has visited Lockleys Primary School, and Sam Woosnam, the captain of Adelaide Lightning, who has been to Wallaroo Mines Primary School. In the coming weeks, Warren Tredrea will visit Murray Bridge Special School and Murray Bridge South Primary School, and his team mate, Shaun Burgoyne, will visit Victor Harbor High and Goolwa Primary School.

Teaching students about the importance of a healthy diet and regular physical activity is a very significant and complementary part of the government's activities in order to reduce obesity in young people. We believe that the Premier's Be Active Challenge is another component of what is an overall whole-of-government strategy in this area.

Controlling obesity, of course, does not stop at the school gate. It involves parents and the community and an understanding of good diet and nutrition, as well as increasing activity. I am pleased to say that the measures we have taken in schools, which deal with canteens, managements, the traffic light system, the Minister for Health's activity with EPODE, and a whole range of other investments, mean that the government is working across portfolios to reduce obesity and increase physical fitness in our young people.

DOCTORS DISPUTE

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite—Leader of the Opposition) (14:19): Will the Minister for Health explain why his department is continuing to offer AWAs when WorkChoices is dead? Visiting medical specialists to our public hospitals are usually employed pursuant to the agreement negotiated between the Department of Health and SASMOA in 2006. Individual contracts have, however, been offered to some specialists, including vascular surgeons, neurosurgeons and radiologists, to name a few. The opposition is informed that individual contracts will now be offered to cardiac surgeons at the Flinders Medical Centre.

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Kaurna—Minister for Health, Minister for the Southern Suburbs, Minister Assisting the Premier in the Arts) (14:20): I think the Leader of the Opposition really needs to go back to industrial relations school to understand what he is talking about, if he indeed ever went to one. Maybe when he did his postgraduate work he did not cover IR matters.

I can assure the member and the house that the government of South Australia is not offering AWAs to any of its employees, particularly in the health department. SASMOA have, from time to time, tried to characterise some of the arrangements we have in place in that way, thus trying to blacken our name, but they are incorrect when they make that claim. It is typical of the opposition that it would have picked up those kinds of claims, carried them in here and tried to give them credibility. We know how the opposition operates.

The reality is that the arrangements that we have with the visiting medical officers (VMOs), which arrangements have been in place for many years, are based on arrangements which are entered into by the government with the union on behalf of its members, but they are not registered in an industrial relations sense. They are contractual arrangements which have been entered into, and that is the nature of those arrangements.

In my view, it would be good if they were registered agreements. That might mean we would have some control over the breakouts that occur from time to time outside the arrangements that have been met. I am not sure that SASMOA would welcome that, but it would be interesting to see what they have to say. So, maybe you can talk to them about that aspect as well.

MEDICAL RESEARCH

Mr KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:21): My question is for the Minister for Health. How will the commercialisation agreement signed between Professor Hopwood of the Women's and Children's Hospital and an American pharmaceutical company advance medical research in South Australia?

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Kaurna—Minister for Health, Minister for the Southern Suburbs, Minister Assisting the Premier in the Arts) (14:21): It is good to see the Deputy Leader of the Opposition has joined us this afternoon. It was regrettable that she was not around for the debate on the Victoria Park development. That was an inconvenience, perhaps, for her.

An honourable member: Vickie-ed off.

The Hon. J.D. HILL: She Vickie-ed off, that is right. Veni, vidi, vici: I came, I saw, I Vickie-ed. A major recommendation of the Shine Young Review released this morning is to build and maintain the South Australian Health and Medical Research Fund.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.D. HILL: It is my fault, Mr Speaker, I must confess. I apologise. The fund—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. HILL: An outrage. I am outraged. The fund operates by ensuring that a third of any royalties resulting from the commercialisation of medical research undertaken in South Australia is captured by the fund and is subsequently reinvested in activities which support further medical research. This fund is unique to South Australia and provides us with the opportunity to remain a recognised leader in health and medical research.

To date, the most successful example of how this fund works has been an agreement signed by the Women's and Children's Hospital and the American pharmaceutical company BioMarin to commercialise the intellectual property developed by Professor Hopwood and his team. Professor Hopwood, who is head of the Lysosomal Disorders Research Unit at the Women's and Children's Hospital, and his team have developed a groundbreaking treatment for a rare lysosomal storage disorder known as MPS-6.

Lysosomes break down cellular waste and recycle it. When this process fails because of a missing or defective enzyme, the waste remains stored in the cell which leads to severe and degenerative problems. Symptoms of MPS-6 include bone deformities, heart and respiratory difficulties and a characteristic facial appearance. This is an appalling disorder, and from time to time people will have seen photographs of children who suffer from this.

Professor Hopwood and his team have discovered how to artificially produce the MPS-6 enzyme. The intravenous administration of this enzyme can arrest the development of symptoms of MPS-6, and if the disease is detected early enough in children it could prevent the symptoms altogether. This is a remarkable and outstanding world-class breakthrough achieved here in Adelaide by Professor Hopwood and his team.

Most importantly, Professor Hopwood's discovery offers a treatment for a previously untreatable disease, and the commercialisation contract with BioMarin will mean that the treatment will be made available to thousands of people, both in Australia and around the world. I understand, from talking with Professor Hopwood, that he has the capacity to extend the range of areas that he can treat that are associated with this disorder.

The outstanding work performed by this world-class team has also strengthened the capacity of this state to invest further in our research facilities and structure. A third of the royalties from the commercialisation agreement will be invested in the South Australian Health and Medical Research Fund to support South Australian researchers, and another third has been injected into research and infrastructure directly at the Women's and Children's Hospital. The balance will remain with the 17 inventors, Professor Hopwood and his team, and they deserve the reward that they get from this activity. The commercialisation agreement is bringing tens of millions of dollars in royalties to the Health and Medical Research Fund over approximately 15 years.

Depending on the success of any future research and the success of BioMarin and other pharmaceutical companies in commercialising these products, the amount of royalties flowing into the fund could increase significantly. We are talking about real money here. These royalty returns are amongst the highest ever earned by an Australian research team working in the public sector. Health and medical research is an essential component of the state's economy, an effective health system and ultimately a healthy community. It is crucial to the attraction and retention of high calibre doctors and researchers to our state. This successful venture paves the way for further collaboration with BioMarin and other pharmaceutical companies and shows us that what we can achieve in health and medical research in this state is second to none.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN SALARIED MEDICAL OFFICERS ASSOCIATION

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:26): My question is to the Minister for Health. How many elective surgery procedures have been cancelled as a result of the enterprise bargaining dispute between the minister for Health and the South Australian Salaried Medical Officers Association since the dispute began in October 2007? There have now been a

number of strikes resulting in the cancellation of elective surgery. During the last strike, on 16 April, approximately 150 elective surgery procedures were cancelled.

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Kaurua—Minister for Health, Minister for the Southern Suburbs, Minister Assisting the Premier in the Arts) (14:27): I am not entirely sure why the Deputy Leader of the Opposition has asked this question, since she substantially answered it herself in her explanation. The industrial action of a week or so ago resulted in 150 procedures in our hospitals being cancelled. That is precisely right. That was the only strike action, if you like. There have been several stop-work meetings, which has meant a number of procedures have been—

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The minister for Health has the floor.

The Hon. J.D. HILL: The Deputy Leader of the Opposition knows not what she talks about. I was saying that a number of other stop-work meetings have been held, and some elective surgical procedures have been cancelled in relation to those. As to the precise number, I think it is around 200 all up, but I am happy to get the exact number for the honourable member. Also, there were some delays. I think, from memory, that the health department or I put the figures out in the public domain, so it is no secret, but it is around the order of 200 procedures, and I will say, of course, that that has inconvenienced those people.

It particularly inconvenienced a number of children whose surgery was cancelled and I said at the time and I say it again: I think the union was wrong to get its members to cancel the procedures for children. It is a different order of business if you are doing something to an adult, but to unsettle children and their families in the way they did I think was just plain morally wrong, and I hope that whatever action they decide to take in the future does not involve interfering with the capacity of children to have surgery that they require.

TRAMLINE EXTENSION

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (14:28): My question is to the Minister for Transport. Will the minister advise the house when his department will be undertaking work to replace the overhead powerlines on the tramline? The opposition has been informed that, due to cost cutting by the government on the tram extension, there is considerable concern regarding the pantograph and overhead wires. Technical officers within TransAdelaide have advised that the wires will need to be replaced, costing the South Australian taxpayers millions of dollars.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Elder—Minister for Transport, Minister for Infrastructure, Minister for Energy) (14:28): The member for Morphett has been in this house on a number of occasions making up stories about the trams, or allegedly hearing voices about the trams. There was some dreadful disease we were going to catch from blue and yellow fungus which, of course, was an absolute nonsense and this time, regrettably, even though *The Advertiser* was told there was no basis to what he said, it was reported today that the overhead wires for some reason are wearing out too fast, causing carbon to enter airconditioners. So, it is not disease anymore, it is carbon. I am sure that if we are around for long enough, the member for Morphett will suggest that the trams are in fact responsible for climate change and global warming, but let us just make sure that we understand that, once again, he is selling a completely bogus story.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: He thinks he is okay if he gets one out of a hundred.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: If he ever gets one right! How many times in this chamber do we have to stand up and deal with completely bogus stories from the member for Morphett? There is no evidence from TransAdelaide to suggest that trolley wire is wearing out at a greater rate since the introduction of the new trams. It is just not true. For the benefit of the member for Morphett, what occurs on the trams (and all trams which have a pantograph, which I think would be most trams in the world) is that the pantograph itself—

The Hon. J.D. Lomax-Smith: What is a pantograph?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: The pantograph is the little bit that sticks up on top.

The Hon. K.O. Foley interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: It supplies the wire. The pantograph itself is fitted with carbon strip. This carbon strip is a consumable: it is designed to wear out. It is made of carbon, and that carbon does fall onto the top of the tram, as it does on every tram around the world operated by a

pantograph. This used to occur with the old trams too, of course, except that the old trams had two pantographs rather than one each, so I suspect that there would probably be less wear.

I am advised that our pantograph carbon strips do not wear out any faster than those in Melbourne but that there can be uneven wear in the strips in a shuttle service because they turn a lot of corners. That is an element, I am advised, of a shuttle service. It is true that Melbourne is able to optimise the tensioning of its wire on its lines, which we are not able to do in the old part between Glenelg and Victoria Square. It is not a major problem—and we are not talking about wires wearing out, we are talking about the carbon strips—but it is because the poles will not bear the tension. It is not a problem; it is something that will be done when it is needed, and probably not for quite some time.

It is regrettable, having heard that quite dull and mundane explanation, that the member for Morphett is prepared to say anything at all to undermine our public transport system. It is not great reading, but I actually picked up his report from his trip overseas to study trams, and the trams that he says that he does not like are the ones to which he gave a pretty good endorsement—the Bombardier trams—while he was overseas, but he did not like the other trams. The truth is that the member for Morphett will say anything or do anything to criticise the trams with no regard even for things he himself said in the past.

The trams are a victim of their own success. That is the only problem that we have with the trams, because ticketed patronage has increased by 15 per cent. For that reason they are—I advise *The Advertiser*—more crowded than they used to be. *The Advertiser* enjoys challenges and stunts, so I would ask that the Editor of *The Advertiser*, Mel Mansell, accompany me to Melbourne and Sydney and ride some peak-hour services.

I know what happens on our services. I do not want one of the junior journalists; I would like the Editor of *The Advertiser* to travel with me to Melbourne and Sydney and ride some peak-hour services just so that he has a little proper perspective, and so that we have some perspective in this debate. The question of the member for Morphett, once again, is simply another bogus invention from the member for Morphett.

TRAMLINE EXTENSION

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (14:35): I have a supplementary question. Given the minister's answer, why is all the black rubbish sitting on the ceilings of the trams coming off? Is it carbon? What is it? Is it bacteria? This is what came off the tram last night on the way home—just on one very small section.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Elder—Minister for Transport, Minister for Infrastructure, Minister for Energy) (14:35): I will go through it again. The stuff sitting on top of the trams comes from a carbon strip fitted to the pantograph for the purpose of wearing out. When it wears, that falls on top of the tram. It either washes off in the frequent rain we are having lately, or it is taken off when they clean. It has been going on for as long as we have had trams. I advise the learned vet on the other side that we are made of bloody carbon. Carbon, because of its valency, is a unique element in that it can take so many forms and shapes. I am told that by my learned doctor friend. One of the shapes it takes is a carbon strip; another is in the air around us in carbon dioxide. In fact, if you look, not only will you see it everywhere but you will see it through eyes made of carbon. Can we stop getting too fussed about the carbon?

WOMEN'S INFORMATION SERVICE

Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens) (14:36): My question is to the Minister for the Status of Women. Will the minister update the house on the Family Court support program provided by the Women's Information Service?

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) (14:37): Volunteers have been fundamental to the ongoing success of the Women's Information Service since its inception 30 years ago this year. I have previously informed members of the great work the Women's Information Service does, including the expansion of the outreach program into our children's centres in South Australian rural communities and throughout the metropolitan area. I know this service would simply not be able to operate at the high level that it does without such strong commitment from volunteers. Over 30 women selflessly and enthusiastically give their time and skills freely to make a difference to the lives of many South Australian women.

One of the important volunteer programs run by the Women's Information Service is the Family Court support program. This program provides non-legal support for women attending the Family Court, with particular focus on women who have experienced abuse or trauma. A lack of knowledge and experience of the court system can be daunting and frightening. The Women's Information Service Family Court support program provides assistance by trained volunteers who are able to explain the layout of the court and basic legal processes, as well as give information and referral options for services that can further assist these women. Volunteers for the program are recruited annually and undertake up to 40 hours training, as well as ongoing developmental opportunities provided by the Women's Information Service.

The first Family Court support volunteer training sessions commenced in 2006, and I am pleased to announce that another group of nine volunteers is about to complete the training program and join the team. The feedback from volunteers and women who have been assisted by the scheme has been very positive. A feature of the program is that many of the volunteers are women who have previously had a Family Court experience and want to help other women through this sometimes challenging time. The Family Court support program has just reached a significant milestone. Since it was established in 2006, the Women's Information Service has provided 100 court support sessions, a significant accomplishment for the Women's Information Service. It is indeed a great achievement, it is a great program, and I thank the volunteers for their enormous effort and commitment which has made this program a success.

COUNTRY HEALTH SERVICES

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:39): My question is to the Minister for Health. Which of the identified 25 country hospitals will be closed and developed as aged-care centres to be announced in this year's budget?

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Kaurua—Minister for Health, Minister for the Southern Suburbs, Minister Assisting the Premier in the Arts) (14:40): I challenge the way in which the honourable member put the question. She said, 'Which of the 25 identified hospitals?' I am not sure which hospitals she has identified, but, if she has identified hospitals, I suggest that she identify them publicly. I am not sure what the honourable member has in her mind—although it is not an area where I particularly want to go.

As part of the reform of the South Australian health care system and the release of the South Australian Health Care Plan, I announced the development of the Country Health SA Services Plan to better coordinate the delivery of health services for country South Australians. While the specific details of this plan are still being formulated, I can outline the key principles that will guide reform of the South Australian country health system. Our intention is to consider the health services of Country Health SA as a whole, rather than as a series of individual services operating in isolation.

Mrs Redmond interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. HILL: That amuses the member for Heysen. The fact that we are trying to reform and make the health system work in the country for country people is something of amusement for members of the opposition. That just shows that they pay only lip service to these issues. Their interests in the country are political and not to do with the health of country people. The fact that country people have a lower set of health outcomes than city people is of no concern to them. Why should we do anything to try to improve those outcomes? Members opposite do not care. They are interested only in the political outcome for them in the country, not the health outcomes for people who live in the country.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.D. HILL: Our intention is to consider the health services of Country Health SA as a whole, rather than in broken down bits and pieces of individual services operating in isolation (as they are now). The change in governance arrangements for country hospitals through the new Health Care Act will mean that the 44 individual health units currently run separately by 44 individual boards will become part of an integrated system of health care. There will be collective planning and common treatment protocols to reduce unnecessary duplication and to offer a wider range of services within a region.

Strategic planning of this nature is needed to maintain the long-term affordability and sustainability of country health services by ensuring the most effective and efficient use of

infrastructure and equipment. A common planning approach will also deliver an economy of scale that will generate the volume of activity required for clinicians to maintain the skill levels necessary to ensure clinical safety and quality standards which, in turn, will make it easier to attract doctors and nurses. The opposition and others are always on about attracting doctors and nurses into country South Australia and this will help to do that.

With the principle of an integrated health service in mind, we are assessing the viability and future service role of each individual service on a case-by-case basis against key criteria. Those criteria include the consideration of: projections for the population and health needs of each community against the availability facilities and workforce; the distance between facilities and the availability of transport; the blend of in-hospital and out-of-hospital services required to meet the health needs of each community; and the future available workforce and the service models known to maximise recruitment and retention in country areas.

Assessing current services against these criteria will allow us to identify areas where the complexity of services needs to increase or decrease or remain constant to meet future needs. We have been consulting widely across country South Australia on the country health plan, talking with doctors, nurses and community members about the needs of their various communities. The new health advisory councils will enable country people to be involved in the decision making processes at their local health care service level.

The most important benefit for country South Australians to come out of these reforms will be the provision of more services in country South Australia. Department of Health figures show that, currently, on any given day, there are 550 country inpatients in metropolitan hospitals receiving treatment, and that more than 45 per cent of the public hospital costs spent on country people are spent in metropolitan hospitals.

We have already committed over \$100 million to capital works projects in Country Health SA. We have also committed to increasing services at four key country hospitals, namely, Berri, Whyalla, Mount Gambier and Port Lincoln. These hospitals will be the focus of the state government's plan to provide more services that would normally be available only in Adelaide. Services including surgical services, rehabilitation services and palliative care will be expanded so that fewer country people will need to travel to metropolitan Adelaide for care.

Without reform, the current system of health care delivery in country South Australia will not be sustainable in the longer term. That is why we are taking action now to build a health care system for the future for people in rural and regional South Australia. I will have more to say on this important matter in the future.

ADULT COMMUNITY EDUCATION

Ms FOX (Bright) (14:46): My question is to the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education. What role does adult community education play in the achievement of our state's strategic objectives?

The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton—Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education, Minister for Science and Information Economy, Minister for Youth, Minister for Gambling) (14:46): I thank the member for Bright for her question and her abiding interest in all facets of education. I know that the member for Bright knows, and I am sure all members would agree, that adult community education plays an important role in engaging adults in learning and developing pathways towards formal education and meaningful participation in the workforce and community life.

This is an area, coupled with others, that has the potential to maximise workforce participation and support the South Australian government's social inclusion agenda and the broader objectives of the State Strategic Plan.

It is important to note that ACE programs attracted 8,500 participants last year, and this amounts to 20,000 enrolments in a number of courses. The programs delivered 300,000 training hours, through 100 projects, into the heart of local communities for an investment of over \$2 million.

We cannot underestimate the impact that ACE has on the community and on the individuals themselves. With 73 per cent of the participants being women, 15 per cent with a disability and 53 per cent from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds, we can be confident of the profound impact it has.

Dr McFetridge interjecting:

The Hon. P. CAICA: Well, we are talking about adult community education being delivered in the community but, if you like, I will have a talk with you and educate you about shoemaking later on, Duncan.

I highlight the diversity of ACE providers, which come in many shapes and sizes, with different cohorts of students, varied activities and outcomes but with the key component that they are driven by a strong community focus. Therefore, adult community education is uniquely placed to re-engage second-chance learners, young people and adults at risk of social and economic exclusion who, without the benefit of community education, may not otherwise develop the capacity to share in South Australia's prosperity.

Connections to local networks, combined with the ability to offer flexible learning options based on the needs of individuals and communities, maximises the opportunities for improving literacy, numeracy and vocational skills. This approach offers vital building blocks towards meeting our workforce challenges and improving the productivity and participation of adults who sit outside the workforce or require additional skills to maintain these essential connections. That is why the government constantly monitors the delivery of adult community education programs across our state, with a view to boosting the skills of adult South Australians who are at risk of 'missing out'.

It is encouraging to see that South Australia ranks better than most other jurisdictions; in fact, we ranked second best among the states in the recently re-released 2006 ABS Adult Literacy and Lifeskills Survey, which reflects the government's ongoing commitment to supporting adult community education.

It is also pleasing to note that the federal Labor government has made available significant funds to encourage and support adult learners as part of its program of 450,000 additional training places. The government is committed to maximising the engagement of our adult population to meet our state's objectives of social inclusion and sustainable economic growth.

WORKCOVER CORPORATION

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (14:49): My question is to the Minister for Industrial Relations. How much have the state government and the WorkCover Corporation spent on advertising their WorkCover legislative reforms presently before parliament?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT (Lee—Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Finance, Minister for Government Enterprises, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:49): I will need to get that figure for the member, and I am happy to do that. A range of organisations have advertised during this process—

Dr McFetridge interjecting:

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: No; I do not know what the figure is, off the top of my head. I will get that figure for the member.

STANDING COMMITTEE OF ATTORNEYS-GENERAL

The Hon. P.L. WHITE (Taylor) (14:49): Can the Attorney-General inform the house about the Standing Committee of Attorneys-General meeting that was held in the Barossa Valley recently?

