

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY**Thursday 8 May 2008**

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

LEGAL PROFESSION BILL

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Kaurua—Minister for Health, Minister for the Southern Suburbs, Minister Assisting the Premier in the Arts) (10:30): I move:

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

Motion carried.

EMERGENCY SERVICES FUNDING (PROTECTION OF FUNDS) AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (10:31): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Emergency Services Funding Act 1998. Read a first time.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (10:31): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

There are a number of private members' matters which I know members want to get to today, so this contribution will be brief. This bill is a very simple bill. This bill prevents a government from funding compensation payments out of the emergency services fund if the CFS, or other agencies covered by the fund, are sued for negligence. The reason for my introducing this bill is that, from time to time, there are incidents, for instance, in the CFS's case, bushfires, where members of the public think the CFS has done the wrong thing and they then seek to sue the CFS. The most recent Port Lincoln fires are an example: a group of residents who were affected by the fire think they have a legal action against the CFS.

This is not to stop legal actions against the CFS. This bill does not do that: it does not stop citizens from seeking compensation from the government. This bill stops the government from paying compensation out of the levy fund. My view is that, if the CFS (or government) is found to be liable for some form of negligence and a fire results, then that payment should be out of general revenue and not out of the emergency services levy. I do not see why residents should be levied to pay compensation in those circumstances. It is a very simple bill: it needs no more explanation than that. I look forward to the support of the house in due course.

Debate adjourned on motion of Ms Geraghty.

CHILD SEX OFFENDERS REGISTRATION (REGISTRATION OF INTERNET ACTIVITIES) AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (10:34): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Child Sex Offenders Registration Act 2006. Read a first time.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (10:34): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

Again my contribution will be brief for the same reasons. Under section 13 of the Child Sex Offenders Registration Act (an act to deal with paedophiles), there are certain requirements for those who have been found guilty of child sex offences to register certain details with the relevant authorities, mainly the police: their name or former names, their place of residence, their place of work, their travel details. A whole range of personal details are required by the authorities so that the paedophiles can be monitored in a way that keeps the community safe.

Recently, I travelled to New South Wales and noticed that their act also has provisions for email addresses to be registered so that paedophiles can be monitored. An offence is created if they do not register all their email addresses. Given the rise in the use of chat rooms by the youth of the community and given that they are very vulnerable to not knowing who is on the other end of the email, it seems sensible to me that the next step in offering better community protection is to have people who have been found guilty of child sex offences (as per the act) register their email addresses with the appropriate authorities.

This principle picks up exactly the same principle that exists in New South Wales. It offers the community a higher level of protection and it offers the police force and the appropriate

authorities another tool to ensure the community is safe. Again I look forward to the support of the house in due course.

Debate adjourned on motion of Ms Geraghty.

NATIVE VEGETATION (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. G.M. GUNN (Stuart) (10:36): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Native Vegetation Act 1991. Read a first time.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN (Stuart) (10:36): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

I draw to the attention of the house the urgent need to protect the public of South Australia against the ravages of bushfire and to ensure that land managers and owners are in a position to carry out responsible, effective and necessary action which will protect not only them but also the public.

We have had a debate in South Australia for a considerable time about the difficulties that people have with the exceptional build-up of hazardous material and the failure of governments of all persuasions to take firm and decisive action to give these people the ability to contain and control bushfires. The time for action has long passed.

Bearing in mind what took place on Kangaroo Island and Lower Eyre Peninsula, and elsewhere, we cannot allow those experiences to go unanswered. At the end of the day, unfortunately, in my view, there will be a calamity. When that happens those who have stood in the way of commonsense approaches will have to accept responsibility. They cannot say that they have not been warned or spoken to and representations have not been made to them—they have. The people concerned have consistently tried to make out that there is not a real problem.

Ministers have not been strong enough to deal with entrenched bureaucracy. I have to say that I have confidence that Mr Mutton will do his utmost to resolve some of these difficulties, but there is an inbuilt, entrenched attitude within the native vegetation bureaucracy which is not only unhelpful but also unwise and, in my view, a danger to the community.

I do not have a lot of knowledge about some things we discuss in this house, but one or two matters I do have some knowledge about—and one of them is bushfires and controlled burning off. I have had experience with that; nearly every year of my life I have been involved in it. A couple of cogent points cannot be ignored. First, you have to be prepared; secondly, you must have decent breaks; and, thirdly, you have to know how to read the wind and hold your nerve. If you do not take preventative action, you are building a problem for the future. Every time I drive home to my farm I drive past a plaque on the side of the road where an unfortunate person who was trying to fight a bushfire lost their life. It will happen in that area again.

This bill is sensible and reasonable. The first amendment in the bill involves one of the matters which the Director of the Country Fire Service, Mr Euan Ferguson, said needed to be dealt with, that is, take 'burning' out of the definition of 'clearance'. If the Director of the Country Fire Service is not to be listened to, who will we listen to? Will we listen to the eccentric people in the Wilderness Society or other irrational groups such as that? The Director of the Country Fire Service said this to the Economic and Finance Committee a few years ago. Surely, we should listen to him because he has responsibility to try to manage and contain huge bushfires.

Next, the bill removes the unintended decision-making of the Native Vegetation Council in relation to people putting water points on pastoral land. It was never the intention and it was never enforced until this government came to power. Obviously, ministers and backbenchers who do not understand these things are allowing bureaucrats to get their way. It is an absolutely stupid decision and the amendment to section 27 is absolutely essential.

The bill also provides the ability to put in decent firebreaks of up to 20 metres—15 metres in some areas—and to burn up to 100 hectares during a prescribed time of the year to hazard reduce. That is absolutely essential. Between 1 March and 31 October is the time of the year when the fires will not be extreme but when one will be able to reduce combustible material. It is unbelievable that, whereas we used to burn off to reduce the hazard, over the last few years we have not been able to do that. That is why we have had wildfires.

It is beyond belief that land managers cannot do this and, if they know what they are doing, they will not cause any harm. Aborigines used to burn the country; otherwise, it results in fires such as that which occurred on Kangaroo Island where huge areas were wiped out. The cost to the taxpayer, the disruption to the community and the ongoing difficulty is amazing.

The bill also provides for the ability to put in a decent dam without having to go through the nonsense and humbug that the Natural Resources Committee witnessed on Kangaroo Island. I think one of the classic examples of stupidity and bureaucracy gone mad is where a person was to be prosecuted and, at the same time, the people on Kangaroo Island had to rely on a dam for adequate water to live. If ever there was an act of stupidity and bureaucracy gone mad it was that instance.

In my time in this place I have seen rather interesting innovation on behalf of bureaucracy, but this was the best example of it; this took the prize! If they were rated one to 10 this would be up at the top. No matter where you went in the world, if you told people about this sort of nonsense, they would think you had been drinking, but that is the sort of bureaucratic nonsense people have to put up with. There was the example of the farmer who wanted to put in a small dam. We are suffering the worst drought in the history of the state and they gave him the run-around.

There was not an ounce of common sense. Nevertheless, the minister marches on. The minister has been advised by people who obviously do not like farmers and do not like people involved in other activities. They even interfered—this merry band of individuals—and caused problems with the sealing of the highway from Port Augusta to Port Lincoln and with the new sealed road going to the ferry they interfered on road safety issues and caused difficulty for the council sealing the road. You would have to have something wrong with you, but this band of merry men march on, obviously with the full support and concurrence of the minister. It is unbelievable.