Mr Venning: I was there.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON (Croydon—Attorney-General, Minister for Justice, Minister for Multicultural Affairs) (14:50): As the member for Schubert said, he was there. South Australia hosted the Standing Committee of Attorneys-General in its first meeting since the election of the Rudd Labor government. Members comprising the commonwealth, state and territory attorneys-general, the commonwealth Minister for Home Affairs and the Associate Justice Minister of New Zealand, and ministers from Norfolk Island, held discussions on more than 30 matters.

The Hon. M.D. Rann: That's Clayton Cosgrove.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: Yes; Clayton Cosgrove, a black Irishman from New Zealand.

The Hon. K.O. Foley: Norfolk Island is not a state.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: No; it is one of Australia's federal territories, I believe.

The Hon. K.O. Foley: Norfolk Island gets to sit at SCAG?

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: Yes.

The Hon. K.O. Foley: That's outrageous.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: It wasn't so bad when we held SCAG there. We held discussions on more than 30 matters of substantive legal reform for all jurisdictions.

Mr Venning interjecting:

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: That's right; Donald McDonald was there, and he wrote me a lovely handwritten note thanking me for the hospitality. We had a nice conversation outside Chateau Tanunda when I noticed he was reading one of my favourite publications, *The Spectator*. The committee had high hopes that successful negotiations after the COAG meeting, held only days earlier, was able to break the stalemate over the future of the Murray-Darling River system.

Rather than be bogged down by party politics, progress was made on items including the interstate enforcement of fines, a national electronic conveyancing system and a national register of suppression orders. Members recognised the unique opportunity to reinvigorate the legal reform process on a national scale without the former commonwealth attorney-general. A fresh idea from the Eastern States was to develop an exchange program between judicial officers of state and territory courts.

As the host of the meeting, South Australia was given an opportunity to showcase some of our own justice initiatives. Presentations were given on our victims of crime law reforms and our native title claim resolution initiatives. The presentation on our proposed laws to tackle criminal bikie gangs was greeted with shock and awe by members. The blood drained from their faces as they realised that this law will lead to the relocation of so many members and associates of outlaw motorcycle gangs to other states and territories.

Mr Pederick interjecting:

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: In relation to the interjection by the member for Hammond, it would be strange indeed if anyone in South Australia were arrested in respect of legislation that had not yet passed the parliament. Is he suggesting that people should be taken into custody forthwith, before the legislation passes? Is that his suggestion?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: The member for Waite, who has turned his seat into a marginal for the first time in its history, suggests that our outlaw motorcycle gang members be driven out of Adelaide to Andamooka.

The Hon. K.O. Foley: Out of South Australia.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: Out of South Australia, to Andamooka. I wonder whether he will be campaigning in the great seat of Giles at Andamooka during the next campaign. I think not. The conference was a success, and I am pleased that an important meeting such as this was held in a regional area rather than meetings being confined to capital cities. Of course, our government is a government for regional South Australia, containing two ministers from regional South Australia.

Mr Hamilton-Smith: They'll pay the price.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: They'll pay the price, will they? At the moment, they are two-term ministers looking at at least one of them being a three-term minister. Anyway, we will see. The Barossa Valley region afforded the conference an opportunity to give a small boost to the local economy, and allowed the members to sample the local cuisine and full bodied shiraz, as well as meet some of the South Australian wine makers who were speakers at the official dinner. No doubt this left many interstate attorneys-general envious of my jurisdiction.

The Hon. K.O. Foley: Were you there, Ivan?

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: Ivan was there. I was also glad to have been joined by the member for Schubert, who attended part of the meeting on Friday. I understand that he had the opportunity to renew some interstate acquaintances with an Attorney-General whom the member had come to know through his competing in parliamentary bowls tournaments. Parliamentary bowls is not the death sentence to a career in politics that some think it is; you can go on to become Attorney-General after participating in parliamentary bowls.

Mrs Redmond: Exactly.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: And the member for Heysen chimes in, 'Exactly'—there is a big future for that bowler. SCAG will meet again in July, after which—

The Hon. M.D. Rann: On Norfolk Island?

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: Not on Norfolk Island. This time we will be meeting somewhere about an hour from Christchurch in the snow, after which I will again be pleased to take members' questions on this important regular meeting of first law officers.

PAXTON REPORT

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:57): Will the Minister for Health now act on the Paxton summary report recommendation that the Central Northern Adelaide Health Service be reduced? The report states:

CNAHS has essentially imposed an additional layer of executive management over and above the already existing management structures of the individual facilities.

These regional bureaucracies were set up by the government on 1 July 2004. The report recommends that the regional executive positions be limited to six and that all other regional roles should be allocated back to the existing hospital management with direct operational facilities. The CNAHS annual report tabled this week discloses that there are now 916 employees earning more than \$100,000, and 12 of these earn more than \$400,000. The total cost of—

The Hon. J.D. Hill interjecting:

Ms CHAPMAN: They are not all doctors. The total cost is \$146.6 million; 25 of them are your executives.

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Kaurua—Minister for Health, Minister for the Southern Suburbs, Minister Assisting the Premier in the Arts) (14:58): For the record, dealing with the highest-paid workers in the Central Northern Adelaide Health Service (I saw the figures the other day), I think that nine earn more than half a million dollars, and every single one of them is a medical officer; in other words, a doctor. They earn a lot of money. We pay them a lot of money for the services they provide. They are not, as the deputy leader is trying to characterise it, public servants who are sitting in an office: they are doctors working for that service.

As the member indicated, the Paxton report has been tabled in here, and it has been provided to the officers who work in the service. We are working through the recommendations with them. I expect, particularly in relation to the issues about unnecessary bureaucracy, the department to take a very hard line and to reduce to the bare minimum the bureaucratic levels that we require. I am happy for them to take that very hard line.

PAXTON REPORT

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:59): My question is again to the Minister for Health. Will the government immediately implement the financial data recommendation of the Paxton report which will not require any loss of services?

The Paxton summary report tabled on 1 April 2008 identifies that 'there is a material variation between the reported entity results and the underlying operating results' in each of the entities reviewed. The report recommends that the financial information published should disclose the former, which includes government bail-outs during the year. The recommendation affects the disclosure as an accounting entity without affecting any staff or services. This week the government tabled the CNAHS annual report, which disclosed an annual deficit of almost \$11 million, but this does not tell us the true deficit as recommended by the Paxton report.

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Kaurua—Minister for Health, Minister for the Southern Suburbs, Minister Assisting the Premier in the Arts) (15:00): As I said at the time that I released this report, this is an example of the government attempting to make our public health system work as efficiently as it can. At the time, the deputy leader demonstrated, as I predicted she would, an attempt to have a bob each way, that is, using the report to condemn the government for failures and also using the report to defend practices which she thought might be a political advantage to her if she were to defend them.

This is a report which has been published now for a month or so and, as I said, we are working through all the recommendations and we will attempt to apply the principles that have been recommended by Paxton. Some of the issues, of course, require sensitive handling, particularly in relation to workforce issues where there is an award in place and so on, but in relation to the

bureaucratic procedures I am very keen for the department to implement the recommendations as laid out in Paxton.

The central issue that Paxton raises, which is a conundrum not only for this government but for every government in Australia—indeed it is not a political thing, it is not partisan politics, it is an issue—is the conundrum between providing a budget to a department to run a service and then expecting that department to operate within that budget, and that is certainly what the Treasurer expects, and the other principle, which is that whenever anybody turns up to a public hospital facility they expect to get service.

It is impossible to manage those two elements exactly, and from time to time, of course, there are more services delivered than are budgeted for, and that is where we get deficits and so on. Trying to manage that is a difficult thing but that is what we are trying to do. The Paxton report makes some useful suggestions about how we might manage that.

HOUSING AFFORDABILITY

Ms THOMPSON (Reynell) (15:02): My question is to the Minister for Housing. How is the government working with the community sector to increase affordable housing options in Adelaide?

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) (15:03): I thank the honourable member for her question. I was delighted recently to accompany the honourable member, along with my parliamentary colleagues the honourable member for Mawson and also the new federal member for the seat of Kingston, Amanda Rishworth, to the opening of an exciting new partnership that is delivering new housing options for disadvantaged families.

On Friday I launched the new Calvary Housing Association, which is a joint project between this government and Lutheran Community Care. Calvary Housing Association is starting out with eight homes, north and south of the city, and these homes will be rented to low and moderate income families. Six existing houses have been upgraded and are tenanted, and two are being newly built in Aldinga. I am delighted that the families have now been able to settle into their new homes and have done so with the knowledge that they will have an affordable rent, long-term security and a supportive landlord who is committed to helping them move forward with their lives.

This project is another step in the state government's commitment to provide affordable housing through partnerships with the private and non-government sectors. More than 370 houses have been funded by the Affordable Housing Innovation Fund since the government launched its housing plan in March 2005. In the present housing affordability crisis, we know that it is getting increasingly difficult for low to moderate income families to access appropriate affordable housing, and I am delighted that this government has been able to assist a new organisation to take shape and deliver such a vital community service.

What we have decided to do in this state is tackle the affordable housing question, not just preside over the long, painful and slow death of the Housing Trust, and that is really what the previous opposition was doing. The opposition ripped out 10,000 homes over the period of its term in government. What passed for housing policy in this state was the slow haemorrhaging to death of the Housing Trust—just slowly ebbing away. That is all there was. All housing policy was consumed by that, and the way in which houses were sold to maintain the viability of the trust was completely mad. They would sell off homes for something like \$40,000, \$50,000 or \$60,000—homes that we are now having to buy back to assemble parcels of land to actually regenerate some of these suburbs.

When you hear about some of the issues involving disruptive tenancies, some of the worst issues in places like the Peachey Belt actually occur because of the slum landlords who purchased these cheap homes that were sold off at bargain basement prices by those officers, and we are now seeking to overcome those issues as we try to rebuild these communities.

The member for Norwood yesterday gave a report to this place from the Public Works Committee about an important new project, the billion dollar Playford North Redevelopment Project, which is the way forward for housing policy and the Housing Trust (now known as Housing SA in this state), with the regeneration of the old properties, new ways of doing things, partnerships with both the private sector and the community sector and critically now, for the first time, a willing commonwealth partner. There will be a range of exciting new projects that we will be announcing in the coming months.

MARJORIE JACKSON-NELSON HOSPITAL

Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder) (15:06): My question is to the Treasurer. Has the Treasurer reconsidered the financial model for the funding of his privatisation of the proposed new hospital at City West? The Treasurer has told taxpayers he will fund the hospital with a 30-year private leasing and management deal whereby the consortium that builds the hospital will receive lease payments for 30 years, along with management and maintenance fees. The costs of those types of private-public partnerships have risen in the time since the Treasurer's announcement, and I refer him to the 13 February front page of his favourite newspaper, the *Financial Review*, which states:

The credit crunch induced crisis among specialist bond insurers could substantially raise costs for public-private partnership consortiums just as Australian governments are looking to embark on a massive infrastructure building program.

This article goes on to explain how the collapse of the monoline insurance market will add to the costs of PPPs.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Port Adelaide—Deputy Premier, Treasurer, Minister for Industry and Trade, Minister for Federal/State Relations) (15:08): That is a very good question. Did the member put that to Treasury when he was briefed on this hospital last week? Did he ask that question?

Members interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: That is a no.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Slam dunk! I would have thought if you were getting a briefing from a high-level Treasury official—I guess the Under Treasurer was there—and you were asking a whole series of questions, you would ask him that. I am happy to answer it.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Sorry?

Members interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: You are still thinking about it?

Members interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Don't abuse me.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Treasurer has the floor.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: If I get abused by the member for MacKillop I will sit down.

The SPEAKER: Be quiet, member for MacKillop. Can we just get on with it, please? The Treasurer.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: There is no question that the tightening in world credit markets has put another dimension into the issue of PPPs. I asked that very question back in February, actually; I did not wait until 1 May to be raising that concern with my Treasury officers, and the advice with which I have been provided is that it is not expected to have a material impact on the PPPs. We will not know for certain, of course, until we go through expressions of interest and the tendering process.

As the member would be aware, the tendering process will occur some way down the track yet, and one would hope that credit markets have stabilised sufficiently at that point. I say this. First, this issue of privatisation is nonsense, and we know that to be the case, but the opposition—

Mr Hamilton-Smith: Who will own it?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Sorry?

Mr Hamilton-Smith: Who will own the building?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: The private operators will own the infrastructure—

Mr Hamilton-Smith interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Yes, the building.

Mr Hamilton-Smith interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: No, we can extend.

Mr Hamilton-Smith interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: The building. Unlike Modbury, we own the building, but the private sector owned the doctors, nurses and everything else that went on in the hospital—that is privatisation. We do not own most of the offices that public servants live in. Does that mean they are privatised? Is the Attorney-General's Department privatised? No, but we do not own the building, I guess. We do not own a lot of buildings, but we lease them.

I would have hoped for a better understanding of the financing of infrastructure from the member for Goyder as he has had a job as a senior officer managing a small but not insignificant council.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: That's not patronising him; that's actually praising him.

Ms Chapman: That is rude.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Rude? I said that he managed a small but not insignificant council. Did the member for Goyder find that rude when I said that he managed a small but not insignificant council?

Members interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: That's the truth.

Mr Griffiths: I don't like the word 'small'.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: All right—a not insignificant council. Public-private partnership for the delivery of social infrastructure is a method of project delivery supported actively by every government in Australia and nationally and, to my knowledge, it is supported by all conservative governments except the Leader of the Opposition. And why? Because he opposes everything. Nick Greiner supports it; he thinks it is a good idea. Jeff Kennett thought it was a good idea.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: No, he didn't. That's not true. He thought they were a very good idea. What would you know? The former premier of Victoria was a big supporter of PPPs. Do you know what the Leader of the Opposition said yesterday? He only supports PPPs—he said it across the chamber—when they involve an income stream.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Was it now? What else has an income stream? Toll roads. So let us put it on the agenda now that the Leader of the Opposition actively supports and promotes toll roads in South Australia as a PPP with—

Mr Hamilton-Smith: That's a lie and you know it.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Mr Speaker, I am appalled. The Leader of the Opposition has just said that I uttered a lie. I would not even know how to do that. I am offended, and I would like the leader to withdraw that remark.

The SPEAKER: The Leader of the Opposition must withdraw that remark.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: The Treasurer's remarks are untrue, sir, completely and totally untrue.

The SPEAKER: Are you withdrawing—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: I withdraw the word 'lie'.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: So, sir, I wasn't lying; the Leader of the Opposition does support toll roads.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: You can't get away from that.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: Mr Speaker, if you are going to require things of the opposition, I think it is inappropriate to allow the minister to twist the truth as he just did for political point-scoring, and I ask you to call him to order.

The SPEAKER: Order! I do not know what I can do to make the Deputy Premier change his remarks. The Leader of the Opposition can make a personal explanation.

NORTHERN SUBURBS

Mr PENGILLY (Finniss) (15:15): My question is to the Premier, or a pretender, or whoever. Will the Premier appoint a minister for the northern suburbs and will he give him more attention and resources than those given to the Minister for the Southern Suburbs? Yesterday the opposition asked the Premier whether he endorsed the comments of his colleague the member for Little Para who said that if northern suburbs identity Jimmy Barnes thought government infrastructure in the northern suburbs was so run down, as reported in Mr Barnes' letter in the *Sunday Mail* last weekend, then Jimmy Barnes should put his money where his mouth is: 'Put up or shut up,' she said.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Port Adelaide—Deputy Premier, Treasurer, Minister for Industry and Trade, Minister for Federal/State Relations) (15:16): This is a very sad moment for me and a very difficult moment. I would ask for indulgence and some sympathy, because I first saw Cold Chisel and Jimmy at the tender age of 16. I snuck into the Lady Largs Hotel—

Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I didn't drink. I first saw Jimmy on stage with his bottle of scotch. I am, I believe, one of the greatest Cold Chisel and Jimmy Barnes fans ever to be in this place. In fact, when the ABC (that publicly funded broadcaster) was asking people about their favourite song and favourite pieces of music, John Hill said it was Mahler and Mike Rann said it was Dame Kiri Te Kanawa. They asked me, and what did I say—Jimmy. I saw Cold Chisel return in the round at the Entertainment Centre. I have been a great fan of Jimmy Barnes. I have all his records. I have 'records' of Jimmy Barnes! I have the Circus Animals record. I have a number of DVDs. I have followed all Jimmy's career, so it saddens me now—

Mr Williams: I bet he is not following yours.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: No, that could well be true. I have seen The Tin Lids, too. However, I have to say that it pains me to criticise Jimmy, but Jimmy needs to be criticised because I concur completely with my colleague: he was out of line and wrong, plain wrong.

An honourable member: He should be Treasurer!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: And I should be fronting a band.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: And what part would you play in the band?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I would be the lead singer because 'I'm a working-class man'. He is wrong because we are doing a lot out north. We have a battalion of soldiers heading north to protect us. A lot is happening out north, a hell of a lot. Jimmy just has to realise that—

The Hon. J.D. Lomax-Smith: Playford.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Playford North. We are building houses out there, lots of them.

The Hon. J.D. Lomax-Smith: Schools.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Schools: we have superschools; PPP superschools. PPPs, not privatised: they are PPP schools.

An honourable member: Northern Expressway.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Northern Expressway. I actually also like John Swan, his half brother. Jimmy Barnes' half brother is John Swan, Swanee.

Ms Breuer: I like David Campbell best!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: That's his son. We are doing lots out north and I hope Jimmy can take the opportunity—Marty, where are you going? Don't you like Jimmy?

Mr Hamilton-Smith interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Not been a good day for Marty.

The SPEAKER: The member for Davenport.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Thank you, Mr Speaker. My question is to the—

The SPEAKER: I apologise to the member for Davenport. I did not see the member for Morialta on her feet. The call does pass to this side.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Mr Speaker, I have a point of order. You did give me the call. You may have seen the member for Morialta, but you gave me the call.

The SPEAKER: The call does pass to this side of the chair. The member for Morialta.

INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF LABOUR INSPECTION

Ms SIMMONS (Morialta) (15:20): My question is to the Minister for Industrial Relations. What were the outcomes of the recent International Association of Labour Inspection Conference held in Adelaide?

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: I have a point of order, sir. That matter is on the website as a result of the conference. Given your rulings in previous weeks of sitting, that question is out of order.

The SPEAKER: Order! I think we have canvassed, if not laboured, this point many times. The joke is running a bit thin, member of Davenport. I say for the third, fourth or fifth time that I reversed my original ruling on the question from the member for MacKillop. It was out of order on other grounds, not on the grounds of that information being available.

I want to make it absolutely clear to the member for Davenport so that there can be no confusion whatsoever in his mind because, obviously, he has difficulty grappling with this point. There is a big difference between asking a minister a question which has a specific answer and for information which is specifically available alternatively. The information for which the member for MacKillop was asking, at least initially, as I understood it, was about specific amounts of money received by the Labor Party as donations. Questions of that nature are out of order because they are quite specific. They are asking for specific information that is otherwise easily obtainable by other people.

In relation to a question of a minister asking for information about things going on in their portfolio, there may be components of that minister's answer which may be available by other means, but the chair cannot pre-empt what the minister will say. There may be other information which the minister will provide and which is not publicly available.

I make it quite clear to all members, in particular the member for Davenport, that I am getting a bit tired of this point of order. I took it a couple of times with good humour, but I think the joke has now run a bit thin. There is a big difference between asking for information for which there is a specific answer, for example, specific amounts of money donated that is otherwise disclosed, and information of a general character, components of which might be available. There is no point of order.

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT (Lee—Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Finance, Minister for Government Enterprises, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (15:23): In mid March I had the pleasure of welcoming 200 delegates from approximately 40 nations to Adelaide for the International Association of Labour Inspection Conference.

IALI is the global professional association for labour inspection. The association works in close partnership with the International Labour Organisation to promote safe and decent work worldwide and to strengthen and modernise labour inspection. Labour inspectorates from over 100 countries covering every continent are members of IALI. This was the first time the IALI conference was held in the Pacific region.

Hosted by IALI and SafeWork SA, the conference was staged in partnership with the ILO and all other OH&S authorities across Australia and New Zealand. IALI conferences are designed to facilitate the sharing of information about best practice and to provide a forum to address challenges and foster cooperative arrangements between labour inspection authorities. The conference theme was towards healthy, safe and decent work through 'alliances, ethics and influence'—principles and strategies to build the foundation for strong and effective labour inspection across the world.

The conference achieved an ambitious agenda that provided delegates with the opportunity to hear from national and international experts. A range of forums also facilitated

information-sharing on occupational health and safety, industrial relations, employment and labour inspection developments across continents.

One of the most successful outcomes of the conference was the commitment by all Australian jurisdictions to implement a new global code of integrity for labour inspectorates. The code sets out ethical and professional standards of conduct, as well as expected behaviours for labour inspectors and all employees who work in the inspectorate.

The success of this international gathering has again demonstrated that South Australia is a centre of excellence for such conferences, and I extend my congratulations to SafeWork SA for its great organisational work.