These provisions which I bring to the house today have been brought here after a great deal of careful consideration. Some of us have had some experience in these areas and only want to see common sense apply. If you ensure that some of this decision making is handed back to councils (locally elected people), if they get it wrong, the community can get rid of them. Unfortunately the community cannot get rid of these appointed individuals, so this particular measure, which I have brought to the attention of the house today, is necessary and absolutely essential if we are going to protect the people of South Australia against the unintended ravages of bushfire.

I appeal to the good judgment of this house, and to the members of parliament who obviously want to ensure that the citizens of this state are not put in danger, that huge amounts of money which can be better spent do not have to be utilised to contain massive bushfires, and that the average landholder, going about their business, is not interfered with or harassed or having day-to-day management decisions made more difficult. At the end of the day, common sense must apply.

We are living in a society which is crying out for agricultural production. With the latest modern trend of global positioning operations and all that modern technology, there is going to be a requirement to knock the odd tree down and to remove little islands of scrub. Because things have moved on and there is better technology. Small areas of limestone can be ripped out and turned into productive agricultural land.

The Native Vegetation Act has never contained provisions to take account of the latest technology in agriculture. These provisions which I have drafted and put before the house today do take into account some of those difficulties. I urge the backbenchers of the government to take heed of some of the things that I am saying because, at the end of the day, these problems are not going to go away. They are going to become more difficult and people are going to become more frustrated and, at the end of the day, the community of South Australia is not going to be better off, in fact, it is going to be worse off.

So, I appeal to the good judgment of this house and I sincerely hope that the government will respond. It is incumbent upon the responsible minister to respond. You cannot hide behind the screen in the other place. It is all very well for the government to adjourn this particular bill and hope that it will drop off the *Notice Paper*. My challenge is that I want this matter fully debated, because that is in the interests of the people of South Australia, so that adequate firebreaks and access tracks can be constructed so that firefighters can safely go in to contain and back-burn to stop the extent of bushfires. You cannot expect people to go in to contain bushfires unless they can get out. That is a fundamental principle and, if you do not understand that, you do not understand anything.

I would say that some of the people who have been advising the minister have a limited understanding of some of these problems. I gave the example on a previous occasion in the house of the Wilmington fire where the gentleman had taken exceptional action to prevent the bushfire from burning into Wilmington. His major concern was whether these people would come up and

harass him. He had to grade to extend the width of the road to stop the fire. If he was acting in the public interest and as a responsible person, why should he be put under any stress? Why should that be because of these people who have these odd ideas?

The matter is now clearly in the hands of the government of South Australia. Let me say to you, you will not get away with it if there is a disaster and there is another big bushfire, because you have had the opportunity—not once, but many times—to do something about it. The provision of removing the definition of 'burning' from the act is being put to this house on the recommendation of the Director of the Country Fire Service—not me, the Director of the Country Fire Service. So, you can make all sorts of comments about me, but the director does have very considerable responsibilities, which he discharges, in my view in an excellent manner. He has the long-term interests of the people of this state at heart and he supports his volunteers.

These provisions are put here to support the volunteers. It is hard enough to get volunteers to do this work. I say in conclusion that the volunteers carry the state in many of these areas. When you have clowns from the Native Vegetation Council going around trying to usurp and override what volunteers do in containing bushfires—fools with measuring tapes measuring firebreaks wanting to illegally prosecute people, telling untruths—then it is up to this government or any government to come to their senses and fix the problem. I commend the bill to the house.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mrs Geraghty.

ELECTORAL (VOTING AGE) AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher) (10:53): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Electoral Act 1985; and to make related amendments to the Juries Act 1927 and the Local Government (Elections) Act 1999. Read a first time.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher) (10:53): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

This is a reintroduction of a bill that I first introduced in 2006. I will seek leave at the conclusion of my remarks to insert the explanation of clauses. This is a very simple bill, which seeks to allow those who are 16 or 17 the option—I emphasise: the option—of enrolling to vote in state and council elections. Once they enrol, they are then required to vote. I have not been convinced of any need to abolish compulsory voting. Once people have enrolled, I think they should vote, and this does not in any way seek to undermine the current situation.

There are many young people in our community, not the majority but many, who would like to exercise the right to vote at state and council elections. If members do the mathematics they can appreciate that, given four-year terms, it is not all that radical a measure, because we are not having council elections for nearly three years, and we are all looking forward to our next state election, which is about two years away. Even if you enrolled, if this law was passed immediately—and nothing ever happens in this place immediately—it would eventually be proclaimed and the young person concerned would not then be voting for quite a while anyway.

However, over time it would allow those who wish to enrol to participate if they were of the age of 16 or 17. I know that the argument has been trotted out before: they are not allowed to drink until they are 18, so why should they vote? I do not believe that that is a compelling argument. If you look through our whole list of age requirements, you can vote, and you can be 40 but you are not entitled to an age pension. I think that argument is a red herring and a furphy. To involve yourself in the voting process is to have a say about most aspects of society. It is not just for local council elections.

In my experience in local government if young people, for example, are keen to have a facility for people in their age group, by the time the process starts and is completed you are looking at probably six, seven or eight years. That has been my experience with things like skate parks. Even if a teenager was keen to see something happen in their local council area, it would take many years before it ever eventuated. You can consult and listen as much as you like but, at the end of the day, unless you have a vote, you do not have any say at all. Anyone who argues that listening gives someone power has a very limited view. You do not have any power until you have a vote; you can determine the outcome.

The Labor Party allows people to join at the age of 14; the Liberal Party, 16; and other parties also allow teenagers to join. I recently spoke at a weekend conference involving talented and gifted children. They were talented and gifted, but I am not; I was just there to talk to them. I

was very impressed with the grandson of one of our famous builders in Adelaide by the surname of Baulderstone.

This young lad, who was 11 or 12, knew more about politics than most people—I would say 99 per cent of people. He was very keen to be involved at the age of 11. I am not suggesting by any stretch of the imagination that we allow somebody of that age to vote. However, he was articulate, passionate, knew the issues, and he knew pretty well what is 'knowable'—if I can borrow from Rumsfeld—about members of this place; so, his knowledge was amazing. Most young people are not in that category, and I am not suggesting that they are, but this young Baulderstone boy was so keen to be involved.

That is not the reason for putting forward this bill, although it makes the point that there are many young people who would like to be involved. In fact, at the age that we are talking about—16, 17—those young people are paying taxes of one kind or another—certainly GST; they can join certain parts of the military, they can get a driver's licence, they can do a whole lot of things, yet they are not allowed to have any meaningful say in the community in terms of making decisions.

As I pointed out before, probably only—and I am guessing—10 per cent of the eligible age cohort would take up this option but, nevertheless, that is important. I am not suggesting putting forward this proposal because South Australia has been a leader in areas of electoral reform, but I think it is in keeping with our tradition. I do not know whether members realise, but we gave Aboriginal men—unfortunately, not women—the right to vote back in the 1850s. We gave Aboriginal women the right to vote in the 1890s. Sadly, those provisions were not allowed to continue after Federation because the other states were not as enlightened as South Australia in relation to allowing people of an indigenous background to vote.

We were also about the third place in the world to allow women to vote and, if not the first, we were certainly up with the leaders in terms of allowing women to stand for parliament. Also, in South Australia we developed the secret ballot, which we take for granted. It was developed by Commissioner Boothby, after whom the federal electorate is named. He developed the concept of a secret ballot because, prior to that, people were able to see who you were voting for. The Australian secret ballot voting system, as it became known, spread throughout the world.

Now, the Victorians (like they do in football) tried to beat us and got something into the parliament before we did, but the secret ballot was a South Australian creation. So it is a bit like the AFL: the reality does not always match what we are told.

As I have said, I believe this measure has merit. If it is passed it would not be taken up as an option by many young people, but it will focus the attention of teenagers on the democratic process and will give a lot more meaning to any participation in which they may be interested. I would like to put the question around the other way: rather than ask why they should vote, ask why they should not.

Other jurisdictions have introduced this, including the Isle of Man, which I visited two years ago as part of the CPA 'educational program'. They introduced the provision and, to my knowledge, the Isle of Man has not been struck by lightning or subjected to earthquakes or famine as a result of allowing 16 and 17 year olds to enrol. I come back to the point I made at the start: even if this measure goes through, there will not be a stampede of people that age participating simply because of the mathematics of the four-year term.

So, in many ways it is a very modest and conservative measure, and I think it fits in with what the major parties already do in terms of allowing even younger people to join their party and participate. I believe the more young people who can be encouraged to be actively involved in politics in a creative way, the better. I commend to bill to the house, and seek leave to have the explanation of clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Commencement

3—Amendment provisions

These clauses are formal.

Part 2—Amendment of Electoral Act 1985

4—Amendment of section 4—Interpretation

This clause alters the definition of elector to reflect clauses 5 and 6.

5—Amendment of section 29—Entitlement to enrolment

This clause lowers the age of entitlement to enrolment from 18 years to 16 years and lowers the age for provisional enrolment from 17 years to 15 years.

6—Amendment of section 69—Entitlement to vote

This clause lowers the age of entitlement to vote for an enrolled person from 18 years to 16 years.

Schedule 1—Related amendments

Part 1—Related amendment to *Juries Act 1927*

1—Amendment of section 11—Qualification of jurors

This clause ensures that the amendments to the *Electoral Act 1985* will not affect the *Juries Act 1927* (so that jurors will still need to be 18 years or over).

Part 2—Related amendment to *Local Government (Elections) Act 1999*

2—Amendment of section 14—Qualifications for enrolment

This clause amends the *Local Government (Elections) Act 1999* to allow persons aged 16 and over to vote in Local Government elections.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mrs Geraghty.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (GAMING MACHINE LIMITATIONS) BILL

Mr HANNA (Mitchell) (11:03): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Casino Act 1997 and the Gaming Machines Act 1992. Read a first time.

Mr HANNA (Mitchell) (11:03): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

The background to this legislation is the very limited attempt by the parliament in 2001 to amend the gaming machine legislation to limit problem gambling. We know that the much publicised measure of reducing the number of gaming machines has completely failed. We always knew it was symbolic, but the government could not even achieve a reduction of 3,000 machines in the total number in South Australia. We got a bit over 2,000, which was the compulsory element; the rest relied on trading of machines and extracting a number as they were traded. However, it simply has not come up with the solution.

To deal with problem gambling, attention is finally being turned to the game features themselves. We know the main problem with poker machines is that they are deliberately designed to have addictive features and, although I do not take a hard line on gambling generally, I have always believed that poker machines are particularly pernicious because of the way they are designed to take advantage of psychological weaknesses. They are designed to feed people's addiction.

So, in terms of ameliorating this problem, the way to go is to focus on game features. This is already done to some extent in the legislation. Under section 40 of the Gaming Machines Act, the Liquor and Gambling Commissioner must have regard to guidelines issued by the Independent Gambling Authority as to whether a game is likely to lead to an exacerbation of problem gambling, and should not approve a game if it is likely to do so.

The legislation I am proposing today does two things. First, it takes the current guidelines and puts them into legislation, because the tricks and deceits in that list of game characteristics published by the Independent Gambling Authority are well established as features further likely to exacerbate problem gambling. However, I also include some additional game features, and I do that on the basis of recent research. The Independent Gambling Authority (IGA) commissioned research conducted by Charles Richardson that clearly establishes there are further features that need to be addressed.

The IGA has published concerns about features such as the so-called 'near miss' feature. Gaming machines have a number of pictures in a row; there is a central row and then usually a row or rows above or below that. Each column can be considered a reel, that is, based on the old physically manipulated gaming machines whereby there would be a spinning circular series of symbols within the machine, and in the old days the pull of the handle of the machine would cause the wheels to spin and a particular symbol would come up at random.

It has been established that if you have, say, four symbols that come up commonly and a fifth column, or reel, which contains one of those symbols that only comes up very rarely, you will tend to have on that machine a series of results whereby people get four out of five, and that is termed a 'near miss'.

This is a particular inducement for problem gamblers, because there is the mistaken belief that they have almost won and that if they keep going they will get that magical five out of five. The reality is that the machine has been designed to make that five out of five as difficult as a machine which had an equal number of symbols on each reel. The payout at the end of the day is the same, and that payout of 87 per cent to the punter is set out in the statute anyway.

There is also a concern about multiple lines. This is not just multiple betting on the one line, but allowing players to bet on multiple lines. The research indicates that it is an issue for problem gamblers because even though they can win when they play multiple lines, they end up losing more credits than they gain because they are betting more on those numerous lines.

However, the small win is sufficient inducement for the problem gambler to keep going with multiple bets. There is evidence that problem gamblers will start with the minimum bet over the maximum number of lines, but during the course of the period of play they will raise their bet to the maximum bet over the maximum number of lines. In other words, multiple lines allow the problem gambler to scale up their gambling.

There is also something called a 'reel power' feature. There is such a feature on the Indian Dreaming gambling machine design, and that allows symbols which apparently give some sort of a jackpot or bonus, so that it allows for extra credits to apply to subsequent spins: up to 243 credits to be bet per spin. When you consider that a credit could be worth \$1, you can see that that could raise the amount of betting power considerably. As I have said before, the payout at the end of the day is statistically the same. So, these so-called bonuses do not result in any real long-term benefit to the punter.

There is also an issue about maximum bets, and I seek to reduce the maximum bet to \$1 per spin. There is also an issue about the deceit of so-called free spins, whereby certain results on the gaming machine can lead to a spin being provided to the punter without additional insertion of tokens—tokens representing cash. The same principle applies, that there is nothing free in the world of gambling machines. The result is the same at the end of the day, and a free spin means that the other spins need to be designed in a way so that the results are even less favourable to the punter.

The bill that I have drafted ensures that all of these things are outlawed. There is sufficient evidence now to say that these things are conducive to problem gambling. Frankly, it is not that hard to change the design of the machines. There are teams of experts back at the gaming machine factories, so to speak, who can address these issues in a short space of time. I appreciate the cost to industry of changing over machines, but what it means is that you are going to remove from the pokie parlours these most pernicious of features.

I acknowledge that the IGA held a hearing on 29 April 2008. There was a fairly legalistic registration process, and evidence was taken on the day. Unfortunately, I could not attend but my colleague Nick Xenophon was able to, and he was able to present evidence supportive of the issues that I am raising today.