HEALTH AND MEDICAL RESEARCH REVIEW

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Kaurna—Minister for Health, Minister for the Southern Suburbs, Minister Assisting the Premier in the Arts) (15:26): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.D. HILL: This morning, the Minister for Science and Information Economy and I released the Review of Health and Medical Research in South Australia, and I tabled a copy of that report just prior to question time. The review was undertaken by independent consultants, namely, Professor John Shine, who is the Executive Director of the internationally recognised gene-based medical research body, the Garvan Institute, in Sydney, and Mr Alan Young, who is Chairperson of the Flinders Medical Centre Foundation, a partner in Baker Young Stockbrokers and a prominent Adelaide businessman.

South Australia has a proud tradition of world-class health and medical research. Our researchers are of the highest calibre and our research is internationally renowned. The review was commissioned to maintain South Australia's strong position and provide clear directions for the continuing success and expansion of health and medical research in South Australia.

The key recommendations are for the establishment of an independent health and medical research institute and for the Health and Medical Research Fund (set up by the government last year to fund new research) to be expanded. The establishment of an independent health and medical research institute would develop a structure to link together the state's researchers to position South Australia at the forefront of health and medical research and would attract and retain world-class talent. It would provide a focus for health and medical research in South Australia, which would attract increasing levels of national and international funding and enhance collaborative health and medical research activity.

Last year, the government set up the Health and Medical Research Fund, a dedicated fund to support researchers in the state. This fund is unique to South Australia, and Shine and Young recommended that it should be treated as a valuable opportunity to grow health and medical research capacity in South Australia. The fund brings with it opportunities to invest strategically in health and medical research in South Australia, to build capacity in this area, and to leverage funding received from national resources. The Minister for Science and Information Economy and I will now be talking to universities and other key players in research to see how the recommendations can best be progressed.

A series of related sub-recommendations are presented in the report and will be addressed by the Department of Health and the Department for Further Education, Employment, Science and Technology over the coming months.

I take this opportunity to acknowledge the work and success of health and medical researchers in South Australia. We have a long and successful history of high performance in health and medical research, and this provides the foundation upon which to grow this sector. I also thank John Shine and Alan Young for their outstanding work. The future promises to be an exciting time for health and medical research in South Australia.

MEMBER'S REMARKS

Mr PENGILLY (Finniss) (15:29): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr PENGILLY: During the course of debate this morning, I raised some matters in relation to a constituent of the member for Bright. After I had finished speaking, I was made aware of some

other matters about which I had absolutely no knowledge whatsoever in relation to the constituent and the member for Bright, matters with which she clearly had some difficulty, and I totally understand her position. I want to place on the record that I had no knowledge whatsoever of those matters, and I hope the member for Bright will take this personal explanation in the way in which I have made it.

Members interjecting:

Mr PENGILLY: I apologise for offending her.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

WHEAT MARKETING

Mr VENNING (Schubert) (15:30): I raise the important matter of single desk marketing for wheat currently before the Australian federal parliament. Mr Tony Windsor, the federal Independent member for New England, recently conducted a poll to determine wheat growers' attitudes to different wheat exporting systems. Only 14 per cent said they wanted to change from the current single desk structure to a multi-licence system. Eighty per cent of the growers responded that they were in favour of retaining the single desk for wheat. Surprise, surprise; isn't that ironic! The minister walks out. The figure of 80 per cent is the same figure that I used—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr VENNING: It's not Liberal party policy, incidentally. Eighty per cent is the same figure that I quoted in this parliament regarding farmers wanting to retain the single desk for barley. Isn't that ironic: it is exactly the same figure. Mr Windsor is an Independent member; he is not a Liberal. So, surprise, surprise: the figures are the same. I just cannot believe that this has happened, and that it is a figure that I quoted.

I commend the federal National Party for its stance. I commend Jock Munro, the New South Wales Farmers Federation and the Victorian Farmers Federation, but I cannot commend the South Australian one. I support the National Party 100 per cent in trying to stall it and supporting growers to retain what the overwhelming majority want to retain.

The big question is: what is the South Australian National Party position on this? It has been extremely silent. The state President of the National Party, Mr John Venus—with whom I had discussions a couple of weeks ago—had a go at me about what the Libs are doing in Canberra. I said not much. What is the National Party doing here in South Australia? Deathly silence.

I have heard nothing from the National Party leader (Hon. Karlene Maywald) who voted against single desk for barley. I do not know what the difference is; I do not believe there is any difference. I would be very keen to hear from her. She did not support single desk for barley; what is her decision on single desk for wheat? As the Leader of the National Party here, I only hope that she supports the federal National Party and comes out to strongly represent the farmers, many of whom live in her electorate.

The response to Mr Windsor's survey clearly demonstrates that growers want to retain a single desk for wheat, as they did for barley here in South Australia. I believe we are being conned by big business. I was disappointed to read in today's *Advertiser* that the wheat export monopoly currently in place would be dismantled. The article states as follows:

A Senate committee has recommended that the government go ahead with draft laws to dismantle the single desk for wheat exports.

That is an absolute disgrace. Given the results of Mr Windsor's survey—again, independent—I cannot believe that this is happening. It is the barley single desk saga all over again. I am calling for an Australia-wide referendum on this issue to truly gauge what the growers want. That is the only fair thing to do.

My position has never changed. I fully support cooperative, orderly collective marketing for wheat, as I did for barley, with growers maintaining control. I believe that the growers of Australia are being conned by an unholy alliance between governments and multinational grain traders. It is a big thing to say, and I say it quite clearly. There is money floating around to pay certain people to support a certain opinion, and these are the decision makers. Heavens above! Decisions like this are irreversible. Before doing it, give all the stakeholders a say via a grower referendum so there can be no doubt about what the majority of farmers want.

I think getting rid of the single desk for barley is an absolute disgrace, because what we have now is an absolute Pandora's box. It is purely luck, and it is luck of the draw. I call on the

Hon. Karlene Maywald—the Leader of the National Party here in South Australia and a cabinet minister—to come out and say what the National Party position is here in South Australia. Is it backing its federal colleagues? If it is not, what is its position? I strongly support the retention of single desk for wheat all over Australia because it has served us well. The blemish in Iraq with the AWB is no reason to throw away a system that has worked so well for so long for Australia and Australian farmers. I only wish it could be reversed, but I do not think that it will be.

NORTHERN SUBURBS

Mr O'BRIEN (Napier) (15:35): Last Sunday the *Sunday Mail* carried a front page story relating to Adelaide and, more specifically, to the Elizabeth area. The majority of Elizabeth's suburbs sit within my electorate of Napier. For that reason, I took great interest in what Jimmy Barnes had to say. I have responded to this front page story with a letter to the editor. It states:

Dear Editor,

In response to the front page article, 'Barnes's Plea for the Northern Suburbs' of 27/04/08, both Jimmy Barnes and our Governor, Kevin Scarce, should be applauded for their continued interest in the area that gave them so much as boys.

Jimmy Barnes called for increased state government spending in the Elizabeth area. It is worth pointing out that the Rann Labor government has committed a level of government spending to the Elizabeth area unmatched since the area was originally developed in the Playford era. In the crucial area of education, where improvement in attainment levels is essential, the government is to build the state's first two new super schools in the Elizabeth area as part of the \$134 million super school program. These two super schools are to be opened in 2010 and 2011 respectively. In addition, a \$4.2 million upgrade of Craigmore High School is currently under way. All primary schools in the Elizabeth area have also received additional teaching staff in years 2 and 3 specifically to improve literacy and numeracy outcomes in these crucial years of early childhood development.

In terms of health care, the state government is delivering a new 24/7 GP Plus Allied Health Clinic for Elizabeth that will open in 2010. This is in addition to a major upgrade of the Lyell McEwin Hospital, worth \$336 million, which will almost double the number of beds available as well as modernise the hospital. Along with a new community rehabilitation centre, these projects will significantly boost the quality of health care facilities available to residents of the northern suburbs.

Two major urban renewal projects, one along the Peachey Belt (Davoren Park, Smithfield and Smithfield Plains) and the other at Elizabeth Park, will commence shortly. These two development projects alone will cost more than \$1 billion. Additionally, the Rann Labor government has provided a new fire station and ambulance station as well as a new police shop front in the Elizabeth area.

The north of Adelaide is enjoying unprecedented prosperity that is reflected in high employment growth and increased property values. However, pockets of disadvantage do exist, as Jimmy Barnes points out. The Rann Labor government is committing the resources needed to deal with this issue.

Michael O'Brien MP

Member for Napier

JABUK CENTENARY

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (15:38): I rise today to acknowledge the centenary of Jabuk, a lovely little town about 150 kilometres from Adelaide towards the Mallee.

Ms Bedford: Postcode?

Mr PEDERICK: That is a good question. It is 5253, or something like that (I probably have that wrong). I would like to acknowledge the work that the committee has done in this regard. It is a small committee led by a local young woman, Heather Wait, who is a descendant of a long-time family in the district. The event to commemorate the centenary of Jabuk was the 'siting' of Jabuk, and included a multi-denominational church service in the morning and a grand parade, which was certainly a sight to see. The parade included machines and implements of farming practices in the area from bygone days to the present. These included tractors from the '40s and '50s through to big air seeder arrangements that are operated now, as well as a ute towing tandem sheep feeders. There was a little bit of entertainment supplied by the Nuriootpa town band, and I was very pleased to be given the chance to speak at the official opening of the new Jabuk railway siding.

The land comprising this area was surveyed and gazetted for application in 1906. It is to be noted that that is the centenary of the Mallee railway line, which Jabuk is situated on, but they did not get a siding until two years later. This region on the Jabuk Marmon Range was part of Moorlands Station previous to this; just open grazing country. Then farmers moved in, cleared the mallee off the land and started cropping.

They were cropping wheat, which was transported to the Polly's Well (Peake) or Geranium Bore sidings. It was the work of Mr Kirkpatrick MP (a Labor MP, I believe) who presented a petition which resulted in Jabuk having the siding built 100 years ago on 27 April 1908. That is where the road from Taillem Bend to Garra Station crosses the railway line. As I mentioned before, the official opening of the Mallee line was in 1906.

The land was sold for the town in 1909, known as Marmon Jabuk and then changed to Jabuk in 1941. A store, a hall and a school were built. The hall, and later the institute, became the focus of many functions, including strawberry fetes, dances, library services, sporting activities, banking, deb balls, weddings, and the like.

Mr Pengilly interjecting:

Mr PEDERICK: Possibly. Sheep came back in the 1920s and by the 1930s passenger trains stopped at the siding, which also carried the mail, the bread and the groceries. It is to be noted that the train guards thought it was a huge impediment to their day when they had to load large numbers of cream cans and crates of eggs at Jabuk for transportation.

The land was developed, crops were grown, silos went up along the line, and over the last 100 years the Jabuk community has celebrated all forms of sporting events: tennis, football, cricket, shooting, basketball and gymkhanas. Churches were also built for Baptist, Lutheran and Catholic congregations, and all the usual country organisations have been represented, including the CFS and CWA. The Jabuk CFS has just received a new firefighting truck, a 34.

I hope that Jabuk enjoys another 100 years at least, and I think they will get it. They are very resilient people out there in the Mallee. I hope that the community thrives and I commend the community for their centenary.

Time expired.

WORKING WOMEN'S CENTRE

The Hon. S.W. KEY (Ashford) (15:43): Today I wish the chamber a happy International Workers' Day. As people would know, it is 1 May, May Day, which is certainly a very important day in my calendar, and I hope that people have a good day today celebrating May Day. I would like to continue my remarks on the Working Women's Centre. I had the opportunity to make a grievance speech yesterday and since that time the Working Women's Centre has been able to supply me with their 2006-07 annual report.

I guess the sad news is that the work that is done by the Working Women's Centre is absolutely overwhelming. It has always been a very busy and effective organisation, but I must say that I was very shocked to find that in the past year (2006-07) it reported that it received over 2,581 inquiries. When you consider the very small number of staff that that centre has, that is an enormous number of inquiries to deal with.

It also says in the report that there have been ongoing cases because not all of the inquiries that they receive are just five or ten minute questions. They have also handled anywhere between 192 and 212 cases that are ongoing, and that is in each quarter of the year 2006-07. So in that reporting period they again have had a number of long-term cases.

I know from talking to the staff and also from my own experience in the industrial relations area that there are a number of problems associated with the WorkChoices legislation. We do not need to go over those issues again because I think they have been very well traversed, but one of the big problems for women workers is that a number of them not only work in precarious employment (part-time or seasonal employment) but many of them work in workplaces with fewer than 100 employees. That, in itself, has caused a number of problems with advocating for workers in those areas because, under the WorkChoices legislation they were not able to take up some of those issues because of the limit on the number of employees in that workplace.

In a number of cases women came to the Working Women's Centre (with the view that they had been wronged in some way) to find that—despite the fact that there were certainly grounds for the case that they wanted to run—their workplace was too small. This point has been made in this place on both sides. South Australia is basically a place where we have small to medium workplaces. I know that both the minister and the shadow minister are well aware of this fact, but it does cause problems with providing remedies for the different issues that were raised.

I also note that, despite the proposed cut of \$97,000 to South Australia's Working Women's Centre, I think in the next financial year, the Working Women's Centre is actually very efficient at

assisting some of the people who come to them with inquiries. I put on record that Teresa Von Wasserling has celebrated 10 years of service at the Working Women's Centre. This what the annual report says about her:

During this time she worked with 3,663 women—

probably more than that, but at least that many—

delivering specialised assistance and completed case work of 834 women recovering [approximately] \$823,163 in compensation and lost entitlements for women in South Australia.

That is just one of the workers at the Working Women's Centre, and obviously the results are very impressive.

Yesterday, I mentioned the different work that the Working Women's Centre staff do, but, when you look at the annual report, you can also see the amount of campaigning that is done by the Working Women's Centre, the Fairwear campaign, just to mention one; and they are obviously looking at the life of outworkers, workplace bullying, supplying information to seminars and workshops (on both a national and state basis), and also being involved in looking at violence in the workplace, which unfortunately has increasingly become an issue that has been identified. The Working Women's Centre has also continued its publication rate.

Time expired.

LE CORNU

Mr PISONI (Unley) (15:48): I, too, acknowledge that today, 1 May, is May Day, the international day of the workers. What we will see in the upper house today is the Labor members voting in favour of cutting workers' entitlements in the WorkCover legislation. So this is no doubt an anniversary to be celebrated by those in the Labor movement.

However, I am not here to speak about that today; I am here to speak about the opportunistic way in which the Shop, Distributive and Allied Employee's Association came in like a vulture on the Le Cornu situation yesterday. We had a media blitz on Monday and Tuesday featuring the new assistant secretary of the SDA who used any excuse to get his name on the radio and his face on TV about the so-called brutal and harsh sackings that occurred in the Le Cornu situation.

He went on to complain about the fact that Mr Kevin Pudney promised us when he took it over that there would not be any reductions. Well, the Le Cornu family said just 12 months ago that they were not going to sell. The thing about business is that it is a fluid thing, and things change.

The assistant secretary also went on to say on radio that the whole retail sales across the country are consistently on the increase. That is just not the case. The latest figures that have come out will tell you that we have the lowest business confidence and the lowest consumer confidence that we have had since 2001. Interest rates are really biting.

The new owners of Le Cornu's have every right to manage their business as they see fit, and they have done so. I have spoken to Le Cornu's and they have assured me that they have done everything in accordance with the award and agreements with their employees. It is interesting that the letter that was sent by registered mail to Le Cornu's from the assistant secretary goes on to state:

As you are aware, a number of members of the SDA have recently been made redundant at Le Cornu's. Unfortunately the SDA was not formally contacted in relation to this decision.

I will come back to that. The letter continues:

Had the SDA been formally contacted, we would have sought to meet with you prior to the redundancies being made to discuss a range of issues, and I would like to request a meeting with you to discuss the following points: how many employees are being made redundant, whether there are further redundancies proposed, the selection criteria applied in selecting employees to be made redundant, the amount of severance pay being paid to employees selected for redundancy pay, and the process followed in informing employees that they have been sacked and the events that follow this. I am flexible in relation to time to make such a meeting. Please contact me...'

A letter from Mr Pudney to me yesterday states:

I would like to confirm the recent events that have happened at Le Cornu's furniture centre. Due to the downturn in the economy and rising mortgage rates—

and with all due respect to the assistant secretary of the SDA, I think probably Mr Pudney has a better idea of how his business is going and what the sales are like than the assistant secretary has—

We have to carry out some redundancies in the company. I spoke to our contact Mr Ben Dineen from the SDA a few weeks prior to the redundancies to talk through the process.

Ms Kerry-Anne White, human resource manager, also spoke to Mr Dineen on the issue so I thought I had better get clarification as to just when that happened, and I asked for some dates. It states here:

Kevin spoke to Mr Ben Dineen from the SDA on 8 April, and Ben was actually in the store the day we did the redundancies in the Cyberkiosk in the rugs department.

I bet he did not buy anything. It continues:

The day I spoke to him on the telephone was the following day, 9 April.

So here we have the SDA saying there was no consultation and the owners of the business giving us the dates when that consultation actually happened. The letter goes on to state:

All employees were advised of their redundancy and they were given a letter stating their redundancy entitlements. At the conclusion of the meeting employees were allowed to collect their personal belongings, speak to their colleagues if they wished to and made their own way off the premises. At no time was anybody escorted off the premises or security was involved.'

Time expired.

POLLUTION COMPLAINTS

Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens) (15:54): Recently I had a number of complaints from constituents concerning the failure of a local council to police planning conditions that that same council had put in place on development approvals for light industry.

I am just going to relate two separate complaints that I have been attempting to work through with the residents. The first relates to a constituent who complained about noise, dust and fumes emanating from a metal fabrication property and coming over his back fence. The constituent had raised the issue with council more than four years ago. The complaint related to dust coming from a truck and other vehicles using a vacant block next to the factory.

There were also complaints about noise caused by heavy metal being dropped onto a concrete driveway outside the factory, as well as fumes and smoke given off by the oxyacetylene cutting equipment used to cut large steel sheets on the factory driveway. So, it made a lot of noise. The constituent obviously became very frustrated with the lack of action being taken and he was forced to seek the release of the planning approval documents for the site under the Freedom of Information Act. These documents clearly showed that the council had placed conditions on the site, which included measures designed to limit dust.

The constituent came to my office seeking assistance and he also lodged a complaint with the state Ombudsman's office. It is clear that the owner of the land failed to comply with the original development approvals and that the lessee of the factory had failed to adhere to the various conditions, with some work being conducted outside the factory. When I became involved, it was also apparent that the relationship between the constituent and the council had hit an all time low. Quite clearly, it should not have taken so long for the council to take the resident's complaints seriously and, as a result, the relationship between the resident and the factory workers had become caustic, I think is one way of putting it.

We have been able to go through the various issues with the resident, the factory owner and the council and, after several months, most of the issues involving this factory have been resolved. Fortunately, the relationship between the resident and the workers has also markedly improved, but mainly because of the goodwill of the resident and the factory owner. The issue caused my constituent significant anxiety and, given the delay in resolution, it is no wonder. Unfortunately, new concerns have arisen which are yet to be resolved. Again the residents—and it is not just one resident, there are several—are frustrated at the apparent delay in council dealing with these new complaints, despite the fact that there is considerable merit in the residents' concerns.

Clearly, as I said, it should not have taken so long for a council to take the resident's complaints seriously. I suspect part of that might have been because the constituent was considered a whinger, and so his complaints were fobbed off. What is interesting in this case is that the investigating officer from the Ombudsman's office had verbally expressed concern with the

council's complaints handling procedures and requested that it take immediate action to improve the procedure. Had there been a better procedure, the frustration and anxiety caused to this one particular resident (and others) would quite possibly have been diminished. Certainly in this case it seems that it is far easier for a resident to resolve a dispute with a neighbour over noise when that noise emanates from a nearby factory.

The second case (which is just a few hundred metres from the previous case) involved residents complaining that employees from a nearby commercial property were choking the street by parking in it all day. Again this was raised with the council—I am talking about the same council—over four years, and the council at the time advised one resident that it was going to impose some parking restrictions in the street, but it did not do that either. We have been able to resolve that issue because, fortunately, the business has moved on. The point is that councils have a duty to monitor and manage light industry, particularly when it is close to residential properties. They approve light industry going into that area, therefore they have an obligation.

I know that sometimes it can be a difficult task when dealing with residents' complaints, but certainly ignoring them is not a satisfactory way to deal with these matters. While we still have some ongoing issues with this particular council—and I am sure the Employee Ombudsman does as well—I hope it gets its act together.

Time expired.

FIREARMS (FIREARMS PROHIBITION ORDERS) AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton—Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education, Minister for Science and Information Economy, Minister for Youth, Minister for Gambling) (15:59): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

After the Tonic Nightclub shooting incident, the Government pledged to introduce new laws to curb motor cycle gang violence. The *Firearms (Firearms Prohibition Orders) Amendment Bill 2008* gives effect to that pledge.

The Bill strengthens the powers of Police to combat firearms related violence by introducing Firearms Prohibition Orders, giving Police the ability to ban persons with a known propensity for violence, or persons who associate with such persons, from possessing or accessing firearms.

Although primarily aimed at targeting motor cycle gangs and their associates, Firearms Prohibition Orders can also be applied to any person who has a known history of serious crime or violence, or who has been identified by a medical professional as being a risk to themselves or others because of a health condition.