I want to force the government's hand on the issue. I do appreciate that the IGA is still considering these issues, but in my view as a parliamentarian the evidence is in: these problem gambling features, these deceptions and tricks, ought to be outlawed. I put it to the parliament that we should take matters into our own hands and make sure that these features, at least, are banned. In subsequent debate, if we get through the second reading of this bill, there may be scope for amendment of this bill to restrict gaming feature design even further, depending on the views later published by the IGA.

I commend the bill to the house. The clauses are reasonably self-explanatory. They apply to the Casino as well as to hotels, in other words, all the venues in South Australia which have gaming machines. I have already described that the current IGA guidelines are incorporated into section 40 so that the commissioner has a very clear message from this parliament not to approve any of these machines which have the tricks and deceptions which are most conducive to problem gambling.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mrs Geraghty.

**BIRTHS, DEATHS AND MARRIAGES REGISTRATION (REGISTRATION OF DEATHS)
AMENDMENT BILL**

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 10 April 2008. Page 2827.)

The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher) (11:15): I just want to make a very brief contribution, and I commend the member for Davenport for introducing this bill. He has focused in this bill on a particular aspect involving de facto relationships, but in terms of this whole process of registration of births, deaths and marriages, which is one of the issues that came up through our select committee looking at cemeteries, there is no centralised record-keeping relating to where people are buried or where cremated remains are kept, etc. That makes it very difficult over time for relatives to find out where loved ones have been buried or where there are cremated remains with perhaps a rose bush growing at that location, and it is even more difficult obviously if the remains are scattered, which for environmental reasons we do not encourage now.

It would be very simple if, at the time of death, there were a requirement that those details—the place of burial, the location of cremated remains and no doubt in time natural burial ground location—be recorded centrally by the Registrar of Births, Deaths and Marriages.

The other issue is a very complicated one, and I have interacted with the Attorney on this: the question of mothers who have a baby that does not go to full term. It is a complicated issue because in some cases you have babies that go full term and are stillborn, but in other cases women have babies that do not go to full term and the termination is not necessarily something that they wanted or wished for, but the medical prognosis was not good.

That is another issue that needs to be dealt with in terms of recording that information, and some of these people, in order to get closure, look for some sort of record or certificate to cover the situation where a baby did not go full term and died, and that information can be replicated by way of a certificate. It is a complicated issue. I know the Attorney is sympathetic to it, but it is another matter that could be dealt with under this bill.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mrs Geraghty.

GAMING MACHINES (HOURS OF OPERATION) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 22 November 2007. Page 1830.)

The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher) (11:18): Once again, I make a brief contribution. I commend the member for Davenport for introducing this bill. It is an issue for which I have a lot of sympathy. In fact, many years ago I sought to amend the relevant gaming machines act to restrict the hours at which the machines can be available to operate. I do not see any justification for having gaming machines operating around the clock or even a large part of the clock. I think there should be an enforced shutdown when people can get right away from these machines.

I am not a wowser when it comes to gaming. If people want to play gaming machines, that is fine but, with all things in this area, there needs to be some provision for, if you like, a cooling-off time when people can stand back from this activity. Therefore, I do not see any justification for having gaming machines operating past, say, 1am or 2am on a weekend. I think they should be shut down from about that time until at least 11am.

This bill is not as radical as my suggestion but, nevertheless, I support it because I think it is a step in the right direction to bring a bit of balance back to what has become a difficult area. I accept that most hotels do the right thing; I accept that most gamblers do the right thing. Nevertheless, I think it is a prudent provision to shut the machines down for at least eight or 10 (or more) hours out of every 24.

Mr HANNA (Mitchell) (11:21): I strongly support the bill; in fact, in my view it does not go far enough. I am of the view that pokie venues should be closed between 12 midnight and 12 noon, but I know that reform has to come step by step most of the time, so I think this will be a huge advance. Interestingly, in a recent survey of a thousand people in my electorate, among a range of possible reforms to pokies, the proposal was put that gaming machines be closed from midnight to noon, and 57 per cent of people approved that measure.

That went further than the member for Davenport's proposal, so I am absolutely convinced that there is easily majority community support for this measure. Let us be realistic: if gaming

machines are still available to the public for 18 hours a day, it means that shiftworkers, people with children, and people with any sort of responsibilities will still have the opportunity to gamble, but there is evidence that gambling late at night is often accompanied by inebriation and/or tiredness and is the bewitching hour when it comes to problem gamblers being preyed upon by these venues.

Mr VENNING (Schubert) (11:22): Mr Speaker, I seek your indulgence to have another attempt at this, because I had two speeches in front of me but I picked up the wrong one. I again commend the member for Davenport for moving this measure, and we support him.

This bill seeks to implement legislation so that, outside of the casino, poker machines are not able to operate between the hours of 3am and 9am. Current legislation states that poker machines must not operate for six hours in a day; however, this six hours of closure does not have to occur in one six-hour block. Machines can be shut down for periods of two to three hours and for a total of six hours.

Gambling causes a lot of problems, and I am certainly very aware of it in my electorate: bankruptcy and other financial stresses, family breakdowns and depression. I certainly commend the member for Davenport for introducing this bill. As members would know, I have been here for quite a while, and I was here when we first passed the gaming machine legislation. I opposed it then and I have opposed it ever since.

I can recall the previous member for Goyder and myself campaigning strongly to try to keep poker machines only in the casino and in licensed clubs and never in local hotels. Well, we lost. If we had been successful—as have other states—and kept them out of hotels, we would not have the grief that we have now. It should have been only licensed clubs and the Casino. I support the member for Davenport and this bill.

Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder) (11:24): I also support the member for Davenport and this bill. I was about to correct one of my colleagues earlier when he stood up and made the wrong speech about party support. It is actually a conscience vote. I will just put that on the official record.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr GRIFFITHS: It is, but gambling issues are complex votes. This is more of a conscience vote. It is in my nature to be a conservative person, although. I would probably classify myself in a few ways. Gambling is not something that I have done very much in my life, so it was quite interesting to me that, upon being elected to this place, the leader gave me the opportunity to be shadow minister for gambling.

Mr Hanna: No risk in Goyder.

Mr GRIFFITHS: There is a risk in any seat, because we can never assume that we will be there for the next term. You always have to work hard. I have not gambled very much, but I do recognise that it is a legally allowable activity. Since time immemorial, people have gambled in some way or another; it is human nature.

As part of holding that portfolio for a bit over 12 months, I enjoyed meeting the various groups involved in the gambling industry. I recognise that they are working hard to actually minimise problem gambling, and I know that has some level of support from the government. The people I met are running an industry that is allowed under the laws of the nation, and they just want to make sure that it is done properly.

The AHA is a peak body for hundreds of hotels that exist within South Australia, and it has worked hard to ensure that resources are out there to get information out to people who gamble, to develop policies to minimise gambling addiction and to work with government on initiatives to ensure that support exists for people with gambling problems. I stress the fact that the AHA and the people who operate these facilities are good citizens and are committed to the industry and the community at large. Whilst holding that shadow portfolio, I had the opportunity to go on a tour with AHA members of six sites that had been upgraded in Adelaide.

Mr Hanna: A pub crawl.

Mr GRIFFITHS: No, it was not a pub crawl. A lunch was involved but only soft drinks were consumed: I am quite confident about that. I do not go on pub crawls. We had a look at these hotels where a lot of money had been spent. It was obvious to me when walking into these places that the pokies area was not actually the focus of the redevelopment: the focus was on the bar and the dining areas. That has been great for businesses that have supported those redevelopments.