Complementing the prohibition orders is a range of ancillary legislation which will provide the Police with further tools to both investigate firearms related crime, and to ensure that only appropriately responsible persons are able to gain a firearms licence and possess registered firearms.

This is the first step in the process of refocusing the attention of Police from the regulation of the legitimate firearms community, towards combatting the criminal elements who use firearms in the furtherance of their criminal endeavours.

Environmental Context

In South Australia, the majority of violent criminal behaviour with firearms does not involve legitimate firearms owners, nor legitimately owned, secured and registered firearms.

Whilst there is some conjecture as to the quantity of illegal firearms circulating in the community, there is no doubt that there is a market for unrecorded and essentially untraceable firearms to be used for a criminal purpose. It is the nature of this enterprise that there exists difficulties in Police being able to prevent this trade and the subsequent crime arising from it. In light of this, examination by SAPOL's Firearms Legislative Reform Project has determined that there are three main, but not exclusive, levels of firearms related offences within the State.

Firstly, offences committed by otherwise legitimate firearms owners in relation to administrative or regulatory matters, not involving violence, which include such matters as 'insecure firearms', 'storage of firearms and ammunition together' and such like.

Secondly, intentional criminal behaviour involving firearms, committed by those with a history of violence, association with others involved in crime, or with a tendency or potential towards violent or criminal behaviour, including intentional shootings, carriage of firearms, and firearms trafficking.

Thirdly, there are 'incidental' offences, involving the use of easily accessed and available firearms, which may involve persons belonging to both the legitimate firearms community or criminals, including domestic violence related shootings or threats, suicides, or offences arising from mental health conditions.

Thus far, firearms regulation has focussed on placing controls and conditions on the licensing of firearms owners. Offences involving violence and the criminalised use of firearms tend to be rolled into generalised offence categories, such as assaults, wounding or murder. Matters involving specific firearms related offences, not involving violence, tend to be heard summarily, and as a consequence the penalties applicable tend to be low, and in many cases involving career criminals, offences under the Firearms Act are withdrawn or not proceeded with in deference to other more serious charges.

This has been compounded with difficulties of prosecuting a person for possession offences with regards to non—registered and unrecorded firearms, wherein purported ignorance of the existence of a firearm, such as in a car in which a criminal is travelling in, can severely limit, if not negate, a successful prosecution.

It is in consideration of this that the focus should be on the behaviour of persons, rather than on the firearm itself. This is combined with the view that firearms ownership and possession is a privilege, not a right, and that the ultimate determination of the exercise of the privilege is vested in the State. It is intended to concentrate Police efforts on reducing the level of firearms related crime, and taking pre—emptive action on the potential for that to occur, while maintaining an appropriate level of co—operative regulation within the legitimate firearms using community.

Firearms Prohibition Orders

The Bill provides for the introduction of two levels of Firearms Prohibition Orders.

The first is an Interim Firearms Prohibition Order, which can be issued by any Police Officer, but requiring the authorisation of a supervisor. An interim order can be issued against a person if it is suspected on reasonable grounds that possession of a firearm by the person would be likely to result in undue danger to life or property, or that the person, through their behaviour, is not a fit and proper person to possess a firearm. Interim orders provide for an immediate response by Police which will effectively prohibit a subject person from gaining access to a firearm, regardless of any other action being taken against the person.

The second level is a Firearms Prohibition Order issued by the Registrar of Firearms. These orders carry the full range of powers, and may be issued if the Registrar is satisfied that possession of a firearm by a subject person would be likely to result in undue danger to life or property, or the person is not a fit and proper person to possess a firearm and it is in the public interest to prohibit the person from possessing and using a firearm. Proposed Police powers in relation to Registrar issued orders are strong, but necessary. A person subject to one can be stopped and searched on sight, any vehicle, vessel or aircraft they are in charge of can be stopped and searched, and the place of residence of subject persons can be inspected at any reasonable time, for firearms, firearm parts or ammunition.

The Bill provides for a range of offences in relation to Firearm Prohibition Orders, making it an offence for a person—

- to possess a firearm;
- to reside in premises if there is a firearm on the premises or to bring a firearm on to premises where a person subject to a firearms prohibition order resides;
- to supply a person subject to a firearms prohibition order with a firearm;
- to attend any shooting range or firearms dealership.

Revised Appeal Process

Against the background of the strong compliance powers, the Bill makes amendments to establish a thorough appeal process. The Bill changes the name of the Firearms Consultative Committee to the Firearms Review Committee. In line with the Committee's change of name, the Bill removes the requirement that the Committee give its approval before the Registrar can make specified decisions. Instead, the Firearms Review Committee will act as a body of review. A person aggrieved by a decision of the Registrar may apply for review of the decision by the Committee. The Committee may affirm the decision of the Registrar or remit matters to the Registrar for consideration or further consideration. The amendment Bill removes the existing right of appeal to a magistrate and instead establishes a right of appeal from decisions of the Registrar and the Firearms Review Committee to the Administrative and Disciplinary Division of the District Court.

Complementary Proposals

The Bill provides for the creation of aggravated offences under the Firearms Act. This will consist of carrying a loaded firearm or a firearm and a loaded magazine for the firearm, or if a person has a firearm concealed about the person.

The Bill also provides a range of reporting requirements on certain bodies and persons. Firearms clubs are required to report to the Registrar on members who the club considers to be a person who should not have access to firearms, and reporting persons will receive indemnity from civil or criminal liability for doing so. Likewise, medical professionals and other prescribed persons will be required to report to the Registrar on persons they have seen in their professional capacity and have determined may pose a risk to themselves or others if they possessed firearms. This complements current law, but also strengthens the ability of Police and Health services to take positive pre—emptive action to mitigate the potential for a Port Arthur or Virginia Tech type tragedy occurring in South Australia.

Further, medical professionals and other prescribed persons will be required to report to the Registrar if they treat a person who has suffered a wound caused by a firearm, and will be required to furnish police with any projectile or fragment of such removed from a wound. Naturally, the welfare of the injured party is paramount, but early advice to Police will allow for timely and appropriate follow up investigation.

The Bill also provides for tighter controls on the manufacture of, and dealing in, firearms. Broader provisions on the associations and employees of firearms dealers will mean the Registrar has a greater say in who may take part in this legitimate business, as well as stronger laws in relation to manufacture will provide Police the tools to make a significant impact into the clandestine firearms trade.

In terms of direct crime fighting powers, Police will have the power to require a person whom they suspect on reasonable grounds is committing an offence in relation to firearms to state their full name, and whether they are the owner of the firearm, part or ammunition to which the question relates, or if not, to state who is the owner. They will also be required to answer questions in relation to the purpose of possession of the firearm, and who else may have had possession of it.

To assist in progressing successful prosecution, certain terms and definitions will be clarified or expanded by the Bill.

A definition of 'possession' of a firearm is inserted.

A person is to be taken to have possession if the person—

- has custody of the firearm or has the firearm in the custody of another or
- has and exercises access to the firearm or
- occupies, or has care, control or management of, premises, or is in charge of a vehicle, vessel or aircraft, where the firearm is found,
- unless the person establishes that—
- he or she did not know, and could not reasonably be expected to have known, that the firearm was on or in the premises, vehicle, vessel or aircraft or
- the firearm was in the lawful possession of another or he or she believed on reasonable grounds that the firearm was in the lawful possession of another.

Further, the Bill provides for the expansion of the term 'fit and proper person' to have possession of a firearm, licence or ammunition, by altering the reference from being convicted of an offence under the Firearms Act, or an offence involving actual or threatened violence, to having been found guilty of such offence. This will allow for the application of previous offences where a person has been convicted without penalty, in the assessment processes of the Registrar for matters where a determination as to a persons fitness for access or possession of firearms is required. This will be complemented by a broadening of criteria to allow the reputation, honesty and integrity of a person, and the people with whom that person associates with, to be taken into account.

The Bill also provides the Registrar with the power to request a person to undergo a medical examination or provide a report to the Registrar to assist in any process where it is necessary to determine whether the person is a fit and proper person. No offence is committed if a person refuses to do so but the person may then be taken not to be a fit and proper person for the relevant purpose.

Conclusion

The *Firearms (Firearms Prohibition Orders) Amendment Bill 2008* is the first step in the refocusing of firearms regulation in South Australia. It provides for increasing the powers of Police in relation to violent crime involving firearms, and provides Police strong powers for taking pre-emptive and compliance authority over persons who, through their own actions and history, have shown they are a menace to society and a threat to public safety. Such strong powers are complemented by development of judicial review process, and are targeted against those who have shown a propensity for the use of violence for their own ends, rather than against the legitimate legal firearms community. The Bill will introduce the strongest powers available nation wide to Police in South Australia to combat violent firearms related crime.

Explanation of Clauses

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Commencement

3—Amendment provisions

These clauses are formal.

Part 2—Amendment of *Firearms Act 1977*

4—Amendment of section 5—Interpretation

This clause makes some consequential amendments to the interpretation section in the principal Act, and makes the following substantive changes to the meaning of 'fit and proper' and 'possession'. The concept of fit and proper person is currently relevant to decisions about licences and permits and is relevant under the proposal to the

issue of firearms prohibition orders. The concept of possession is central to the current Act and, in particular, to the offences set out in section 11.

Fit and proper

- An amendment to subsection (11) substitutes references to 'convicted' with references to 'found guilty' in paragraphs (b) and (c), the effect of which is to apply the grounds on which a person may be taken not to be fit and proper for the purposes of subsection (11) to a person who has been found guilty of an offence captured by paragraphs (b) or (c). This departs from the current position which limits the ability to make such a finding to a person who has been convicted of such offences. A further amendment to subsection (11) inserts new paragraph (ca) and extends the grounds on which a person may be taken not to be fit and proper for the purposes of subsection (11) to a person who has been found guilty of any prescribed offence.
- Subclause (13) has been inserted to broaden the grounds on which a person may be found not to be fit and proper. In determining whether a person is a fit and proper person to have possession of a firearm or ammunition or to hold or have possession of a licence regard may be had to the reputation, honesty and integrity of the person and of the people with whom the person associates.

Possession

- Subclause (14) extends the meaning of possession of a firearm beyond the meaning currently given to the term in the Act (other than for the purpose of Part 3 Division 2A) by deeming a person to be in possession of a firearm if the person—
 - has custody of the firearm or has the firearm in the custody of another; or
 - has and exercises access to the firearm; or
 - occupies, or has care, control or management of, premises, or is in charge of a vehicle, vessel or aircraft, where the firearm is found.
- Subclause (15) prescribes the basis on which a person caught by the extended meaning of possession of a firearm under subclause (14) can establish his or her defence as follows:
 - if he or she did not know, and could not reasonably be expected to have known, that the firearm was on or in the premises, vehicle, vessel or aircraft; or
 - if the firearm was in the lawful possession of another or he or she believed on reasonable grounds that the firearm was in the lawful possession of another.

5—Insertion of new sections

This clause inserts new sections 6A, 6B and 6C.

6A—Registers

Proposed section 6A requires the Registrar to maintain a register of licences, a register of firearms registered and a register of firearms prohibition orders. The first 2 registers are currently the subject of section 27.

The proposed section also prescribes various rules governing the inspection, availability and maintenance of the registers, in particular, ensuring that the new register of firearms prohibition orders is made publicly available.

6B—Power to require medical examination or report

Proposed section 6B enables the Registrar to require a medical examination or report for the purpose of determining whether a person is a fit and proper person. This is a new power.

6—Substitution of heading to Part 2 Division 2

This clause deletes and substitutes a new heading for Division 2 of Part 2 and is consequential on the substitution of the Firearms Consultative Committee with the Firearms Review Committee in the principal Act. It is proposed that instead of decisions of the Registrar relating to licences etc being vetted by the Committee on an ongoing basis, the scheme provides that a person aggrieved by a decision of the Registrar may apply for review of the decision by the Committee. See new section 26B.

7—Amendment of section 7—Establishment

8—Amendment of section 8—Quorum etc

9—Amendment of section 9—Allowances and expenses

10—Amendment of section 10—Procedure

Clauses 7 to 10 change the name of the Committee established under the Act from the Firearms Consultative Committee to the Firearms Review Committee and make other consequential amendments.

11—Insertion of Part 2A

This clause inserts new Part 2A into the principal Act, which establishes a scheme for the issuing of firearms prohibition orders.

Part 2A—Firearms prohibition orders

10A—Interim firearms prohibition order issued by police officer

The proposed section gives a police officer power to issue an interim firearms prohibition order if the officer suspects on reasonable grounds that possession of a firearm by the person would be likely to result in undue danger to life or property or that the person is not a fit and proper person to possess a firearm.

The provision states that if the police officer issuing the order is not of or above the rank of sergeant, the officer must, before issuing the order, obtain the authorisation of a police officer of or above that rank either orally or in writing.

The provision governs the form in which the order must be made and the manner in which the order takes effect.

The proposed section enables the police officer to require the person to remain at a particular place so that the order may be served on the person and, in circumstances where the person refuses or fails to comply with that requirement or there are reasonable grounds to believe that the person may not comply with that requirement, the police officer may arrest and detain the person for a maximum of 2 hours.

A person against whom an order is issued must notify the Registrar in writing of an address for service and an interim firearms prohibition order expires 28 days after the Registrar receives such notification.

The Registrar may revoke an interim firearms prohibition order.

10B—Firearms prohibition order issued by Registrar

Proposed section 10B gives the Registrar power to issue a firearms prohibition order against a person. The Registrar may issue a firearms prohibition order if—

- satisfied that possession of a firearm by the person would be likely to result in undue danger to life or property or the person is not a fit and proper person to possess a firearm; and
- it is in the public interest to prohibit the person from possessing and using a firearm.

A police officer issuing an interim order under proposed section 10A need only suspect on reasonable grounds that one of the matters prescribed in paragraph (a) or (b) of section 10A(1) exists. Whereas the Registrar is required under section 10B to be satisfied of either of those matters and that it is in the public interest to prohibit the person from possessing and using a firearm before issuing a firearms prohibition order. A police officer may only make an interim order under section 10A but an order made by the Registrar under section 10B continues until it is revoked.

The provision governs the form in which the order must be made, the manner in which the order takes effect and the basis on which the order will be taken to be served on a person against whom an interim firearms prohibition order under proposed section 10A is already in force.

The Registrar may revoke a firearms prohibition order.

10C—Effect of firearms prohibition order

Proposed section 10C sets out the effect of a firearms prohibition order on the person against whom an order has been issued and on other persons.

The person is subject to the following rules:

- the person is disqualified from obtaining any licence or permit under the Act;
- any licence or permit under the Act held by the person is suspended;
- section 31A (Period of grace on cancellation, suspension etc of licence) does not apply;
- the person must not acquire, possess or use a firearm, firearm part or ammunition;
- the person must forthwith surrender to the Registrar all firearms, firearm parts and ammunition owned by the person;
- the person must not be present at—
- the grounds of a firearms club or the range of a commercial range operator; or
- a place at which a person carries on the business of manufacturing, repairing, modifying or testing firearms, firearm parts or ammunition or buying, selling or hiring out, firearms, firearm parts or ammunition; or
- any other place of a kind prescribed by regulation;
- the person must not become a member of a firearms club;
- the person must not be in the company of a person who has a firearm on or about his or her person or under his or her immediate physical control (It is a defence to prove that the person did not know, and could not reasonably be expected to have known, that the other person had a

firearm on or about his or her person or under his or her immediate physical control.);

- the person must not reside at premises on which there is a firearm, firearm part or ammunition (It is a defence to prove that the person did not know, and could not reasonably be expected to have known, that the firearm, firearm part or ammunition was on the premises.);
- the person must inform each other person of or over the age of 18 years who resides or proposes to reside at the same premises as the person of the fact that a firearms prohibition order is in force against the person and ask each such person whether or not he or she has or proposes to have a firearm, firearm part or ammunition on the premises.

The following rules apply in relation to other persons:

- a person must not supply a firearm, firearm part or ammunition to another person to whom a firearms prohibition order applies or permit such a person to gain possession of a firearm, firearm part or ammunition;
- a person who has a firearm on or about his or her person or under his or her immediate physical control must not be in the company of a person to whom a firearms prohibition order applies;
- if a person to whom a firearms prohibition order applies resides at premises, a person who brings a firearm, firearm part or ammunition onto the premises or has possession of a firearm, firearm part or ammunition on the premises is guilty of an offence.

It is a defence to prosecution for an offence against these rules to prove that the person did not know, and could not reasonably be expected to have known, that a firearms prohibition order applied to the other person.

Possession is given a special meaning for the purposes of the proposed section: if a person to whom a firearms prohibition order applies is on or in premises or a vehicle, vessel or aircraft (other than any premises, vehicle, vessel or aircraft to which the public are admitted) when a firearm, firearm part or ammunition is found on or in the premises, vehicle, vessel or aircraft, the person will be taken to possess the firearm, firearm part or ammunition unless it is proved that the person did not know, and could not reasonably be expected to have known, that the firearm, firearm part or ammunition was on or in the premises, vehicle, vessel or aircraft.

Acquisition and supply are also given extended meanings in line with other offences in the principal Act (see sections 14 and 14A).

A discretion is given to the Registrar in proposed subsection (15) to exempt a person, unconditionally or subject to conditions, from a specified provision of this section and the Registrar may vary or revoke an exemption by notice in writing served personally or by post on the holder of the exemption. This is designed to enable the particular circumstances to be taken into account and arrangements made, for example, for the delivery of firearms not in the immediate possession of the person.

10D—Report on first 2 years of operation of Part

Proposed section 10D requires the Minister to cause a report to be prepared under the proposed section within 3 months after the second anniversary of the commencement of this Part.

The report must relate to the 2 years immediately following the commencement of this Part and specify—

- the number of firearms prohibition orders issued; and
- the number of firearms prohibition orders revoked; and
- the number of reviews and appeals under Part 4A relating to firearms prohibition orders and the outcome of each review or appeal that has been completed or finally determined

The Minister must, within 12 sitting days after receiving the report under this section, cause copies of the report to be laid before both Houses of Parliament.

12—Amendment of section 11—Possession and use of firearms

Section 11 of the principal Act makes it an offence to unlawfully possess a firearm in circumstances where the person—

- does not hold a firearms licence authorising possession of the firearm; or
- holds a licence but the possession or use of the firearm is for a purpose that is not authorised by the licence held by the person.

The proposed amendment to section 11 makes the offence of unlawful possession of a firearm under section 11 an aggravated offence if it has been proved that the offender—

- was carrying a loaded firearm or a firearm and a loaded magazine that can be attached to and used in conjunction with the firearm; or
- had a firearm concealed about the person.

The carrying of a firearm or magazine is taken to have occurred if the person has the firearm or magazine on or about the person or if it is under the person's immediate physical control.

The penalties that apply to an aggravated offence are higher than in the case of an offence against section 11 where there is no aggravating factor.

This clause amends subsection (8) of section 11 by limiting the prosecutor's discretion to prosecute an offence under section 11 as a summary offence. The amendment removes the discretion in the case of a person who has previously been found guilty of an offence against section 11.

13—Amendment of section 12—Application for firearms licence

This clause deletes paragraph (b) from section 12(6) to remove the requirement for the consultative committee to agree that an application for a firearms licence made under section 14 of the principal Act should be refused before the Registrar may refuse the application under that section. The removal of paragraph (b) is also consequential on the amendment of Part 2 Division 2, to change the name of the committee established under the Act from the Firearms Consultative Committee to the Firearms Review Committee.

14—Amendment of section 13—Provisions relating to firearms licences

This clause amends section 13 by deleting paragraph (c) from subsection (4) and deleting 'with the approval of the consultative committee' from paragraph (b) of subsection (4). The amendment to paragraph (b) is consequential on the removal of all references to the consultative committee from the principal Act.

The amendment to subsection (9) is the first in a series of amendments designed to ensure consistency in the form of service of notices effecting variation, suspension or cancellation of licences and permits, in each case requiring the notice to be served personally or by registered post.

15—Amendment of section 14—Acquisition of firearms

The proposed amendment to section 14 corresponds with the amendment to section 11(8) and removes the discretion to prosecute a person for a summary offence against section 14 in the case of a person who has previously been found guilty of an offence against section 14.

16—Amendment of section 14A—Supply of firearms

The proposed amendment to section 14A corresponds with the amendment to sections 11(8) and 14(7) and removes the discretion to prosecute a person for a summary offence against section 14A in the case of a person who has previously been found guilty of an offence against section 14A.

17—Amendment of section 15—Application for permit

This clause amends section 15 by requiring the Registrar to grant a permit as soon as practicable after receiving an application for a permit, if the applicant for the permit is the owner of a registered firearm of the same class as that to be acquired under the permit.

18—Amendment of section 15A—Reasons for refusal of permit

This clause deletes subsection (5) and (6), which refer to the consultative committee, from section 15A.

19—Amendment of section 15B—Transfer of possession

20—Amendment of section 15C—Obligations of prescribed person

Amendments to sections 15B and 15C substitute references to various categories of persons who are authorised to witness the transfer of possession of firearms with references to a prescribed person. Prescribed person is defined to include the categories of persons currently identified in the principal Act and to include a Public Service employee authorised by the Registrar to witness the transfer of possession of a firearm.