An enormous amount of work has been created. It has been hard to get the tradespeople, but it really does highlight that many hotels in our state have had a lot of money spent on them, and there is no doubt that gambling revenue has assisted in that regard.

However, going back to my conscience and my conservative nature, I think it is important to recognise that there are people out there who have gambling problems. I, probably like a few members in this place, have attended several meetings of Gamblers Anonymous. I have been there on Saturday mornings and on a Wednesday night. There were probably only 15 people in the room, but each person stood up and recounted how gambling had affected them, and it was really heart-rendering. There were so many sad stories of how, every day, these people feel challenged to even walk or drive past a gambling venue without the urge to walk in the front door and put some of their hard-earned money into the machines. It is for those people that I indicate my support for this bill.

The control of the six hours in which venues will not be able to operate may seem a minor matter but, for those people out there who just need some relief from the anxiety they face with their addiction to gambling and the pressure that it creates in their families, I think it will be a positive step.

I note that those people with specific gambling problems are small in number and percentage, but every person should be considered. The statistics often quoted by the Hon. Mr Xenophon when he was in the other place, indicating that for every one person who is a problem gambler there are seven other people who are addicted, really do indicate the need for the house to consider very seriously the merit in the member for Davenport's bill.

I know that it will not automatically create a situation where we have utopia again and all the problems go away for the people in question, but I do believe that it is a positive step forward. I encourage the government and the minister to make sure that they do everything possible to assist people with gambling problems, and I hope that the government resolves to support the bill.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel) (11:29): I am pleased to be able to make a contribution to this bill. My position on gaming and particularly poker machine operations in the state has been fairly well documented in terms of the stance I took when the government introduced the legislation about four years ago to remove a maximum of 3,000 machines from the industry.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: The member for Mitchell will have an opportunity to make a contribution, if he has not done so already. I supported the legislation and every amendment moved by the member for Mitchell at the time.

Debate adjourned.

WORKCOVER CORPORATION: MEMBER FOR HARTLEY

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (11:30): I move:

That this house condemns the member for Hartley 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.

Like so many of her government colleagues the member for Hartley is guilty of sitting silently in the back seat of the WorkCover bus, while the Minister for Industrial Relations, mutely supported by his fellow cabinet members, including the Premier, steered it blindly off the road and into a forest of unfunded liabilities, falling return to work rates and rising premiums.

In doing so, the member for Hartley is complicit in this disastrous situation and should be roundly condemned for abandoning her parliamentary responsibilities in not carefully protecting the interests of her constituents.

The unfunded liability in 2002 was \$67 million. As things stand, that figure could exceed the magical \$1.5 billion mark within 12 months. No doubt members opposite will want to dispute those figures and what they mean, but what they cannot argue with is that South Australia has the

highest unfunded liability and the highest levy rates in what a former WorkCover CEO described as the worst WorkCover scheme in Australia.

This did not happen overnight. It has been looming for six years, growing steadily all that time, and since taking up her back seat in this parliament in 2006 the member for Hartley, and many of her parliamentary colleagues, sat idly, gazing out of the side window, not wanting to look ahead for fear of seeing the obvious catastrophic collision that was about to happen, and face this fact that, in remaining silent, she was also responsible for it.

Over the past six years the opposition has asked hundreds of questions in the parliament, and the matter has been reported widely. Yet in her two years in this place the member for Hartley did nothing. She did not, or would not, hear the alarm bells ringing as the unfunded figures climbed steeply and steadily—\$100 million, \$200 million, \$300 million, \$400 million, half a billion, etc., etc.

While the bus driver, the Minister for Industrial Relations, was reassuring unions that there would be no cut to benefits and, at the same time, promising industry that there would be changes, the member for Hartley sat mutely in the back seat. Still no alarm bells, still no concern for her constituents, or indeed any of the state's workers and business owners. There they all were, the government's back seat passengers, content to be in a bus with a big majority.

But the member for Hartley does not have a big majority. The next time that bus pulls up at the terminal and the conductor yells, 'All change,' the member for Hartley may well discover there is no longer a seat for her. With any luck we will get a new driver too, assuming this one has not already been sacked and replaced.

Within the last few weeks we have seen one of the government's staunchest supporters, SA Unions Secretary Janet Giles, perhaps herself an aspiring Labor parliamentarian, resign from the WorkCover Board, pleading a moral conflict of interest and stating, 'It's my job to defend workers.' What a tantalising proposition this presents, a Labor politician with a moral and social conscience. She might well run for the seat of Hartley, although she would have trouble getting Labor preselection.

The Premier has often proclaimed in this place that he has absolute confidence in his ministers. Does he mean he has great confidence in their ability to perform their roles, or does he mean he has great confidence that they will not cross him in the party room? Given the obvious conflicts of this, and numerous other contentious issues of late, I confidently suggest it is the latter.

Does the member for Hartley have the same absolute confidence in the minister? How could she, when the situation was so clearly deteriorating. And let us not confuse informed confidence with blind faith. What was the member for Hartley doing for the five months between the time the report was handed down last November and the recent announcement? Did she query the figures? Did she request the policy? Did she doubt the minister? Did she even see the train coming?

And there are other questions. Did she not know that the Liberals had reduced the unfunded liability from \$267 million in 1994-95 to \$67 million by 2002? Does she remember that my colleague the member for MacKillop pointed out in this place 12 months ago that the last Liberal government had reduced the injury rate by 20 per cent, in the face of a 10 per cent increase in workforce growth? Did she ask any questions at all of her own party about this alarming situation and, if she did, what were the sugar coated answers that convinced her everything's fine, our driver knows where he is going? I suspect not, and, if I am right, the member for Hartley is to be condemned for gross inattention to task. It is fine to be a back seat passenger in a big bus, but you should still take an interest in what is going on and how it is going to get there.

Conversely, the Liberal Party's Industrial Relations Portfolio Committee is working toward the following objectives: providing workers with fair entitlements and rehabilitation; reducing the levies on business; and fully funding the scheme. I would add that we are doing it in discussion and consultation with unions and business, a technique apparently foreign to this government.

Is the member for Hartley still reassured by the minister's claim in December 2006 that the claims liability would be cut by \$100 million within two years, namely, July 2008? Is she aware that WorkCover Chairman, Bruce Carter, recently told the Statutory Authorities Review Committee that he believes the government-appointed claims management agent will 'struggle to get there'? Has this rung any alarm bells for the member for Hartley or was she dozing when the bus rattled over that level crossing?

The electorate of Hartley covers the eastern suburbs of Campbelltown, Hectorville and Kensington Gardens, in which there is a broad cross-section of voters including hardworking employees and committed and entrepreneurial small business people. One wonders who will vote for the member for Hartley in 2010—assuming she gets back on the bus. Will it be the workers—Labor's long-time voter base—who stand to lose money and benefits by this bill or will it be the business owners who may find themselves saddled with a WorkCover levy rate that has doubled to 15 per cent or even, possibly, 22.5 per cent? How many employees will the employer have to lay off to cover the increased premium, simply to stay afloat? One should bear in mind that for the employer this is not an investment in improving his or her business but, rather, another addition to the cost of doing business.