21—Amendment of section 17—Dealer's licence

This clause amends section 17 by extending the Registrar's power to refuse an application for a dealer's licence if the Registrar is not satisfied that—

- a close associate of the applicant is a fit and proper person to be a close associate of the holder of such a licence; or
- the applicant is to be the person primarily responsible for the management of the business intended to be carried on under such a licence.

A definition of close associate is inserted in section 5. This clause makes consequential amendments by removing references to the consultative committee.

The amendments to subsections (4b) and (4d) are part of the series of amendments designed to ensure consistency in the form of service of notices effecting variation, suspension or cancellation of licences and permits, in each case requiring the notice to be served personally or by registered post.

22—Amendment of section 20—Cancellation, variation and suspension of licence

This clause extends the power of the Registrar to cancel a licence issued under the Act to a case where the licence has been obtained improperly. The requirement for the Registrar to have the concurrence of the consultative committee before the Registrar can cancel a licence is removed in line with the removal of all references to the consultative committee from the principal Act.

The amendments to subsections (1), (1b) and (2) are part of the series of amendments designed to ensure consistency in the form of service of notices effecting variation, suspension or cancellation of licences and permits, in each case requiring the notice to be served personally or by registered post.

This clause amends subsection (2) by—

- removing a further reference to the consultative committee; and
- removing references from the subsection that prevent the suspension of a licence for more than 3 months; and
- inserting a reference to subsection (1a) to extend the power of the Registrar to suspend the licence under subsection (2) if the Registrar is satisfied of the matters set out in subsection (1a) of the section.

23—Repeal of section 20A

This clause repeals section 20A (Reporting obligations of certain persons and clubs). These matters are proposed to be dealt with in new sections 211 and 27A.

24—Amendment of section 21BA—Cancellation or suspension of permit

This clause amends section 21BA by removing references to the consultative committee in subsection (1) and removing references from subsection (2) that prevent the suspension of a permit for more than 3 months.

25—Substitution of Part 3 Division 6

This clause substitutes Part 3 Division 6. The provisions for review and appeal are moved to Part 4A. Current sections 26A to 26D are relocated to the beginning of this Division by a later clause.

Division 6—Firearms clubs, paint—ball operators and commercial range operators

21H—Requirement to expel certain persons from firearms clubs

Proposed section 21H imposes an obligation on the controlling body of a recognised firearms club to expel a person from membership of the club if the controlling body has reasonable cause to believe that—

- the actions or behaviour of a member of the club has been such that there is a threat to the member's own safety or the safety of others associated with the member's possession or use of a firearm; or
- a firearms prohibition order applies to a member. (However, this does not apply to an interim firearms prohibition order or to a firearms prohibition order until the period allowed for an appeal against the order has expired or, if an appeal has been instituted, until the appeal lapses or is finally determined.)

A person incurs no civil or criminal liability as a result of action taken in good faith in compliance, or purported compliance, with this section.

21I—Obligation to report

Proposed section 21I imposes an obligation on the controlling body of a recognised firearms club to make a report to the Registrar if the body—

- has reasonable cause to suspect in relation to a member of the club that the member is suffering from a physical or mental illness or condition; or
- that other circumstances exist,

such that there is a threat to the member's own safety or the safety of another associated with the member's possession or use of a firearm. The obligation is similar to that currently set out in section 20A(2).

The following further obligations are imposed by proposed section 21I—

- if a member of a recognised firearms club or a person employed or engaged at the grounds of a recognised firearms club has reasonable cause to suspect that a person to whom a firearms prohibition order applies has gained or attempted to gain access to the grounds of the club, the member or person must, as soon as practicable after the suspicion is formed, report the matter to a police officer; and
- if a commercial range operator or a person employed or engaged at the range of a commercial range operator has reasonable cause to suspect that a person to whom a firearms prohibition order applies has gained or attempted to gain access to the range of the operator, the operator or person must, as soon as practicable after the suspicion is formed, report the matter to a police officer.

A person incurs no civil or criminal liability in making a report in good faith in compliance, or purported compliance, with this section.

26—Amendment of section 24A—Identification of firearms

This clause substitutes subsection (7) of section 24A with a new subsection (7) which extends the offence created to include a person who defaces, alters or removes the identifying characters of a firearm without the authority of the Registrar or a person who has possession of a firearm that does not have identifying characters as required under this section or the identifying characters of which have been defaced or altered without the authority of the Registrar. The proposed amendment increases the maximum penalty for an offence against section 24A.

27—Insertion of Part 4A

This clause inserts Part 4A into the principal Act. Part 4A sets out the processes and procedures governing rights of review and appeal under the principal Act.

Part 4A—Review and appeal

26A—Review of interim firearms prohibition order

Proposed section 26A allows a person to whom an interim firearms prohibition order applies to apply to the Registrar for a review of the decision to issue the order. The fact that an application for review has been made does not affect the operation of the original decision and the Registrar may affirm the decision or revoke the interim firearms prohibition order.

26B—Review by Firearms Review Committee

Proposed section 26B allows a person aggrieved by any decision of the Registrar specified in paragraphs (a) to (l) of proposed section 26B(1) to apply to the Registrar for the Registrar to refer the decision to the Firearms Review Committee for review of the decision.

Proposed subsection (2) facilitates the provision by the Registrar of the Registrar's reasons for making the decision (although if the making of the decision is based on information classified by the Registrar as criminal intelligence, the only reason that need be given is that the decision was made on public interest grounds).

Proposed subsection (3) sets out the procedural requirements that an applicant must adhere to including the time within which an application must be made. It also provides that the making of an application does not affect the operation of the decision to which the application relates or any action necessary to implement the decision.

The referral of the decision to the committee must be made by the Registrar following an application under proposed subsection (1) and the committee may, on the review, affirm the decision or remit matters to the Registrar for consideration or further consideration.

26C—Right of appeal to District Court

Proposed section 26C allows a person to appeal against a decision of—

- the Firearms Review Committee to affirm the decision of the Registrar; or
- a decision of the Registrar following remission of the matter by the Firearms Review Committee; or
- a decision of the Registrar to issue a firearms prohibition order,

to the District Court.

Proposed subsection (2) ensures that the written reasons of the Registrar or the committee for the decision being appealed against are provided (although if the making of the decision is based on information classified by the Registrar as criminal intelligence, the only reason that need be given is that the decision was made on public interest grounds).

Proposed subsection (3) sets out the time within which the appeal must be made.

Proposed subsection (5) establishes that on an appeal, the Registrar may apply to the District Court for a determination that information classified by the Registrar as criminal intelligence is criminal intelligence. The Court must maintain the confidentiality of information subject to such an application.

Proposed subsection (7) ensures that if the Court proposes to determine that the information is not criminal intelligence, the Registrar must be informed of the proposed determination and given the opportunity to withdraw the information from the proceedings.

Proposed subsection (8) provides that if the Court determines that the information is criminal intelligence or the Registrar withdraws the information, the Court must continue to maintain the confidentiality of the information.

28—Relocation of sections 26A to 26D

Sections 26A, 26B, 26BA, 26C and 26D are redesignated as sections 21C, 21D, 21E, 21F and 21G respectively and relocated so that they appear at the beginning of Part 3 Division 6 (as inserted by the measure).

29—Substitution of section 27

This clause substitutes section 27 and inserts sections 27A and 27B into the principal Act. The matter currently dealt with in section 27 (Registers) is proposed to be dealt with in section 6A.

27—Manufacture of firearms or firearm parts

Proposed section 27 creates an offence for manufacturing a firearm or firearm part or taking part in the manufacture of a firearm or firearm part unless the manufacturing of the firearm or firearm part is undertaken by a person in the ordinary course of carrying on business as a licensed dealer pursuant to the licence.

The proposed section creates a defence to prosecution for an offence against subsection (1) if it is proved that, in the case of a firearm part, the firearm part was a firearm part for a firearm registered in the name of, or otherwise in the lawful custody of, the person who manufactured the firearm part.

Proposed section 27 sets out the basis on which a person is deemed to have taken part in the manufacture of a firearm or firearm part in subsection (3).

The penalties for an offence against proposed section 27 are set out in subsection (4) subject to subsection (5), which gives a discretion to prosecute a person for a summary offence against section 27 except where the person has previously been found guilty of an offence against the section or the firearm is a prescribed firearm or the firearm part is a firearm part for a prescribed firearm.

27A—Obligation to report unsafe situations associated with firearms

Proposed section 27A imposes an obligation on a medical practitioner or other prescribed person to make a report to the Registrar if the medical practitioner or other person has reasonable cause to suspect in relation to a person whom he or she has seen in his or her professional capacity—

- that the person is suffering from a physical or mental illness or condition, or that other circumstances exist, such that there is a threat to the person's own safety or the safety of another associated with the person's possession or use of a firearm; and
- that the person has, or might be intending to acquire, a firearm.

The requirement is similar to that currently set out in section 20A(1).

Proposed subsection (2) imposes an obligation on employers to make a report to the Registrar, if an employer has reasonable cause to suspect in relation to an employee whose work with the employer involves the possession or use of a firearm that the employee is suffering from a physical or mental illness or condition, or that other circumstances exist, such that there is a threat to the employee's own safety or the safety of another associated with the employee's possession or use of a firearm.

A person incurs no civil or criminal liability in taking action in good faith in compliance, or purported compliance, with proposed section 27A.

27B—Obligations of medical practitioners etc relating to wounds inflicted by firearm

Proposed section 27B requires a medical practitioner or other prescribed person to make a report to the Registrar, if the medical practitioner or other person has reasonable cause to suspect in relation to a person whom he or she has seen in his or her professional capacity that the person is suffering from a wound inflicted by a firearm.

Proposed subsection (2) states that the report must be made as soon as practicable after the suspicion is formed and sets out the form in which the report must be prepared.

The proposed section requires a medical practitioner or other prescribed person who treats a person for a wound that the practitioner or person has reasonable cause to suspect was inflicted by a firearm to take reasonable steps to retain any ammunition or fragment of ammunition recovered from the wound until it can be collected by a police officer.

A person incurs no civil or criminal liability in taking action in good faith in compliance, or purported compliance, with this section.

30—Amendment of section 30—Information to be given to police officer

This clause substitutes subsection (1) and inserts subsection (1a) into section 30 of the principal Act.

The power for police officers to ask questions under section 30 is extended to allow them to ask questions of a person to whom subsection (1) applies—

- about whether the person is the owner of the firearm, firearm part or ammunition and, if not, to state the name of the owner of the firearm, firearm part or ammunition; and
- that relate to the firearm, firearm part or ammunition or to other persons who have, or have had, possession, of the firearm, firearm part or ammunition.

The police continue to have the power that the principal Act currently provides to ask the person to whom subsection (1) applies to state his or her full name, address and age.

A person to whom these questions may be asked is extended to include a person who—

- is in the company of a person who has, or recently has had, in his or her possession a firearm, firearm part or ammunition; or
- a person who is an occupier or in charge of premises or a vehicle, vessel or aircraft on or in which a firearm, firearm part or ammunition is found; or
- a person who is or was on or in any premises, vehicle, vessel or aircraft (other than any premises, vehicle,

vessel or aircraft to which the public are admitted) at the time or immediately before a firearm, firearm part or ammunition is found on or in the premises, vehicle, vessel or aircraft.

The police continue to have the power that the principal Act currently provides to ask questions under section 30 to a person who has, or recently has had, in his or her possession a firearm, firearm part or ammunition.

The maximum penalty for failure to comply with a requirement is increased in line with the increase in penalties in section 33.

31—Amendment of section 32—Power to inspect or seize firearms etc

This clause inserts a new subsection (a1) into section 32 to enable police to require the owner of a firearm to produce the firearm for inspection at a specified place at a specified time or within a specified period.

A new paragraph is inserted into subsection (1) by this clause to allow a police officer to seize a firearm if the police officer suspects on reasonable grounds that the holder of a firearms licence authorising use of a firearm can no longer use the firearm for the purpose endorsed on his or her licence.

This clause inserts subsection (3a) and (3b) into section 32. The proposed subsections give police the power to stop, detain and search a person in specified circumstances as reasonably required for the purpose of ensuring compliance with a firearms prohibition order issued by the Registrar. The Police may—

- detain a person to whom subsection (3a) applies and search the person for any firearm, licence, mechanism, fitting or ammunition liable to seizure under the section; and
- stop and detain a vehicle, vessel or aircraft to which subsection (3a) applies and search the vehicle, vessel or aircraft for any firearm, licence, mechanism, fitting or ammunition liable to seizure under the section; and
- enter premises to which subsection (3a) applies and search the premises for any firearm, licence, mechanism, fitting or ammunition liable to seizure under the section.

Subsection (3a) applies—

- to a person who a police officer suspects on reasonable grounds is a person to whom a firearms prohibition order issued by the Registrar applies;
- to a vehicle, vessel or aircraft that a police officer suspects on reasonable grounds is in the charge of a person to whom the subsection applies;
- to premises that a police officer suspects on reasonable grounds are occupied by, or under the care, control or management of a person to whom the subsection applies.

32—Amendment of section 33—Obstruction of police officer

This clause increases the maximum penalty that applies to a person who hinders or resists a police officer acting in the exercise of power conferred by the principal Act to \$10 000 or 2 years imprisonment.

33—Amendment of section 34A—Powers of court on finding person guilty of firearms offence

This clause deletes references which compel the court to make at least 1 of the orders set out in paragraphs (a) to (e) of section 34A(1) following a person's conviction against an offence involving a firearm, mechanism, fitting or ammunition and inserts references which provide the court with a discretion to make 1 or more of the same orders following a finding of guilt against a person of an offence involving a firearm, mechanism, fitting or ammunition.

Paragraph (f) is added to section 34A(1) to enable the court to order that the person be subject to a firearms prohibition order until further order. A similar amendment is made to section 34(2), which gives the court a discretion to order that a person who has possession of a firearm and whom the court believes is not a fit and proper person to have possession of a firearm be made subject to a firearms prohibition order until further order.

Proposed subsection (3) gives the court the power to exercise the same power given to the Registrar under section 10C(15) to make exemptions in respect of the conditions imposed by firearms prohibition orders when the court makes an order that a person is subject to a firearms prohibition order. A further amendment is made to ensure that the Registrar of the court notifies the Registrar of Firearms of the details of any firearms prohibition order made under section 34A.

34—Amendment of section 35—Disposal of forfeited or surrendered firearms etc

This provision sets out the procedures that must follow the surrendering of a firearm, firearm part or ammunition owned by a person against whom a firearms prohibition order has been issued.

In the case of an interim firearms prohibition order the Registrar must retain the firearm, firearm part or ammunition or in any other case the Registrar must retain the said items for the period allowed under the Act for an appeal against the order or, if an appeal has been instituted, until the appeal lapses or is finally determined.

However, if the firearm, firearm part or ammunition is retained by the Registrar and a firearm prohibition order ceases to be in force, the Registrar must make the firearm, firearm part or ammunition available for collection by the person or some other person who satisfies the Registrar that he or she is entitled to the firearm, firearm part or ammunition. If there has been no collection of any of those items within the period allowed by the regulations, the Registrar may sell or otherwise dispose of the firearm, firearm part or ammunition and pay the proceeds of the sale or disposal into the Consolidated Account.

At the end of the period of retention, if the person continues to be subject to a firearms prohibition order, the Registrar must sell or dispose of the firearm, firearm part or ammunition in accordance with the regulations, with the proceeds going to the person. Earlier arrangements for sale or disposal may be put in place at the request or with the consent of the person.

35—Amendment of section 35B—Advertising firearms for sale

This clause makes amendments that are consequential on changes made to sections 15B and 15C by adding a reference to an authorised Public Service employee. Amendments to sections 15B and 15C add an authorised Public Service employee to the categories of persons authorised to witness the transfer of possession of a firearm.

36—Amendment of section 36—Evidentiary provisions

This clause inserts new paragraphs (aa), (ga) and (gb) into section 36 of the principal Act. In doing so it ensures that notice can be given to the court by the Registrar that—

- a firearms prohibition order applied to or was in force against a person for a particular period; or
- that at a specified time a person was or was not the holder of an exemption under this Act; or
- that an exemption under the principal Act was subject to specified conditions,

as evidence of those matters.

37—Repeal of section 38

This clause repeals section 38. The period within which a prosecution may be commenced will be determined by the rules set out in the *Summary Procedure Act 1921*.

38—Amendment of section 39—Regulations

The Governor may make regulations under paragraph (af) of section 39(2) requiring the keeping of records and the furnishing of information to the Registrar by specified bodies, organisations and persons. This clause makes an amendment to that paragraph to provide that such information may be required to be verified by statutory declaration and accompanied by documents. A further amendment is made to paragraph (af) by inserting subparagraph (iv) which adds owners of firearms to the list of specified bodies, organisations and persons about which a regulation under paragraph (af) may be made. Effectively this enables the regulations to establish a scheme for self audits by owners of firearms.

Schedule 1—Related amendments

Part 1—Amendment of *Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935*

1—Amendment of section 299A—Orders as to firearms and offensive weapons

This clause amends section 299A of the *Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935* by allowing the court to make an order that a specified person be subject to a firearms prohibition order under the *Firearms Act 1977*, if the court is satisfied of 1 of the matters set out in paragraphs (a) to (c) of section 299A(1) of the *Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935*.

Part 2—Amendment of *Summary Offences Act 1953*

2—Amendment of section 15—Offensive weapons etc

This clause amends section 15 of the *Summary Offences Act 1953* by deleting all references to firearms and deleting subsection (1)(a) and paragraph (a) of subsection (1f). The amendments remove offences involving loaded firearms from section 15, which are no longer necessary following amendments to section 11 of the *Firearms Act 1977* by this measure. (The amendments to section 11 make the unlawful possession of a loaded firearm (as defined by that section) an aggravated offence and provide for significantly higher penalties than section 15 of the *Summary Offences Act 1953*.)

Schedule 2—Further amendment of *Firearms Act 1977*

The Schedule contains technical amendments that substitute the terms—

- 'certified mail' with 'registered post'; and
- 'member of the police force' with 'police officer',

throughout the principal Act.

Debate adjourned on motion of Dr McFetridge.

SUPPLY BILL 2008

Adjourned debate on motion to note grievances.

(Continued from 30 April 2008. Page 3047.)

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (16:01): In the few minutes available to me, I want to focus on one particular piece of transport infrastructure in my electorate that has been the bane of the ratepayers of the City of Holdfast Bay for a number of years, namely, King Street Bridge. For the

uneducated and those who have not had the pleasure of travelling in and around my electorate and visiting the numerous restaurants and cafes—and I note the member for Croydon has been there; and he is welcome any time—King Street Bridge crosses the Patawalonga River, just north of the Buffalo restaurant.

It is a vital piece of transport infrastructure in the council area and in my electorate. The bridge was built in 1954 and was extended under the South-Western Suburbs Drainage Act in 1970. It was built by the state government and it was extended by the state government. It was part of the Patawalonga works, carried out in conjunction with an amendment to the South-Western Suburbs Drainage Act which involved widening the Patawalonga River to an average width of 300 feet, the construction of three additional outlet regulators, an extension of King Street Bridge, dismantling of the bridge at Anderson Avenue, diversion of the northern end of Adelphi Terrace and realignment of Military Road adjacent to the Glenelg sewage treatment works.

Considerable works were carried out, and it is interesting to note that Adelphi Terrace and Military Road were realigned. I think that, even then, the state government knew it was a busy thoroughfare. King Street Bridge is really a state-controlled bridge. I do not know why local government took it on. I think it was a stupid thing to do because ever since then it has created a headache for the council because of the need to have it maintained all the time. The concrete and steel used in those days was not up to the standard we use now, so it has concrete cancer. Significant repairs have been done to try to maintain the bridge in a functioning form.

In 2005 the council prepared an engineering and environment committee report on the bridge and looked at the various options and costings of repairing or replacing the bridge. Arguments for state government funding were laid out in the report. The arguments were—and still are—that 80 per cent of the traffic is through traffic or regional traffic. The 31,000 ratepayers of Holdfast Bay are subsidising the bridge for traffic, 80 per cent of which is through or regional traffic. The report states that using the bridge provides relief and an alternative for Tapleys Hill Road traffic on busy days. We know when footy is played at AAMI Stadium there is a constant stream of traffic from the southern suburbs to Footy Park, and I would think also from the south-eastern suburbs when the Crows are playing. It is certainly not to be discounted as a major link for people going to the footy.

Emergency services would be severely compromised if the bridge was not available. I am told that response times from Camden Park Fire Station would increase from six to seven minutes (which is standard) to between 12 and 14 minutes because they would have to travel via Tapleys Hill Road and Africaine Road to the peninsula at Glenelg North where there are over 600 homes. In fact, there is probably more than that now because of the number of apartment blocks that have been built there; it is probably closer to 700 or 800 homes and apartments.

Regional traffic use is increasing much faster than local traffic, and it should be noted that the state government's emergency response plan for the Patawalonga in relation to King Street Bridge states that 'King Street Bridge provides access to the western part of the suburb that connects Adelphi Terrace south of Military Road, creating a major north-south road transport link'.

It is a major transport link and it should be funded by the state government. However, the minister seems to think the council should be made to abide by the decision it made years ago to take on the bridge. I understand that to a degree, but the circumstances and facts have changed. When facts change, one has to think about it and most people would think about changing their mind if the facts change, not just making people wear the consequences of what were then well-meaning and well-intentioned decisions.

The bridge is there and the problem is that it is decaying. The concrete cancer is getting worse. I understand that load limits will be introduced in relation to the bridge in the near future. There have been reviews of the load limits in order to ensure that public transport buses can use that bridge. Certainly, the emergency services will use that bridge. We need to keep the bridge in good repair and keep it open. The council is making some decisions in relation to short-term spending to ensure the bridge is able to carry the 20-tonne plus load limit that is required for public transport in order to say that the bridge is safe to use.

I have written to the minister, at least twice, probably three times, asking for the government to consider funding to replace King Street Bridge with a new bridge. I would be more than happy if it came in 50/50 with the council to help fund a new bridge—but even that seems to be out of the picture. The latest letter I received from the minister is dated April 2008. It states:

The state government has made its position clear on King Street Bridge and I do not see the necessity for a meeting at this time.

I had asked for a meeting between stakeholders and the minister to discuss the funding, but the minister said that it was part of the local road system and was the responsibility of the Holdfast Bay council. So, there is no budging the government's and the minister's current position.

On 17 April, I wrote to the council indicating that the bridge has outlived its lifespan and said that it was time to consider making a decision on a new bridge, which would have an expected lifespan of 60 to 100 years, and that any money that had to be borrowed could surely be borrowed over a term of 25 to 30 years. It was my suggestion that the council should bite the bullet now because the state government was not coming forward with any money at all and, at that stage, the federal government had made no commitment. I suggested that local government should make a decision and go ahead and borrow the money (I think \$6 million to \$8 million would be required) funded over 25 to 30 years. It should not have to happen but, unfortunately, the council will have to levy the ratepayers at a rate, I think, of about \$20 a year (about 6 cents a day).

I also suggested that, as well as having the emergency services and natural resources levies on the council rate notice, they should also have the 'Mike Rann fix the King Street Bridge levy' on there to remind the ratepayers of Holdfast Bay that it is the council that is having to bear the cost when it should be borne by the state government.

To reiterate that fact, John Trainer wrote to minister Conlon on 24 April. John Trainer is a former speaker in this place and the Chair of the Western Adelaide Consultative Group, which is made up of the CEOs or mayors of the City of Charles Sturt, Holdfast Bay, Port Adelaide Enfield, Marion and West Torrens councils, as well as representatives of Adelaide Airport Limited, Adelaide Shores and the Adelaide and Mount Lofty Ranges NRM Board. All these people agreed to seek state government funding for the running costs of maintaining the King Street Bridge. They recognise that the role of the bridge is not just as a local bridge; it has significant through traffic, and it has a role in relation to public transport and supporting tourism; it is also part of the State Emergency Response Plan.

So, it is not just the people of Holdfast Bay who are asking the state government to put its hand in its pocket. All the councils along the coast, the natural resources management board, Adelaide Shores Limited and Adelaide Airport recognise that this is a very important piece of infrastructure in the area. So, I ask the government to reconsider its position in relation to funding this bridge. Even partial funding would be better than nothing because at the moment the City of Holdfast Bay will have to do something about it, and it is going to cost the ratepayers in that council area a significant amount of money to replace that bridge (estimated to be between \$6 million to \$8 million).

Carrying out constant repairs is not the answer because the bridge is decaying and it will continue to decay. I ask the minister and the government to consider the electorate of Morphett for once. We do not get very much at all from this government, and we never have. Ratepayers down there deserve a bit of consideration in relation to this piece of infrastructure, which I would argue is state infrastructure and should be paid for by the state government, not the ratepayers of Holdfast Bay.

I look forward to a favourable response; a change of heart. I am not holding my breath on that, though. In this place you have to be an eternal optimist, but I am afraid I am a bit of a pragmatist now as well. I would settle for half funding, minister, if you are not going to pay for the whole lot. I look forward from a response from the federal Labor government as well, and the local member (Steve Georganas) is helping on that matter.

Time expired.

Mr BIGNELL (Mawson) (16:12): Once again, the member for Morphett has shown the financially irresponsible actions of members opposite. He has come in here looking for the state government to fund a fix that is the responsibility of the local government. There are 47 members in this place and, if we all came in here with an \$8 million project that belongs to the local council, that would be \$400 million.

Members opposite are all about making these outrageous promises that would blow our budget. What do members opposite think councils are out there for? They have ratepayers and they collect the rates. The Onkaparinga council has just introduced a 10 per cent levy. The council has not been able to fix the stormwater problem, unlike the councils in the northern suburbs, which have done a fantastic job. Unfortunately, the people in the Onkaparinga council area have been let

down by the council. The member opposite comes in here looking for funding for projects that are actually the responsibility of local government. We have infrastructure that we own, operate and maintain, and it is our duty to pay for that infrastructure and to make sure that those things are taken care of. But let's not start paying for all the stuff that is local government responsibility.

I could drive around the electorate with people from the Onkaparinga council, and they would say, 'Can you fix this road; can you fix that road?' No; it is the council's responsibility; they are not the state government's roads. So, that is the way it should be. We have lines there, and we have only so much money to spend on things that are state government responsibilities, and we spread that money right across this great state.

I congratulate the government on the money that has been spent in the seat of Mawson and in the southern area, in areas such as health. In relation to Family and Youth Services, we have seen the great work that has been done in places such as at the Hackham West Community Centre, where we feed money in to work with those groups in our community who are at the coal face looking after those most vulnerable South Australians. I congratulate the minister. Thanks to a huge investment by this state government, things are going along very well down there in other areas, such as health and education.

An amount of \$80 million, shared between the state and federal governments, has been set aside because of the closure of Mitsubishi's Tonsley Park plant, and that money will be invested in infrastructure in the south, as well as to help those people who have lost their jobs to get into other jobs. I congratulate and commend the Premier, the Deputy Premier and the Minister for the Southern Suburbs for the great work they have done.

I am someone who likes to get out into the regions of our state. I was in the Flinders Ranges just a couple of weeks ago, and the amount of money that has been spent up there replacing the roads that were washed out in the devastating floods in January last year is something the locals up there are very grateful for.

It makes you start thinking about all the different funding streams the state government is responsible for. When you visit national parks, you pay your fee and you pick up these wonderful brochures about all the different walks you can take in the Flinders Ranges. The walking paths, along with everything else, are immaculately maintained, and I thank the Department for Environment and Heritage very much for its contribution in that area to show off our great state. Thirty-five per cent of the visitors to the Flinders Ranges come from overseas. We met up with some Belgian and French tourists who said that, after being in Sydney and Melbourne and passing through Adelaide, they finally felt they were in Australia because they were in the Flinders Ranges—the gateway to the Outback and a marvellous part of our fantastic state.

The investment extends also across to the West Coast. This government does not just look at the Adelaide CBD when it comes to investment; we realise the importance of regional areas. It is wonderful to see growth in all regional parts of this state, and that is something that we want to continue to support, whether it is in the South-East (the place where I grew up), over on the West Coast or on Yorke Peninsula. Our job is to maintain the funding right across this state. It is not a time to take on the project and the responsibilities of local government: it has a rate base and it should use that money wisely and actually invest in the things that it owns.

I also want to commend the government for the enormous amount of money that it has put into emergency services in this state. In mid-March we had a fire at Willunga which threatened many homes, lives and livestock. It was wonderful to see the CFS, the SES, the Metropolitan Fire Service, the police and the Salvation Army—another organisation that the government helps fund—deliver food and water to those people on the front line, on the fire ground.

There has been an incredible increase in the amount of funding for aerial firefighting since the Rann government took over from the Liberal government, which neglected that area. I think the people of Willunga, and people in the district of Mawson generally, are very grateful for the fact that there were plenty of fixed wing and helicopter fire bombers on that day in mid-March. I am sure that the member for Finnis would also agree.

I spoke to people at 2 o'clock in the morning when they came down from the top of Willunga Hill, and they said, 'We faced an awful, awful day the next day with the forecast winds.' They said that if it got away it would go to the coast. It was not going to go to the coast in the Aldinga direction; it would go through the other way and burn right through Mount Compass on its way to the sea. Quite clearly, that would have been disastrous not just for the region but for the entire state.

All the money that was put into aerial firefighting allowed the fire bombers to really hit that fire hard in the hours between about 3.30 and 4 o'clock when the fire broke out and when the sun went down. It was the 500 or so CFS volunteers who were up there all night and into the next day, Saturday and Sunday. The work those volunteers did on the ground really needs to be commended. These firefighters deserve every dollar that the state government gives them, as do the other support agencies we need so desperately in times of fire, flood and other disasters that sometimes hit our state.

Another area that I have been very interested in since my time in parliament is the Department of Trade and Economic Development. I would like to pay tribute to the Agent-General's Office in London (funded by the state government) for the incredible work that it does right across Europe. I also want to pay tribute to our new Agent-General, Bill Muirhead, and to Maurice de Rohan, who went before Bill, as well as David Travis, our Assistant Agent-General, who—when I spoke to him last night—had worked about 55 days in a row.

I was with David in Russia just last month. The amount of money being put in by DTED for South Australia to get back an incredible amount of money through exports to Europe is fantastic. We have seen the value of exports of South Australian wine to Russia go from \$3 million in 2006 to \$6 million in 2007. We are hoping to see even further growth in that market when the figures come out soon. It is about tapping into these markets and spending a relatively small amount of South Australian government money to reap huge rewards, not only for the wine companies but for the people down the street to whom the wine company employees then go to spend their money—in the main street of McLaren Vale, in the Barossa or in Clare. I think this is a very good area in which to spend money to get a lot more back, and it is a great boost for jobs and for our local economy.

As I pointed out, the money supplied by the Rann government across this entire state goes a very long way to doing a lot of good things. The member for Finniss sits there, scoffs and shakes his head. Perhaps one day he could come into this place and say, 'Thank you' and show a little gratitude for the money that we spend on Kangaroo Island, that very beautiful part of our state. We are always promoting Kangaroo Island to tourists. It is really a fantastic part of our state. We put a lot of money into Kangaroo Island to supply services, not just for the locals but for the tourists who come to visit South Australia and Kangaroo Island.

Mr PENGILLY (Finniss) (16:20): It is not a hard act to follow, is it! In my time this afternoon, I would like to raise some concerns about doctors in my area. There is major concern down on the South Coast at the moment about the number of doctors we have, and this matter has been raised in the local press. It is causing a fair bit of grief to the local community and to local authorities that doctor numbers seem to be decreasing through doctors retiring, or for whatever reason. We are just not going to have enough doctors.

We have quite an ageing population down there and medical care is at the top of the priority list for many people. In my electorate we are fortunate in that, at the moment, Kangaroo Island has enough doctors. That is because of extremely good management through the Southern Division of General Practice and the fact that the local business run by doctors there has been very good in recruiting doctors from elsewhere, including overseas, to fill the void.

The lack of doctors in the Goolwa/Victor Harbor area, only an hour's drive from Adelaide, is an issue that is certainly causing concern, and we will have to put a lot of work into maintaining the numbers that are required over the next few years. More to the point, after listening to the Minister for Health this afternoon, I shudder at what will happen to country hospitals in South Australia. We can only presume that the information, as the member for Bragg has indicated, has come from within the system. The information is that they are about to role change 25 country hospitals and they are about to take the acute services out of those hospitals and turn them into nursing homes. That will be a categorical disaster for many of those country areas, because the doctors just will not stay there. If they do not have acute facilities and acute care in the hospitals they will disappear; they just will not stay there. The last thing doctors in general practice want to do in many of these areas is have a hospital that is only a nursing home. They cannot further their professional expertise in those places. I think that is an horrendous outcome.

I do not follow the logic of the Minister for Health or his bureaucrats in what he was saying this afternoon about looking at it holistically. I think they will savagely and surgically destroy health in regional and country South Australia. It is all very well to boast about having good hospitals here, there and everywhere else. Look, for example, at the member for Hammond's hospitals at Pinnaroo and Lameroo, both with acute care facilities. One of them will go. Karoonda will go; they will dismember and emasculate it. Strathalbyn in the Adelaide Hills will go. These wonderful

hospitals will be cut off at the knees, and we will face an impending disaster in country health in South Australia.

If the member for Mawson spoke about all the money they are spending, he might want to go out in about 12 months' time after these hospitals have been role changed and talk to some of the communities where they have lost their doctors, and he might get a bit of a different perspective on the world. It is just such a critical issue for rural South Australia to have close and handy high-care facilities and doctors.

Why should rural people have to drive one, two hours or three hours to find an acute care hospital? Why should they not have the same capacity to go to acute care facilities in the country like they always have? I think it is a gross injustice. It will happen. They have done it before and they will do it again. There are 25 on the hit list. It has fallen off the back of a truck; it is all out there. The people inside the health department are leaking information like sieves, and woe betide this government when it does it, because it is not too good.

Similarly, in my electorate in particular, the lack of money put into arterial road funding and the assistance to local government to get decent roads put in place is alarming. This government is absolutely drowning in GST revenue. What has it done? It has employed an extra 12,000 public servants. That money would have been pretty handy out in the paddock. I know that the councillors in my area—Yankalilla, Alexandrina, Victor Harbor and Kangaroo Island—are screaming for assistance with their rates. They simply cannot cope with their income. They have had everything else thrust upon them.

You only have to read the Hawker report on cost shifting, which was done by the federal parliament two or three years ago, to acknowledge what pressures are now on local government due to unfair cost shifting put onto them by federal and state governments. Local government has always been about roads, rates and rubbish—that is basic. The fact is that they have had to deal with everything else that has been unloaded on them quite unfairly without any revenue source. Governments say, 'Put the rates up.' Well, the poor old ratepayers are at about the end of their tether, and they cannot take anymore.

As a result, council roads in rural areas and, more to the point, in my electorate of Finnis, are deteriorating and falling apart at the seams. For example, we have 1,100 kilometres of dirt road on Kangaroo Island, most of which is absolutely appalling. How do I know? I live on one of them, and it is just dreadful. I was the mayor and could not get my road bituminised—I failed dismally. I do not know whether Mr Piccolo got his done when he was mayor. The fact is that you have to reinvest.

The member for Mawson talked about the Rann government putting money into Kangaroo Island. The local council over there has absolutely pleaded for money for the community, and they got what Paddy shot at. In relation to tourism, under minister Lomax-Smith the Tourism Commission has cut the marketing budget, as I said last night. You can hardly say that they have showered the island with gifts. Down on the Fleurieu and the South Coast they are also feeling the pinch in tourism numbers, particularly around Goolwa, which is struggling with the negative publicity about the lakes and the amount of water down there. That community is struggling as well. It is just absolute poppycock to suggest that money has been poured into tourism in my electorate. It has not happened. The mayors down there will give you another story to what has been thrown around this chamber at this afternoon.

Along with road funding, there are water issues. The Fleurieu is a rapidly growing area for people to live in, and the increased population needs reticulated water. We have a swag of it in Myponga dam, which could be used a lot more than it is at the moment. It is being used as a back-up to supply Adelaide. I think the latest figure is that it is 70 per cent full. There is limited capacity for water to come back to Happy Valley; so I think this government is poing its pants over what will happen next year if it does not rain. We will see B-double loads of water being brought in to supply members opposite with something to drink. Everyone in this chamber knows that there are plenty of ways to create more water and to take the pressure off the Murray.

Mrs Geraghty interjecting:

Mr PENGILLY: Yes; fresh water. It's called desalination.

The Hon. R.J. McEwen interjecting:

Mr PENGILLY: Okay; I reckon you've missed your plane, Rory, you'd better get going. On top of that, the impost of high taxes to the South Australian community is grossly unfair. You only

have to talk to small business and people with investment properties about land tax to know that what is being preached from the other side is arrant nonsense. Taxes are going through the roof. This is the highest taxing government we have ever had in South Australia. It is an absolute disgrace and in my view it is a debacle.

Despite the attempts by members opposite to paint a rosy picture, I have an alternative view. When these high interest rates kick in and when the wheels fall off a lot of employment around Adelaide and South Australia, then perhaps we will hear the member for Mawson say, 'Oh gee, perhaps I was wrong. I think we've stuffed it up.' I reckon he is auditioning for a job, because he will be looking for one on 21 March 2010. He wants to get his old one back, and I wish him well.

Time expired.

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop) (16:30): I am delighted to be able to grieve today. There are a number of issues I want to talk about, principally concerning matters in my electorate down in the South-East, but I might also get the opportunity to get onto a couple of matters of grave concern to me which are involved in my portfolio areas. First, I will talk about Meatworks Road at Bordertown.

Meatworks Road runs past the Tatiara Meat Company, the meatworks just outside of Bordertown. It employs 450-odd workers and is a brilliant little business. It is the biggest export lamb kill works in Australia. Meatworks Road has been extended through to the Dukes Highway and is used as a bypass for people travelling particularly north-south past Bordertown.

For many years the local council, the operators of the meatworks and me as the local member have been lobbying the current government to have the speed limit outside of the meatworks reduced from, I think it was 100 km/h or 110 km/h down to 80 km/h, because of the number of people who were driving out of the town for a couple of kilometres and then pulling into the meatworks for their employment and the amount of heavy vehicle traffic coming in and out of that works.

With the meatworks killing something in excess of 8,000 lambs a day, you can imagine the number of trucks carting those lambs in and then the trucks taking the finished product out. It is a brilliant business. We were trying to get some action from the government and, eventually, after literally years of lobbying, the government has apparently recently reduced the speed limit to 80 km/h.

I have not been on Meatworks Road for a few weeks but a story was related to me by a young woman, who happened to be a guest of my family, who recently drove from the Riverland to the South-East. She drove down Meatworks Road and was pulled over by a police officer and charged with speeding. This person uses the road regularly but she did not see the 80 km/h sign. She pleaded with the police officer to warn her, as she had been travelling the road for years and it had always been 100 km/h and it was quite inadvertent.

The police officer's response was, 'I'm sorry, ma'am, I would love to give you a warning, but the instructions are that we give no more warnings.' If you are 6 km/h over the speed limit you get a bluey—no more warnings. The reality here is that this is a tax measure. The Treasurer is so desperate for money that he has forced the Police Commissioner to send the message down the line that there are no more warnings, it is bill them every time.

So much pressure has been put on police officers. I was talking to a country police officer earlier this week and he told me that even police prosecutors—I presume members of the government understand what they are, they are the ones who actually work in the courts, prepare the cases and carry them through the courts on behalf of the police when a charge has been contested—get a 'please explain' notice from their superior officer if they do not get at least one booking per month.

I said to the country police officer, 'How does a prosecutor book somebody?' He said that the argument is that they are on the road, travelling back and forward to work, and surely they would see somebody doing something wrong, pull them over and book them. I say to the government: if that is the way it is going to police the community, if that is the way it is going to expect police officers to react and interact with communities, particularly in country areas, the communities in which they live, God help the security and safety of our police officers in the future.

No wonder morale in the police force is as low as it is. No wonder that, when you go to local service areas in country areas—and it is probably the same in the city—as few as half of the number of people who are supposed to be operating in that local service area are actually operating there. That is the reality that is happening in South Australia, and I think it is pretty

obvious why. It is the way that the police force has been turned into a tax arm of this government. It is destroying morale within the police force. That is a very serious matter in my electorate, and I am absolutely certain that it is a serious matter right across the state.

Mrs Geraghty interjecting:

Mr WILLIAMS: Can I remind the member for Torrens, who has plenty to say, that it is May Day today, it is workers' day. I suggest to her that because of her government there are not too many workers in this state who are very happy this May Day. They are probably not out there celebrating in the streets; they are probably still very concerned about why their Labor members have let them down over WorkCover. The member for Torrens might spend a bit of time contemplating that rather than interjecting.

I concur with the points that the member for Finnis made a few minutes ago about country health. I am very concerned about country health. I have been concerned about country health since before coming to this place. I have seen nothing but a reduction in services in my electorate. Again, I can only assume, and I am certain it is the case, that we are getting the same treatment right across regional South Australia—a reduction in services.

In question time earlier this week the Treasurer spoke about the health inflator and admitted that it is up around 9 per cent, yet we are seeing increases in the health budget for country health as low as 3 per cent, which is supposed to cover inflation and everything. We are getting a real reduction in the money spent in country health, a very serious reduction, and it is impacting on health services. In question time today the Minister for Health acknowledged that the health outcome for country people is lower than the health expectations and outcomes for city people.

When he can come in here and say that the health outcome for country people is equal to that enjoyed by our cousins in the city, I think he can then say, 'Well, maybe we can look at having some rationalisation of the services in country health,' but until he can do that I would suggest to the minister that we should be putting more money into country health and building services, rather than taking money out and cutting services.

Another issue was raised with me by one of my local councils last weekend when I was at a function in my electorate at Kingston. The chairman of the district council told me that the council wanted to open a road. It is a declared road and has been for 150 years, but it has never been actually used as a road. The road that a group of farmers were using has been closed and the land joined to some neighbouring land which is owned by a local Aboriginal group. The council and the local neighbours do not have a problem with that, but that was the roadway that was used by a group of local farmers, particularly to drive their stock back and forwards between several properties.

So the council said, 'Well, we need to provide a service access for these farmers, we will open this other road,' which has never actually been fenced and cleared to allow access through, 'but we will have to remove a few trees.' They did the right thing and applied to the native vegetation people under the relevant act and said, 'This is what we want to do. We have got to give access to these people.' The attitude of the native vegetation people was completely different. They said, 'We can't have you taking these trees out, we won't allow that.'