Is the member for Hartley concerned about the potentially negative impact that the requirement for employers to appoint a rehabilitation and return-to-work coordinator within the workplace could have on staff cohesion and morale? Is the member for Hartley concerned that the Minister for Industrial Relations has appointed as actuary the same person that he and the Treasurer have castigated in recent years? They have accused him of giving 'very, very poor actuarial advice' and said that he 'significantly understated the true level of liabilities'. Is the member for Hartley satisfied with the reappointment by the government of an officer who, according to cabinet members, was sacked for a good reason?

No doubt the member for Hartley will endeavour to excuse her lack of interest and involvement in her government's mishandling of this matter by suggesting that this is a case of the pot calling the kettle black; that is, I have never taken any interest in the matter. Even if that were true it would not be a defence for her disinterest and lack of care. She cannot absolve herself of blame by endeavouring to cast the spotlight on others. At best, all she will do is draw others under the same light.

As it happens, and as one would hope, the member for Hartley has already discovered that I will not share the spotlight with her on this. In fact, I have referred several times in this place to workers compensation issues. The most specific reference was on 28 March last year—over 12 months ago—when in my Supply Bill contribution I said:

The WorkCover unfunded liability is, I believe, heading towards \$1 billion. The latest figure we have is \$694 million, but who knows where it is exactly at the minute. Unless some reform is done in the WorkCover sector—and we are told that deals are done with unions not to cut benefits—I cannot see that happening. The worrying factor is that the figure of \$694 million comes from June 2006. As that figure we are referring to is nine months old, it would be interesting to see where it is at the moment.

I remind the member for Hartley that she is a member of the government—the government that is overseeing this massive and unavoidably obvious blow-out in the unfunded liability. It is to be assumed that as a member of the government she is more privy to the discussions and decisions that go to make up the policies of her ministers than am I. She ought to have been far better aware of what was happening than I.

As the member for Hartley and her colleagues will find after the next election—if she makes it back into this place—there is only so much you can do in opposition. Given the worker roots inherent in her family history, the high ideals she held at university (that she so eloquently described in her maiden speech) and the demographics of her electorate—and the marginal state of that electorate—it would be reasonable to think that she might at least have taken an interest in the matter, let alone contribute something in the government debate in the interests of her electors and, for that matter, all South Australian electors. I remind the house of the member's own words to her supporters. In her maiden speech she said:

To Mark Butler, Andy Dennard, Don Farrell, Robyn, Andrew, Craig, Katrine, Ian and Charles, I thank you and all the fine people I have had the pleasure of meeting in the union movement. The Labor movement will always have a friend in me.

One can only wonder how these fine people are feeling now about their choice of someone to represent them in this house. I contend that the member for Hartley has taken no interest in the blow-out in WorkCover's unfunded liability, taken no interest in WorkCover's poor return-to-work results, failed to inform the public until after the federal election that WorkCover entitlements to injured workers would be cut, failed to examine alternatives to cutting workers' benefits as part of the WorkCover reform and sat silently in the back of the bus taking the easy ride while her Minister for Industrial Relations and his cabinet colleagues cannoned like an unguided missile through a forest of problems. For all this the member for Hartley is to be roundly condemned. I commend the motion to the house.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (11:44): Graham Richardson said in 1993 that not only were the Liberals stupid but they were stupid often. I have to say that today they are being stupid—and they are being stupid often. Here they are again condemning the member for Hartley for voting on a bill which they supported. The member for Hammond waxes lyrical about being on a bus, but on that bus, apparently, he is a passenger. He is on the same bus of WorkCover. But there is another problem here.

They cry crocodile tears. They speak with forked tongues. In this house they demand that we pass the bikie legislation and the WorkCover legislation. They say it is imperative we do something, yet in the upper house they have lost control. They have entered the heart of darkness because what has happened is they have a Colonel Kurtz in the upper house, the Hon. Rob Lucas, out of control. I will quote from the movie in a moment, but he is up there controlling the natives, the indigenous tribes.

An honourable member: The Mung.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: The Mung. He is up there filibustering, not listening to his commander-in-chief, not taking orders. So I say it is time for a new Willard. The member for Hammond is to be the new Willard. I want to quote from the movie. In Saigon, he says:

Kurtz had ordered executions of some Vietnamese intelligence agents. Men he believed were double agents. So he took the matter into his own hands.

Corman: Well, you see Willard—

that is you, member for Hammond—

in this war, things get confused out there, power, ideals, the old morality, and practical military necessity. Out there with these natives it must be a temptation to be God.

That is the Hon. Rob Lucas, 'the temptation to be God':

Because there's a conflict in every human heart between the rational and the irrational, between good and evil. The good does not always triumph. Sometimes the dark side overcomes what Lincoln called the better angels of our nature. Every man has got a breaking point—

Mr VENNING: I rise on a point of order.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I heard no point of order. Member for West Torrens.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: It continues:

Because there's a conflict in every human heart between the rational and the irrational, between good and evil. The good does not always triumph. Sometimes the dark side overcomes what Lincoln called the better angels of our nature. Every man has got a breaking point. You and I have.

Mr VENNING: Madam Deputy Speaker, I ask you to rule again. This is all about the motion, not some philosophical desire of the member for West Torrens.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! There is no point of order. Member for West Torrens.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: Continuing:

The good does not always triumph. Sometimes the dark side overcomes what Lincoln called the better angels of our nature. Every man has got a breaking point. You and I have. Walter Kurtz has—

that is Rob Lucas—

reached his. And very obviously, he has gone insane.

This is where the member for Hammond says:

Yes sir, very much so sir. Obviously insane...

Your mission is to proceed up to Nung river in a Navy patrol boat. Pick up Colonel Kurtz' path at Nu Mung Ba, follow it, learn what you can along the way. When you find the colonel infiltrate his team by whatever means available and terminate the colonel's command.

This is what the member for Hammond says:

Terminate? The colonel?...

He's out there operating without any decent restraint. Totally beyond the—

Mr PEDERICK: On a point of order, Madam Deputy Speaker. I draw it back to relevance. The member is making reflection on me and what I say. I think I can speak for myself.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Member for West Torrens, wait a minute.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: I am nearly finished.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I understand that currently the argument is a little distant from the subject, and I ask the member for West Torrens to draw the argument together.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: It is all going to come together at the end, you will see:

Your mission...When you find the colonel infiltrate his team by whatever means available and terminate the colonel's command...

Terminate? The colonel?...

He's out there operating without any decent restraint. Totally beyond the pale of any acceptable human conduct. And he is still in the field commanding his troops...

Terminate with extreme prejudice.

That is your mission, member for Hammond, to terminate with extreme prejudice. Go to your comrades in the upper house, use the spirit of the motion you just moved. Condemn them for filibustering, condemn them for not passing WorkCover legislation. David Ridgway, the Leader of the Liberal Party in the upper house, today said on radio they are not passing WorkCover until after June. After June. What are we paying them for? What are they doing up there?

Member for Unley, it is not your problem, remember; you just work here. It is not your problem. Member for Hammond, you have a mission. Terminate the colonel with extreme prejudice. Rob Lucas still controls the upper house, like Kurtz. The horror, controlling his troops, they are lost, out of control, no ammunition, just working his magic, infiltrating the troops. Out of control, and what happens every day he is still in command? The liability goes up, every single day. This government has acted and acted decisively. We have taken on our friends, which is something the Liberal Party has never done. We have taken on our friends and have said to them, 'We have to act in the interests of South Australia.' The Premier made this pledge at the last election, 'State first, party second.'

I call on the Liberals to do the same thing, to put their state first. Stop filibustering. No internal workings of the party are going to overturn this, so you can forget it. Every time you delay, the liability goes up, and it is your fault.

I know the member for Hammond is a passionate man. Take up your command, take up your mission; go tell Rob Lucas it is time to come out of the jungle. It is over. It is like one of those Japanese soldiers in the jungle who has not heard the emperor's call to surrender. Still out there polishing his gun, sitting in the cave, waiting for the Americans to land. It is over. The WorkCover legislation has to be passed and the Liberals come in here condemning us for voting for a bill they supported. The member for Unley sits there all confused because it is not his problem. He just works here: 'It's nothing to do with me. I'm just a member of parliament.'

I ask all members of parliament to think very carefully about these motions. I cannot believe you are still going on with it, like I said, being stupid often. But the truth is that the member for Hammond was serious about the liability, he was really concerned about it and it kept him up at night. He should speak to David Ridgway and speak to Colonel Kurtz in the upper house. He should speak to him and say, 'Time to put the games behind us. Stop supporting private members' business in the upper house. Stop adjourning the house. Stop going home at 6 o'clock at night.' How about they do some work?

Rob Lucas has had two jobs in his life: working for the Liberal Party and in the upper house. How about he does his job here and passes the WorkCover bill? Do not come in here and lecture us about WorkCover.

Mr Pederick interjecting:

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: The member for Hammond says that he is not leader any more. That is the whole point: he is still in command. He is lost up the river—

Mr Rau: He's up the Mong River.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: He's up the Mong River, still in command, not taking orders from anyone. The colonel is giving out the orders, but Colonel Kurtz is not listening; he is out of control. If you were serious about WorkCover you would pass it in the upper house. But your leader in the upper house said today that they are not passing it until June. Are we to take it now that, one, you are not ready, and, two, you do not care that liability goes up? Not interested? If that is true why are you moving these motions?

I will tell you why you are moving them: pure political expediency, that is all it is. Why are you delaying it? You are hoping beyond hope that somehow we will pull the bill, or there will be some internal split within the party, or something will go wrong. That is what you are hoping. You do not actually want to fix WorkCover: you want it to be there at the next election as an issue. That is what you want, but you do not have the courage to say that, because you hide behind Colonel Kurtz. You are hiding behind there like Dennis Hopper—

Mr Rau: The journo.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: —the journo. He's a great man—

Mr Rau: A kind man.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: He's a kind man. Rob Lucas is still in control of the show. He has been fired, but he is still in charge. He is filibustering, and you are letting him do it. Yet, you come in here and tell us that it is really about WorkCover. Well, tell your colleagues in the upper house that we are ready to go; we will debate it right now. Stop everything else; we will do WorkCover. But you will not. Do you know why you will not? Because Colonel Kurtz is still in charge. Member for Hammond, terminate his command.

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop) (11:54): I congratulate the member for Hammond for bringing this matter to the attention of the house, as have a number of his colleagues over recent weeks. I find it interesting that members opposite are at last standing up and talking about WorkCover. When we had the opportunity to debate the bill in the house there was stunned silence from members opposite.

I remember making my second reading contribution. I encouraged people like the member for Taylor, who is always very vocal in the house, to stand up and explain to her constituents why she was supporting the bill promoted by the front bench of the Labor Party. I called on a number of other members to explain to their constituents why, after a lifetime of fighting for the cause of working men and women, they had turned their backs on them.

It was interesting that a couple of weeks ago the member for Enfield in this place made the point that I crossed the floor on a number of occasions to support the member for Mitchell. I am sure that the member for Enfield is smart enough to understand that, if the member for Mitchell proposed an amendment and called for a division, if he was left on his own we would not have recorded in the *Hansard* forever that every member of the government voted against the amendments that the member for Mitchell put forward.

That is in essence why I voted on that side of the house at the time. It is interesting that the member for Enfield stated: 'I have often thought that trade union officials should have access to the workplace.' Yet, he voted against it. He is assuming that that is something that I would not normally vote for and denigrates me for the fact that, on that occasion, I did vote for it. What I did vote for is to make sure that every member of the Rann Labor government is recorded in the *Hansard* for posterity. Your names will be recorded forever for turning your backs on working men and women. Not one of you stood up during the second reading debate—

Mr Rau interjecting:

Mr WILLIAMS: You haven't heard the end of what I was going to say, John. Not one of you stood up and made a sound justification for why at this point you turned your back on the working men and women of South Australia. Not even you did that, John. Not even you have told the working men and women of Enfield why in their hour of need you are happy to turn your back on them; why you believe that an injured worker, who loses an arm in a machine in a workshop, after so many weeks gets a 20 per cent reduction in their income maintenance. I did not hear you explain to the working men and women why you thought that, after losing an arm or leg, or whatever, in a machine, they and their families, all of a sudden, after a certain preset number of weeks, could survive on 80 per cent of their salary.

I did not hear you explain that. Not one of you got up and explained that. Not one of you explained why 30 per cent of the employed people in South Australia, who are covered by self-insurers, about half of whom are private enterprise employers, and the other half is the government of South Australia, have seen no movement from those businesses to have the legislation changed because it had become financially burdensome on them to manage. Not one of you.

A few months ago I met with some lawyers who work in the workers compensation field, and they told me of one example of a business that moved out of the WorkCover system to

become a self-insured employer. The cost to that business was reduced from \$3 million a year—that is what their WorkCover levy had been when it was managing their injured workers' welfare—to \$300,000 a year. That is why the Self-Insured South Australia (SISA) has never lobbied this government to change the act. SISA was quite happy with the act, because it managed it properly.

The opposition has been raising these issues for five years. For five years the opposition has been telling you and warning you that the minister responsible, the Minister for Industrial Relations, is incompetent. We have been telling you that for five years. We started to raise this issue in mid-2003, when we recognised that the WorkCover unfunded liability would go through the roof. That was five years ago, but the Treasurer stood in here in question time yesterday and said that, if we do not pass this legislation in five minutes, we will be saddled with \$1.5 billion worth of debt.

Well, there are plenty of questions in *Hansard* that I have put to the Minister for Industrial Relations and the Treasurer about the unfunded liability, but do members know what the answer has been? Over five years their answer has been, 'This is not a debt, it is just a paper figure. It is not a debt.' Yet yesterday the Treasurer would have us believe that \$1.5 billion worth of debt is going to appear on his bottom line in five minutes.

As the Treasurer knows, the reality is that if something is not done quickly the AAA credit rating is out the window. The Treasurer knows that, it is what he has been advised and it is why he has driven this—and that is why all the members sitting at the back over there have to wear this. The Treasurer will lose his AAA credit rating if nothing is done. They all know that, every one of them, but, just as the Treasurer and the Minister for Industrial Relations have been in denial for the last five years, those members are all in denial now.

The WorkCover legislation has been working for the self-insured all this time. They were not complaining (and I met with them regularly); they were managing it. I never had any member of the government come to me and say that the self-insured employers were doing the wrong thing by their workers because all these injured workers were coming to them complaining. When I was shadow minister for industrial relations, the only complaints I ever had about injured employees and the way they were being treated were with regard to WorkCover. I never had one complainant who worked for a self-insured employer, not one. The reality is that the mess is within WorkCover, and the mess is at the very feet of the minister. Members opposite have been in denial and are now wearing it.