We have a government agency that has closed one road and denied access through one road and will not allow access through another gazetted road, which has never been used, because of a few trees. Not only has the native vegetation branch said to the council, 'We won't allow you to take the trees out, we want you to pay for us to go out and do a survey of all the native vegetation on your roadsides. We're going to do a survey and, by the way, it will cost \$83,000.' So that is the answer that the local council got back.

A few minutes ago we had the member for Mawson talking about local councils knocking on the door of state government for some funding. I can tell the member for Mawson that the shoe is firmly on the other foot. This state government is always transferring costs from state to local government. This is a classic example where the native vegetation branch wants the local council to contribute \$83,000 to the cost of employing some of its people so, ostensibly, they can go out and do a survey. This is bureaucracy gone mad, it is government gone mad. It happens when you have ministers who are either incompetent, or do not care. Take your pick, I don't care whether you call them incompetent, or you just acknowledge that they don't care, but it is not good enough in a modern state like South Australia.

Time expired.

Mr PISONI (Unley) (16:40): I would like to address the house on some of the issues affecting my electorate in Unley. Since we are coming to the end of the debate on the Supply Bill, I would like to take the house back to the days of the turn of the century, around about the 2000s, when there was a very thorough consultation in relation to what we can do with Unley Road. Unley Road is a very busy traffic area. It is a multiple use road. It is a road that has evolved over the years. It used to be the local centre, if you like, for corner shops and services, and it has evolved and grown over the years. It is one of the few suburbs in Adelaide where we have a good chunk of strip shopping.

But it also happens to be a major arterial road out to the southern suburbs, particularly those in the hills face zone, and we are seeing a continual increase in traffic on that road over the years. In 2000, an extensive study was done and a number of plans were drawn up for Unley Road, under the former minister for transport, the Hon. Diana Laidlaw. It was a very thorough consultation process that involved all the stakeholders. It involved residents, business owners, building owners, the council, and a number of options were put forward.

Surprisingly—and I say 'surprisingly' because it is not very often this happens—the cheapest option was to deal with the traffic flow, to ensure that we kept the vibrancy of our strip shopping and to ensure that people could still shop on Unley Road. They need to be able to park, of course. If the parking were taken away on Unley Road the shops would die, and it would cause a major problem for Unley residents as well, because one of the attractions of living in Unley, of course, is the strip shopping on King William Road, Unley Road, Fullarton Road, George Street and Duthy Street. There is plenty of character in that strip shopping, and we only have a very small shopping centre there. But we do have a lot of traffic on Unley Road.

This plan enabled there to be two lanes in in the morning and one lane out and the reverse in the afternoon. What we did get from that is we also had dedicated right turning lanes, which is very important for Unley Road. The way it is currently you only need to have some cars parked on the side and someone turning right but not quite pulled to the right and you simply cannot go anywhere. So this plan was still going to enable car parking during the hours of 9 and 4 on either side of the road, enabling the vibrant shopping area to continue and residents to continue to have access to the shopping. In peak hours it would move traffic quickly through the suburb to get people into work. Of course, people using buses, too, would not be held up and would not be delayed.

After all that work was done, all we needed was some funding. However, unfortunately, we had a change of government and the funding was declined. A request was made for the funding through the department to the minister and it was declined. So we are still waiting in Unley for the upgrade of Unley Road, and the Unley Road situation is even worse since that initial plan was set up. But I did mention buses earlier and I would just like to speak about the problem that we are having with them in Unley.

Unley is, of course, close to the city, and for those residents who live towards the centre of my electorate in and around Parkside, Malvern and Unley, trying to catch a bus from bus stop 4, 3 and 2 in Unley is becoming a very difficult task these days. In early April, I was talking to a number of commuters at bus stop 2 in Duthy Street, just near the corner of Young Street, and I was surprised to see that although there were a number of people there who arrived at the bus stop at 10 to eight, a bus did not turn up until 10 past eight, and then it did not stop because on the sign it said, 'Sorry. Full. No pickup.'

They had to wait for the next bus, and the next bus did not arrive until 20 to nine. So they spent 50 minutes at the bus stop, and you can understand why, while I was standing at the bus stop talking to constituents, a number of people walked past. They had given up on the bus and they were walking past thinking, 'Well, I might as well walk into town. I am going to get there quicker anyway.' Fortunately it was a nice day, but it still causes lot of concern.

Of course, we are seeing increased patronage in the buses because fuel prices are escalating enormously. Despite the promises Mr Rudd made when he was in opposition, we are still seeing continual increases in fuel prices. What is extraordinary about that also is that on 29 February the transport ministers all got together and decided to reintroduce indexing on the road user charge. Since 2001—and I know that the member for Hammond would be interested in this—we have had no automatic indexing on fuel excise, and at the very first opportunity we see a united effort by governments all of one party across the country in reintroducing fuel excising on heavy vehicles.

From 1 January 2009 we are seeing an increase from 19¢ to 21¢ a litre and then every year, automatically—bang! This will not involve the CPI increase; the increase on infrastructure will be the percentage increase applied for automatic indexing, and we know it is always higher than CPI. So here we see a federal government that has set up an inquiry into grocery prices, but then it is putting up the excise on the very trucks and vehicles that deliver that food from the farm gate to the supermarket. It is going to have an inflationary effect, and every single person who buys groceries will be paying more because of the new unity of the combined Labor governments. That is the price that we will pay.

Another very great concern in my electorate, of course, is urban consolidation and I express my concern that over the last 15 months, 65 pre-1940 homes have been demolished within the city of Unley and we are seeing a threat to the character of the area and, believe me, it is a very big issue there. People are very concerned, because they are investing enormous amounts of money. The average purchase price of a house in Unley now is getting up to nearly \$800,000. People are making significant investments and the attraction that they have to Unley is the character, the older homes and the larger blocks. Of course, the Unley council has put together an amended development plan that will allow it to have some control over demolition. It will not stop development at all because it will actually enable additional development to happen in the corridors to deal with the demand for high density housing.

It will also give council the ability to designate certain areas in Unley to be heritage and character zones that will have specific requirements, and it will require demolition approval where necessary. You will not just be able to put an application in and demolish without waiting for approval from the council. The problem is that we do not have that in Unley, because Paul Holloway, in the other place, will not sign off on the heritage provisions on stage 1 of the changes to the development act for the City of Unley.

That is in spite of the fact that in the lead-up to the last mayoral election when his Labor mayor, the unsuccessful Labor candidate for the seat of Unley, was running for re-election for mayor, minister Holloway came out and said, 'We will sign a memorandum of understanding about preserving the heritage of Unley', with a big fanfare and a big media release, and here we are 18 months later and the minister is caving in.

The CEO and the mayor have visited the minister, trying to get him to sign this piece of paper so that they can have endorsement of this policy and have the teeth to start preserving the heritage zone, but he will not sign it. He is backing down and saying one thing in an election climate and something else when he is asked to deliver. That is a very serious concern for my constituents in Unley.

Time expired.

[Sitting extended beyond 17:00 on motion of Hon. R.J. McEwen]

The Hon. R.G. KERIN (Frome) (16:51): Today I would like to speak about an issue in my electorate where the Port Pirie community are probably the victims of one of the biggest acts of bureaucratic disobedience that I have ever seen. Hammill House has always been the aged care facility at the Port Pirie Hospital, and it is very highly regarded in Port Pirie. It has 32 beds and it was realised back in about 2000 that an upgrade was necessary.

At the time, there were people in the department who did not want to upgrade Hammill House. They wanted to outsource the beds. They spoke to Helping Hand and, rather than proceeding with an upgrade of the hospital, they actually came to government and said that they would rather get rid of the aged care beds, hand the licences over to Helping Hand and get out of the game. At the time Dean Brown was health minister. We met with the community on several occasions. The community of Port Pirie, the council, the mayor—everyone—made it absolutely clear that they wanted to keep Hammill House.

We saw some backsliding within the department: obviously it did not agree. I think some of them thought that it was not long until an election, that they would try to stagger it and then they might be able to talk a new government into doing what they wanted, rather than what the government wanted. Having experienced that, Dean and I called in the department. We had it out with them, and they were instructed to go ahead with the upgrade of Hammill House, as had been announced in the budget. With that, the election came and went and, of course, the Labor Party took over.

After the election, the Labor government reannounced that the work would be done. Its first budget stated that the commencement date was December 2002, completion due December 2003 (which is 4½ years ago now), upgrade of 32 aged-care beds currently provided in Hammill House. In 2003-04, again the department had stalled. It had gone into hiding from the minister on this one. In the 2003-04 budget, completion was due June 2004, the upgrade of the aged-care beds. Again nothing happened. Completion was due June 2004, but when May 2005 came around, still nothing had happened. The budget for 2005-06: completion due June 2006, upgrade of the aged-care beds.

By this time, as members can imagine, the people of Port Pirie were getting very anxious. They had been promised the upgrade of the 32 beds. Ministers had constantly reannounced the fact that it was to happen, but a group of people within the department did not agree that that was the best way to go, so they snubbed their nose at the various ministers and did absolutely nothing. Countless inquiries have been made and a very weak excuse is always given by the department as to why nothing has happened.

After a question in this house in early 2006, the minister agreed to meet with me, and I think the general manager of Country Health at the time. It was made clear at that meeting that it was going to go ahead. There was some apologising for the fact that it had gone off the radar. Very soon afterwards minister Hill put out a press release stating:

The State Government has approved a \$2.27 million refurbishment of the Hammill House aged care facility in Port Pirie. Minister Hill said a decision four years ago to involve a private, not-for-profit aged care provider in the running of Hammill House was opposed by the Port Pirie Regional Health Service and the community, and today's announcement will be welcome news.

'The local community wanted its health service to continue overseeing the aged care provision, and the State Government and Department of Health and Country Health SA have worked hard to accommodate those wishes,' he said.

These refurbishments will bring those areas of the aged care unit to current national nursing home standards and ensure the provision of quality aged care services for the community.

In the 2006-07 budget (which members will remember was delayed somewhat), it was noted that money was put aside for completion of Hammill House, due February 2007, upgrade of aged-care beds.

This has appeared in six budgets. The minister needs to tell the bureaucrats to do it. It is not fair on the people of Port Pirie. There is now great fear in the community because new standards came in this year for aged-care beds. The state government's facility at Port Pirie at Hammill House for aged care does not meet the accreditation standards, which leaves us in a very difficult position. The community has constantly made its point of view clear. I have had so many assurances from the government that something is happening. After each one, you will hear that an architect has visited or whatever, then the issue goes away for another three or four months. You stir it up again: it just goes away again.

Quite frankly, the department is not doing what it is told to do: it is absolute disobedience. A couple of people in the department did not agree with the initial decision and, seven years later, they are still thumbing their nose at ministerial instruction after ministerial instruction, which is nowhere near good enough. After a question being asked in October last year, what worried me was that the minister said, 'I think we followed up that commitment to the letter. I will get some further advice for the member because I do not have all the details in my memory at this stage.' I am just worried that the department is now saying that, as it has spent some other money at the hospital, it has filled the commitment.

Both the former government and this government committed to 32 upgraded aged-care beds at Hammill House at the Port Pirie hospital, and that has not happened. I wrote to the minister in March last year. I received a reply in March last year saying that the matter was being addressed and I would receive a reply very soon. Fourteen months later, still no reply. We are seeing people in the department absolutely thumbing their nose at the authority. It is time the minister got on top of it and ensured it happens. This is defiance of the minister of the greatest order.

As I said, it is seven years since it was first mooted and it is 4½ years since it was supposed to be completed. The families of the residents are becoming very annoyed at what they view as an absolute mess. On top of that, today I was interested to hear the minister's refusal to deny the downgrading of 25 rural health units to aged-care units. I think that would be an absolute disaster. Again that decision is not driven by any political agenda: it is driven by bureaucratic agenda, which is what has happened with health for the past couple of years. We have bureaucrats

in the Health Commission who do not want to listen to ministerial instructions. They have had a long history of it and it is about time the government got on top of them and made them do what they are told.

When the Labor cabinet has allocated money to Hammill House at Port Pirie four times and the department has thumbed its nose and done absolutely zero about it, you have to ask where is the discipline to make that department do what it is supposed to do. This is a disgraceful situation. Some of the people who initially raised this matter with me in 2001, 2002, 2003 are no longer with us. It is a totally unacceptable situation, and I hope the minister finally gets firmer and ensures the bureaucrats do what they are being told.

The Hon. L. STEVENS (Little Para) (17:00): I want to spend my time this afternoon talking about a very important report undertaken for the City of Playford by Professor Dick Blandy from the University of South Australia's Centre for Innovation. The report is entitled, 'Assisting economic activity in the City of Playford: a quantitative assessment of the Playford economy'. While my electorate comprises parts of the City of Playford, it also contains a similar amount of the City of Salisbury, and much of what is said in the report applies to the City of Salisbury, as well as to part of that long sweep of the northern suburbs.

I congratulate the City of Playford for commissioning the report from Dick Blandy. The report is part of its strategic planning for the area over the next 10 to 15 years. The executive summary states:

This report estimates Playford's gross regional product (GRP) at just under \$2.1 billion. This represents about 3.4 per cent of South Australia's economy. Over the 1991-2006 period Playford's economy grew at an estimated average rate of 2.7 per cent per annum, compared to a figure of 2.5 for South Australia as a whole. Over the last five years, however, Playford grew faster than the state economy (4.9 per cent per annum compared to 2.5 per cent per annum).

That statistic for the most recent years is what is so important in terms of the future. Dick Blandy mentions that a better than state employment performance was more related to lower paid jobs than before because the rest of South Australia caught up with Playford in productivity terms. The report continues to make important points about workforce. He talks about Playford's economy being heavily dominated by manufacturing activity to the extent that measured by an unpronounceable index 'Playford can be assessed as having a major lack of economic diversification'. The report states:

...Playford's economy has been diversifying rapidly over the past 15 years as manufacturing's dominance has retreated and other sectors have expanded fast. Sectors that have a large share of the Playford economy or that have a medium share and are growing at least as fast as the average for Playford (and that are not essentially driven by local demand) are:

- Manufacturing (40 per cent share, falling rapidly),
- Property and business services (6 per cent share, increasing rapidly),
- Agriculture, forestry and fishing (5 per cent share, increasing rapidly), and
- Government administration and defence (5 per cent share, increasing rapidly).

Dick Blandy makes the point that these sectors are Playford's economic drivers. They are very significant in that they are main sources of economic growth because their markets are not confined to the local economy. He also mentions that other industry sectors are non-driver sectors but that they are still economically important. He makes the point that these sectors provide much economic activity and employment and are very important in consequence, but they cannot expand faster than the Playford economy itself because they are essentially dependent on the local economy. He points to the Lyell McEwin Hospital, which is a very large organisation and a big employer. The report states:

...if the Lyell McEwin Health Service were to become the focus of a regional health precinct serving a community stretching beyond Playford, health and community services...would become a significant economic driver for Playford.

Interestingly, of course, that is exactly the plan for that hospital and health service. It continues:

Similarly, the mooted development of an intermodal freight exchange on the border with Salisbury could accelerate the growth and size of the transport and storage sector, sufficiently for it to become an economic driver.

The report goes on to talk about workforce skills in relation to locals and outsiders, as follows:

Playford's economy has been up-skilling fast...The pattern of economic development in Playford has been such that the growth of jobs for less qualified people, while positive, has not nearly kept pace with the growth of jobs for more qualified people. There is a broadly based prospect that high-level skill shortages could emerge in Playford.

Of course, Playford will not be the only place in Australia that is affected by that. It continues:

People without a post-school qualification living in Playford have faced a difficult task in gaining employment over the past 15 years and that task will become even more difficult in the future.

In relation to the future, the report states:

Irrespective of whether Playford faces fast or slow growth in the future, the possession of post-school qualifications will be a major influence on a person's chances of getting a job in Playford (or anywhere else, for that matter).

Dick Blandy then makes some recommendations in terms of the strategy that he recommends for the future. The report states:

Easily, the most important strategy for Playford is to take all possible measures in conjunction with other levels of government to ensure that as many of its citizens as possible acquire post-school qualifications...One possible approach is that being considered in the City of Salisbury to expand the educational role of local libraries into community learning centres linked to schools, universities and the vocational education and training system through expanded internet services and support activities of various kinds.

I guess this very significant recommendation gets back to education and to making sure that every citizen has the best possible chance. I believe it behoves us to absolutely focus on education, and it is really pleasing that some of the money for the new super schools is becoming available and is targeting this particular community. However, there is much to be done right across the board in terms of every citizen.

The other area of importance relates to the very beginning, that is, the early childhood development strategies that Thinker in Residence Fraser Mustard has outlined, such as the importance of ensuring that every child has every chance of developing their potential by understanding that brain development occurs while a child is in utero. However, the most significant development occurs in the very early years of a child's existence.

So, the state government's strategy of introducing early childhood development centres (there is one set up now at Elizabeth Grove; another one is on the way at Parafield Gardens; and there is one at Wynn Vale and one in Gawler) and the support and nurturing of young children and their parents are very, very significant in making sure that every one of those kids has the best possible chance through to their education and, finally, into the workforce.

I want to mention that there was local consultation by members of parliament Tony Zappia and Mike Butler prior to the 2020 summit, and the issue of early childhood development was a high priority for the people at that consultation, and it was taken up by the Prime Minister at the summit.

I congratulate the council on this report. I look forward to working with the council and encouraging the partnerships, which I hope one day might end in the amalgamation of Playford and Salisbury councils. I believe that, if those two entities combined, their power in the north would be very significant indeed.

Time expired.

Mr HANNA (Mitchell) (17:10): I have 10 minutes today, and I want to outline some of my views on water issues. As I go around doorknocking, I find that one of the issues that repeatedly comes up is water, water supply and the nuisance of water restrictions.

I will just briefly put this into context by referring to what is happening at a national level. We have recently had the announcement from the federal Labor government that \$10 million is going to be spent on water initiatives, and a lot of that will benefit South Australia. There has been a fair bit of political debate about who really came up with the ideas. It is true that this funding is built on the National Water Initiative instituted under the Howard government, but this current Labor government is the one that is actually coming out with more concrete proposals as to how the money will be spent.

I am very pleased to see that, of the money that has been the subject of the announcement, \$3 billion is set aside for water buy-backs. For years I have believed that this has been part of the solution; that the market will help us to decide who should and who should not stay in the business of irrigation, agriculture and other farming. When irrigators find that they cannot afford water at the sort of price that should be paid if we had a truly rational water pricing system,

they will go off and do something else. If they can sell their water allocation, they can actually leave the farming market with some dignity.

The trade-off in the deal is that nearly \$6 billion will be spent on upgrading irrigation infrastructure. There are other smaller amounts—for example, \$1.5 billion for urban water initiatives, and that is great. If there is going to be more money for rainwater tank subsidies, that certainly fits into the scheme I have been pushing for. If it is going to assist us in harvesting the water that comes out of the sky and stormwater generally, that will be a good thing.

However, I do have criticisms of the federal scheme, particularly as it effectively has a 12-year implementation plan. We are reassured by minister Wong that a lot of the money will be spent early in the next decade, but we need the money right now. Mike Young, I recall, described the federal government measures 'as a plan to have a plan', and I think that is a good description. Of course, we in South Australia can have only a very limited influence on how things are carved up at a national level. We just have to remain hopeful and forget any resentment that Victoria has held out for a particularly good deal for the northern Victoria farmers.

I quote from an article by Bill Nicholas, which was provided to me by my friends at the Murray-Darling Association. The article states:

Did you know that carrying buckets of water to keep your garden alive won't make a skerrick of difference to the death throes of Lake Alexandrina, Lake Albert or the Coorong? That's because Adelaide takes less than 0.7 per cent of water out of the Murray Darling Basin.

The nine million households from Adelaide to Brisbane use negligible water compared with rural users. This was outlined to a water seminar by Ross Young, executive director of the Water Services Association of Australia and a former general manager of Melbourne Water.

Giving yourself a hernia lugging water to the roses is a purely symbolic gesture foisted upon you by a government that is running a public relations campaign in its purest form—making you feel like you're part of the solution. The lower Murray is in crisis with the lakes and the Coorong is drying.

I endorse those remarks by Bill Nicholas.

I want to now turn to what I think should be happening in South Australia. Obviously, there are two approaches that can be taken: one is to increase the supply of water for our users in South Australia; and the second is to decrease the demand.

In terms of supply, I deal first with the topical issue of the desalination plant. In my view, although it could be of tremendous benefit to Adelaide water consumers, a number of hard questions need to be asked. I have written an extensive letter to the Minister for Water Security with questions relating to energy consumption, the means of delivery of water and the risks to our precious gulf waters that might arise as a result of building the desalination plant, but more on that later.

In terms of increasing availability of water, I note that some fantastic work has been done in Adelaide to come up with the Waterproofing Adelaide program, but far too little of that program has actually been implemented. The statistics on the rain that falls on Adelaide, and the amount that runs out to sea, are shocking when one considers that we are restricted to one day a week for the watering of our gardens.

This leads me to the question of the demand for water and the way that the government has gone about restricting the watering of gardens. It needs to be borne in mind that household consumption is about 9 per cent of the state's water consumption, and garden use is considered to be about 40 per cent of that. So, we are talking about, at most, 3 per cent of South Australia's use of Murray River water. Given that there is some watering still going on, perhaps the decrease could only ever be 1 or 2 per cent of all of the water that we are taking out of the River Murray.

If one considers the entire set of extractions of water from the River Murray, we can come up with figures like 0.001 per cent that is actually going into our gardens, and one wonders how much difference those restrictions are really going to make. On top of that, discussions with people in my community suggest that probably more than half the people are no longer adhering to water restrictions, and those who are adhering to the restrictions are building up resentment of the government for the continuing restrictions and also of their neighbours who do not follow the rules.

However, when more than half the population is disregarding the rules, you have to question whether that lack of respect actually implies that something is wrong with the law in the first place. In fact, I think the current restrictions are unnecessary. If we had a proper water-pricing

system in South Australia, we would not need the water police going up and down the streets checking whether or not hoses are on.

If we scrapped the annual supply charge, we could have people paying for the water they use. In the recent survey I carried out throughout my electorate, I found there was tremendous support for this notion. It is also not something entirely original. Out of the 25 or so water utilities throughout Australia, four already have a system whereby they have no supply charge but an increasing level of charges per kilolitre as more is consumed.

If we had this sort of system, we would not need police officers or water police driving up and down the streets; people will police themselves. Most of the water used by domestic consumers is used within the house. So, people will decide for themselves to save water in the toilet, in the kitchen and in the laundry if we were to have that sort of water-pricing scheme.

Finally, I will make some perhaps controversial remarks about the use of recycled water. It is a classic case here of the government taking a populist approach rather than an educational approach. We know scientifically that recycled water is actually safer to drink than the water we currently get out of our taps, yet there is a so-called 'yuck' factor. People do not like the idea of drinking effluent that has been treated, even if it is cleaner and more free from bacteria and minerals than our current tap water. One day we will have to face this issue, and I wish that the state government would get on with educating people about the benefits of recycled water rather than just giving in to the 'yuck' factor.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (17:20): I wish to make some comments as shadow minister for social inclusion. In particular, I want to just float the notion that the state government is not looking laterally enough at the issue of prisoner rehabilitation in relation to the current economic conditions and future economic opportunities.

I note with interest that the government has Monsignor Cappo from the Social Inclusion Board looking at how the mining boom can help those less fortunate within the community. Why Monsignor Cappo, and not a minister, needs to look at that is an interesting question. I put on the record—

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson interjecting:

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: The Attorney-General, in his typical smart fashion, suggests that Monsignor Cappo is a minister. Of course, he is not an elected minister and he is not accountable to this parliament in any way, shape or form. However, I wish to say that, as a former minister for corrections, I have an interest in prisoner rehabilitation. I put to the Attorney—when he finds time and is not reading the TAB form—that he might want to put to cabinet—

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson interjecting:

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Yes, of course they do. The Attorney might want to put to his cabinet colleagues that there is an opportunity for the government to get together with the mining industry and retrain some of the prisoners to become truck drivers for that industry.

Let me expand on this. The Premier and BHP are on record, I understand, suggesting that the Roxby Downs mine (just one mine) will require the largest truck order in the world's history. That is what we have been told. Common sense dictates that if it is the largest truck order in the world's history you will probably need a lot of drivers. A lot of the prisoners tend to be low-skilled and they tend to have very poor literacy and numeracy rates. It seems that a lot of them go back into prison because they reoffend. When they leave prison they are still low-skilled, still have poor literacy and numeracy rates, and there are poor link programs between the prisons and the community sector.

It does seem that a lot of them reoffend because they end up in a poor financial position on leaving prison because of a lack of work opportunities for those who have been in prison. I refer to the new prison to be built in Murray Bridge. There is a lot of space and an opportunity to build a facility (possibly funded by the mining sector or certainly from the royalties you will get from the mining industry) to teach the prisoners how to drive these trucks. That will give them a high value job, it will give them a sense of meaning, it will reconnect them to the community and, I think, there will be a far greater chance of less reoffending from those who are trained.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: Quite possibly it might also help them to make their next ram raid better.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: I thought some idiot would suggest what the Attorney just suggested, that it would help them with their ram raid skills. That was the nature of the Attorney-General's interjection. The problem with the Attorney-General is that he has a smart answer for everything except prisoner rehabilitation. If he spent as much time trying to correct and improve prisoners' skill sets as he does in thinking up smart arse interjections we may have a lower crime rate in South Australia.

I took the opportunity to raise this informally with BHP during my short time as leader. I think it is something that the government should pick up, because this opportunity will come but once. When it finally signs off, BHP will place the world's largest truck order. If is the largest number of trucks being ordered, common sense says that you need the largest number of drivers. Most of the prison population is male. Most of them already drive. Most of them have low literacy and numeracy rates. One of the easiest jobs to train them in is driving.

We will need a significant number of drivers for the mining industry. The mining industry tends to be in the outback areas of the state. There are fewer opportunities for them to reconnect to the old criminal elements that tend to harbour in the metropolitan areas. I think it is a fair policy, for Monsignor Cappo and the Social Inclusion Board to have a look at getting the mining industry together and saying, 'How many drivers do you need; what skill sets do you need; and can we assist in delivering those skill sets?' Just as the airline industry builds a model, if you like, of the inside of a plane and places trained pilots in a simulator, I see no reason why one of those cannot be built to get around the Attorney-General's concern about ram raids. Build a simulator out at Murray Bridge or anywhere else.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: Simulator.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: That as well. Train the prisoners so that we have less chance of them reoffending. Whilst I acknowledge that the government has taken a step to have Monsignor Cappo do some thinking—because none of the ministers can—I float the idea for the parliament and the government to consider, because I think it is a unique opportunity that is presented to the state. It is a way of sending a message to the prison population that the parliament is concerned about their skill set, which has in part delivered them to the situations in which they find themselves.

We owe it to the community generally to try to reduce the crime rate by improving the skill set of the prison population, so that when they come out they have a better chance of not reoffending because they find themselves in better economic circumstances. The mining industry is an opportunity. If you believe the Premier, 30 mines are about to be approved over the next period. With 30 mines there will be a good opportunity for this type of skill set to be used, and it is an opportunity that I think the state should take to train prisoners in truck driving and other skills for the mining industry. I encourage the Attorney to take this idea to his cabinet and have some work done on it.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel) (17:28): I am pleased to make a contribution to the 10 minute grievance debate as a consequence of the Supply Bill process. I would like to continue some remarks I was making yesterday when I spoke to the Supply Bill, particularly in relation to infrastructure and the incredible need for infrastructure to be built in the electorate of Kavel, which I represent in this place.

As I stated yesterday, land is being continually opened up for residential development. A recent parcel of land has been opened up on the southern boundary of the township of Mount Barker that will see, at the latest count, at least 835 new homes built. If you calculate how many people on average live in a home, that would be close to (if not more than) 2,000 new residents coming into the township of Mount Barker.

There is continued residential development in Littlehampton, which is only two or three kilometres from Mount Barker, across the other side of the freeway. And then only a hop, skip and a jump a few kilometres further along the road is the township of Nairne, which is continuing to develop in a residential way.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson interjecting:

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: I don't think so, Attorney.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson interjecting:

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: No, I doubt it very much.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: So, you are invincible?

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: I am not saying I am invincible at all. I am just saying that I think people view me as a good local member and as such I garner the majority of support throughout the length and breadth of my electorate. The Attorney, being a scholar of polling booth results, will know that I won every booth in my electorate at the 2006 election. We all know that the Liberal Party did not fare very well as a whole in this state, but I was able to win every booth in the 2006 election, compared to the 2002 result where I did not win the majority of support in every booth. I will have had another four years of incumbency when the 2010 election comes around and I am reasonably confident that I will hold my seat.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson interjecting:

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: I will not respond to any more interjections from the Attorney. It is an unnecessary diversion. I will continue with my remarks concerning the real need for infrastructure in supporting that significant residential development. The main infrastructure build requirement is that of a second freeway interchange. Those people who are aware of the lie of the land, so to speak, in that district will know where the second freeway interchange is required.

Members interjecting:

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: A very good direction from the Government Whip to the Attorney. Full support for that direction. What has occurred through the District Council of Mount Barker with these 800 plus new homes is that the council has been forced into imposing what it calls a developer contribution on each one of these particular residential blocks that are coming on to the market. That is a result of the lack of commitment from the state government in providing the necessary infrastructure that it is responsible for.

Part of the cost in building the new freeway interchange is the responsibility of the state government but, because the government has not been prepared to commit to this significant piece of infrastructure, the council has had to devise an alternative form of funding through developer contributions. What the result of that will be is that the cost of these contributions will be passed on to the end consumer, which are those people who are going to purchase those home sites, those vacant blocks of land on which they propose to build their home. So, it goes to the very core of the significant issue of housing affordability.

We have heard the Minister for Families and Communities speak in the house just this week about housing affordability and how these particular projects are taking place in the outer northern suburbs of the Adelaide metropolitan area. The lack of commitment by the state government in providing the infrastructure, which is their responsibility, will certainly have an adverse affect on housing affordability in these particular areas of land which have been opened up in the Mount Barker township for residential development.

The Minister for Families and Communities says one thing—that they are providing incentives and the like to assist with housing affordability—but there is no coordination, there is no consistent approach across government in addressing housing affordability in other districts. On average, I am advised, the developer contributions will increase the cost of these blocks by \$15,000. That means the potential purchaser has to borrow an additional \$15,000 from their financial institution (usually a bank) to be able to support the purchase of the land and then they will look to borrow an additional amount of money to build a home on it.

We have talked about long-term finance arrangements in relation to the Marjorie Jackson-Nelson Hospital and how flawed the proposed financing arrangement is for that. What the government is forcing on to new land and home package buyers is having to pay an additional \$15,000 over a 30-year term. That is the maximum home loan term usually written in home financing arrangements these days. If one adds \$15,000 to a 30-year term loan and amortises it over 30 years it will probably be close to \$70,000 or \$80,000 (I would have to calculate it out and look at the table books that I have kept from my banking days). They are additional funds that prospective home buyers have to find.

The government must have a consistent approach to housing affordability. It cannot say that it is embarking on projects in the outer northern suburbs and then not support local communities, such as Mount Barker, by providing a level of affordable housing. That is one example but there are other examples of the critical need for infrastructure.

I have spoken about one other issue in the house on numerous occasions (and I will continue to raise it in this place until something is done about it), and that is the Nairne Primary

School crossing. I have been advised that the Minister for Road Safety has finally engaged with the District Council of Mount Barker in an endeavour to find a solution to this problem. However, I am advised that the minister's expectations of the council are extremely onerous, to the point where, if one looks at the costs related to resolving this issue, what the council has to bear and what the government has to bear are incomparable.

Time expired.

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (17:38): I propose to continue my remarks from yesterday in which I outlined my concerns at the lack of consideration by the government towards the provision of housing for the some 30 per cent of the community who will never have access to private rental or to the acquisition of their own home.

Housing does matter. What we live in does matter because it is not only a place of shelter, but it is a place of security and comfort, a feeling of being part of a community, and it is very important. One of the aspects that I considered of concern was the massive sell-off of Housing Trust accommodation that is proposed over the forthcoming 10 years—800 a year—and the plight of the some 30,000 people who are on the waiting list for supported or subsidised housing.

There are initiatives that have had the benefit of assisting private rental owners through subsidies available from commonwealth funding. For as long as that is available that is an important initiative. We would be suggesting to the government, though, that a way of securing the opportunity for accommodation for the other 70 per cent of the population is to ensure that there is adequate land release, that homes are affordable without the heavy burden of stamp duty rates, and that they are comparable to other states in the country. Otherwise we are going to have a continued exodus of our young people seeking to acquire property interstate. It is hardly surprising that we have a net 3,500 loss of population in this state every year comprising those who go interstate, and that Queensland has a plus of 18,000 a year. When you compare the stamp duty obligations, there is about a \$10,000 difference in stamp duty if one were to buy a \$300,000 home in each of those states. Ours, of course, is at the negative end.

One matter that has been of concern over the last 18 months is the government's attempt to recover funds from those who simply cannot afford it. I go back to those who are living in Housing Trust accommodation. One measure was to impose new obligations in the September 2006 budget in respect of aged residents and single parents. The formula applied to the rental they paid, it was changed and their rents went up. As if that was not miserable enough, over the last 18 months the government has decided that it is going to charge tenants for water rates and water consumption. That, in itself, would not bring a howl of opposition from the Liberal Party, except that the government insists upon charging them even though it will not provide them with an independent meter to their property.

So, if they live in a dwelling of a cluster of, say, 20 and there is one meter for the property, the government has announced that it will simply divide the cost of the water consumption between the dwelling owners. It indicated initially that it would do that with a formula that would provide assistance for those who were in financial need. The government has made a couple of attempts to indicate that it has listened to the concerns expressed about this matter, and I will list the fundamental concerns. Why should someone be paying for water consumption where they have not been using it? Why should a single occupant in one property be paying for the same water as someone living in another property with half a dozen occupants? Why should a person who is water conscious be paying for the excesses and waste of a neighbour?

These are fundamental questions. It is quite unjust and inequitable for those people to be paying for anything other than what they are consuming. Every other householder or property owner has a meter and is obliged to pay rates either for consumption and any excess, but Housing Trust tenants—the people who are most often unable to afford this—have been expected to accept this inequitable formula. I have received dozens of letters on this matter, and here is one from today:

Dear Ms Chapman, I am a 72-year old pensioner, single tenant in a group of 24 units. Some of these units have two or more tenants as well as illegals who come and go. I have lived here for 15 years in a block of six. Only two of us in my block are single.

Then she goes on to say that she has received two letters about the recent announcement of how this water rate is going to apply. She says she has had two letters from Ms Fulcher, who is the Director of Housing SA, and she states:

The first letter she stated: not always a single person uses less water than two or three; household size was not a reliable indicator of water consumption. That statement is absurd.

Then she goes on to say:

A few days ago I received a letter from Ms Fulcher, informing tenants about water meter changes. She stated: meters will be installed specifically where there are different size properties, because of greater variation in tenant water use. A blatant contradiction.

That is the tenor of what I am getting, notwithstanding the other letters that go on to say how unfair and inequitable it is. We have tenants who have announced publicly that they will not pay the rent because the government intends to take it out of their rental accounts. We have absolute chaos in this area and yet the government refuses to deal with it. Organisations which are also concerned about this include the Housing Trust Tenants Association. They have recently written making a plea to the Hon. Jenny Macklin, who is, of course, the new federal housing minister, and I will read from the correspondence that went out recently on 11 March, as follows:

We are the Housing Trust Tenants Association, the original advocacy group for tenants. We were formed in the early 1980's to be a voice for the Housing Trust Tenants and we were unanimously endorsed twice by the UTLC but were defunded in 1997 because of our close ties with the ALP, which was the then party in opposition. We are the only Tenants Association that achieved establishing our own community legal service.

So, it is quite open about its ties. The correspondence goes on to say that the association is very concerned about the plight of refugees, and their not having access to housing and the community confrontation that is resulting from it. The association states:

We did bring our concerns to the state government years ago that if something wasn't done we would have racial problems and we are now living in the very environment we were trying to avoid. We cannot blame the refugees—

and it goes on to say that the state government is not providing them with any assistance. On public housing in South Australia, they write of the big fire sale, the sell-off of houses and the obligation to pay the debt each state has to pay the commonwealth. The association also pleads to the federal minister:

We also ask for a moratorium on selling public housing to private landlords or investors on the open market. The only option for the purchase of public housing should be to the owner/occupier. We believe in more public housing and not less.

These are the very things that, during previous elections, this organisation complained of about Liberal governments. The wheel is now turning. I will give an example of some of the material issued during the 1993 election by the Housing Trust Tenants Association. One notice states:

Warning: Protect Our Homes

The Liberals spending cuts to Public Housing mean nearly 1,000 Housing Trust Tenants homes would be sold each year.

This was written 15 years ago. It continues:

Some of us would be forced into renting in the private market which means not only would your rent skyrocket but you may have to move each year as the house lease expires or become homeless as in the USA.

We may be feeling the pinch under Labor but we'll really feel the squeeze under the Liberals...Don't cut off your nose to spite your face.

The notice concludes with a Hewson quote. This is all coming true, as it is exactly what the Labor Party is doing. In 1997, the association issued this notice:

Warning: Danger Ahead.

When we warned you that the Liberals would sell 1,000 houses a year they said it scare-mongering.

When we said they would introduce market rents for Housing Trust tenants they said it was scare-mongering.

However, it has all happened.

Now we fear they plan to privatise the Housing Trust.

We will be voting for Patrick Conlon, Labor candidate for Elder, because he supports public housing! Don't take a chance!

Here we are, ladies and gentlemen, just over 10 years later, and what have we got? We have a privatised Housing Trust; 8,000 houses going on the market; people are being charged for water consumption without having equity in even their own meter; and we have a situation where 30,000

people are alienated from any possible access to affordable housing and shelter. How the wheel turns!

Time expired.

Motion carried.

Bill taken through its remaining stages.

ICT SERVICES

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Kaurua—Minister for Health, Minister for the Southern Suburbs, Minister Assisting the Premier in the Arts) (17:48): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.D. HILL: In question time today, the Leader of the Opposition asked the Premier a question (which I answered) about the cost of ICT services in the Department of Health. His claim of a \$51.4 million overrun in Microsoft licence costs was totally wrong.

In the transition to a centralised ICT system across government, the health department was provided with additional annual Microsoft licences than had been used in the past. The majority of licences are now in use, as new computers have been brought online over the life of the contract.

These additional licences came at a cost of about \$2 million extra per annum for a three-year period, a contract that ends this financial year. There has been no impact from this contract on either the operation of our hospitals or our patients.

In fact, we are spending more than \$1 billion more in the health system than under the former government. I am advised that there will be huge savings to government from the creation of this centralised ICT system. I must say that much of those savings, to the chagrin of my colleagues, will go into health. However, as demand for health services has increased, so has the demand for leading-edge technology in our public hospitals, and the figure that the opposition used is an indicator of the extra demand predicted for ICT services as our system grows. Just as we need more ambulances, hospital beds and the like, we also need more ICT.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (REAL PROPERTY) BILL

Consideration in committee of the Legislative Council's amendment.

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

The amendment will delete clause 68 of the bill. Clause 68 amends section 273 of the Real Property Act to require certification of an instrument of a prescribed class by each party to the instrument, or by a solicitor or registered conveyancer acting on behalf of each party. Although the government believes that the proposed amendment to section 273 of the existing act will help eliminate the risk of fraud, the conveyancing industry has expressed concerns about the amendment.

It is recognised and accepted by industry that these amendments will be required when a national electronic conveyancing system is introduced. The government is prepared at this stage to remove clause 68 from the bill to allow the issue raised by the industry to be worked through before the introduction of amendments to allow for the introduction of electronic conveyancing in South Australia, which is expected to be the year after next.

Mrs REDMOND: I am pleased to see that the government has agreed to the suggestion which I think I raised in this chamber and which was certainly raised by the Institute of Conveyancers in relation to this matter. I indicated at the time of the second reading debate on this bill that I had done conveyancing for more than 30 years, and in all that time I had certified a lot of instruments and never once contemplated having to certify the validity of the identity of the people whose documents I was signing.

It would be common, for instance, if I were acting for a purchaser to prepare the transfer and sign that certifying it correct—and that is exactly what this clause deals with; it is the certification by the conveyancer or solicitor that the instrument is correct—and all of us who work in that industry have always taken that to mean that it was correct for the purposes of the Real Property Act, but without having to go through any sort of 100-point check to establish that the people who came in and signed the document really were those people.

I must say that, in all the years that I did conveyancing, I never once had any doubt about the identity of the people I was representing, but the implication of the particular clause that the government had in its bill originally was that not only would I have to satisfy myself as to the correct identity of those people but also as to the identity of the other parties to the instrument, that is, the vendors' identity. The problem arose, of course, because at the time of the briefing on this bill, we were advised that the industry had been consulted and was in favour of it, but in fact the industry yelled loud and long that the particular provision that is now being deleted was a problem to them and that they had always indicated that it was a problem. I am pleased that the government has decided to withdraw it for the time being.

I recognise that there will be changes once we have electronic conveyancing, and I am glad that I got out of that area before we got to that point. We will sadly come to the point where we no longer have the beautiful certificates of title that we used to have (already we no longer have them) and eventually we will get to the point where conveyance will occur by pressing one button to ensure payment of the moneys and another to ensure the transfer of the title. It will all happen automatically and it will be a sad day as it was a pleasurable part of my former job to go to the Lands Titles Office on a weekly basis and participate in the numerous transactions that occurred in the settlements room, usually on a Friday every week, with lots of people who got on very well with a system that worked very well, albeit a very simple system.

I am sure we will have a lot more problems with conveyancing once we move to an electronic based system, and there will no doubt be all sorts of issues that arise, having not been corrected by people looking at documents and inspecting them, as we have had until now. I am pleased to see that the government has decided to support the suggestions made by the conveyancers that we not proceed to put this provision into the bill at this time.

Motion carried.

At 17:57 the house adjourned until Tuesday 6 May 2008 at 11:00.