We point out to them, and to every South Australian, that this is being driven by the Deputy Premier because of his AAA credit rating. The reason he had to do this is because they appoint people to their front bench, they appoint ministers because of who they are and what support they have from the union movement, not on their ability. This measure has not been argued at their party's executive, and why not? Because they had a defection, someone from the left decided they would move to the right.

Mr Pisoni interjecting:

Mr WILLIAMS: Preselection? They have a fat government job down at the Industrial Relations Tribunal, that is what they have. We had three members dropped off the Industrial Relations Tribunal 18 months ago because the workload had dropped so much because of things happening with shifts of responsibility and functions in the federal arena, but suddenly we have a new one appointed! It happened to be part of a deal with someone moved from the left to the right to shore up the numbers on the right to save that minister, that incompetent minister who is the problem. And all of them are sitting there wearing it.

I see the member for Enfield making notes. I hope he can provide answers to all the propositions I am putting. I look forward to hearing it, because I would hate to be sitting on the back bench over there, understanding how I had been shafted by the leaders of my party. That is what has happened to them; they have all been shafted.

Mr RAU (Enfield) (12:04): As always it is such a pleasure to be here on Thursday. I really do enjoy this, and it is particularly good to be able to follow the members for Hammond and MacKillop; that really is a privilege.

First, in relation to the member for Hammond, I enjoyed his contribution. He obviously did a bit of research into the material he put forward, but my children sing a song that goes something like 'The wheels on the bus go round and round'. Well, the wheels on his bus were going round and round, but he was not going anywhere. I think we got the public transport analogy going a little too far; the whole story suffered a little from the fairly rigorous structure in which he set it.

Nevertheless, it was not a bad contribution, and he was obviously getting out there and doing the right thing by his team because they said (much as the member for West Torrens implied), 'Look, here is a mission, and it is a hopeless mission. When the whistle goes you have to go up over the trench and there will be a bunch of blokes there with machineguns. But don't worry, because afterwards you'll get a medal and your mum and dad will get a nice letter.' Basically that is the task they gave him. The member for Kavel had to do this dreadful thing, as well as the member for Finnis; they all had to do it. I genuinely think that what they are being made to do is unfair, because they know it is absolute rubbish; yet they have come in here bravely, with a straight face (mostly), and have done what they had to do.

However, I want to come back to the member for MacKillop, because he said that this is all about the AAA credit rating. Okay, let us assume, for the purpose of the argument, that it is about the AAA credit rating. Do members of the opposition want to have a AAA credit rating for South Australia or not? There is a simple answer to that: it is yes or no. If members opposite want a AAA credit rating they would vote for the legislation; if they do not want one they would not vote for it. What did they do? Goodness me, every one of them voted for it—including these poor privates who have been sent over when the whistle blew. The Colonel Blimp-type sitting in the bunker with a big moustache eating cucumber sandwiches said, 'Come on, blow the whistle,' and the poor devils have been sent over. Goodness me.

That is the first thing, the AAA credit rating: do you want it or do you not? If the answer is yes you vote accordingly—and they have. So why do the characters in the other place not do exactly the same thing?

The second thing that I think is really interesting is that the member for MacKillop is actually a very clever person, because I have been listening to what he has been saying in here for six years now and I believe that the member for MacKillop is a secret operative for a very left wing outfit. I do not know what it is; I do not know if it is the Workers' Student Alliance or whether it is the Democratic People's Republic of North Korea, but he is like an underground operative.

What he does is he masquerades under this thing. He is like the bloke who dresses up as the Gestapo officer, but he is actually letting people escape through some tunnel. So, what he has done is he has clothed himself in this rhetoric about, 'I'm a country person and I'm very conservative', and all of these things, but actually somewhere, probably in Pyongyang (I am not sure—these types of countries that have the big rooms in which they pay tribute to the pantheon of great political leaders) there is a room with a big oil painting of Marx, Engels and Williams—the big three! There they are, they are up there. Why are they up there? Because one night when he was feeling relaxed and comfortable in here—

Mr VENNING: I rise on a point of order as to relevance.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr RAU: One night when he was feeling comfortable in here, when that serene look of happiness had overtaken him, he came and sat over here and voted with the member for Mitchell to allow unrestricted access to all workplaces anywhere in the state—

Members interjecting:

Mr RAU: To cheers! I went over to him and I said to the honourable member, 'Comrade, do you know what you are doing, Tovaritch?' He said, 'I know what I'm doing,' and of course he did know what he was doing at that moment, but did he realise that by doing what he did at that moment he risked exposing his whole operation? This is a very serious matter. Okay, he demonstrated courage, he demonstrated integrity and he demonstrated that he was a man of steel. Where does that saying 'man of steel' come from? Stalin. Stalin: man of steel.

For members opposite I would quote from that great film, *A Few Good Men*. Jack Nicholson, when pushed and pushed and pushed in the witness-box said, 'You can't handle the truth.' That is your problem: you can't handle the truth. He is a secret agent. You have people up there in the other place completely out of control, and they are actually going to ruin what members opposite have voted for. I cannot believe it. It is nuts!

But back to the main game. I decided I was going to do some research on comrade Williams. I thought that I would find out a little bit more about him. So, I went onto Google and looked around and there is nothing in there about Mitch Williams and socialism.

Mr Kenyon: What about Tovaritch?

Mr RAU: Nothing; he is very careful—good question. But I did find that there is a book called *Perestroika Nyet*, written by Tovaritch Mikhail Richardovich Williams. He has obviously got a nom de plume that he is using to write his poisonous material—I have not read the book so it might actually be very good. I withdraw that; it may not be poisonous. The other thing I found was a book entitled *No Passaran*, published in Cuba by a fellow called Michaelo (Ernesto) Williams, and it is subtitled *Companeros de Armas* (Companions in Arms).

So, here we are; he has blown his cover. It is all out there. It is now in the public domain. He is going to have to try to put it all back in the box but, my goodness, after what he has done it is going to be so hard. He is already about to go into print around the world, and in North Korea they are about to have a special edition of the *Pyongyang Times* with Ernesto on the front page. Tovaritch—

Mr Kenyon: So many aliases!

Mr RAU: Yes; so many aliases. He is like Jason Bourne: he has passports, he has names, he has identities.

Mr Kenyon: The Williams identity.

Mr RAU: The Williams identity; exactly. What is his real identity? We know what his identity was: the man of principle, alone amongst you. He crossed the floor; that brave, lonely walk.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr RAU: That is exactly right. Another clue! Why did the beard come off? Marx, Engels, even Lenin. And what about Ernesto, magnificent beard—no, Che Guevara. The evidence is overwhelming and it is compelling. The fact that he is able to get up here and attack us for voting the same way as he voted, when in a moment of weakness he crosses the floor and reveals his allegiances, it is, as I said, Stalin-like—the man of steel. When the submarine pulls up in a few weeks' time down at Millicent with some information for him, I hope there are people there to watch him go and collect it.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for Schubert.

Mr VENNING (Schubert) (12:13): I want to bring the subject back to relevance and I commend the member for Hammond. I have been here for 18 years and I think this morning I have seen the most ridiculous flouting of the standing orders that I have ever seen, because we are supposed to speak on the subject.

I want to commend the member for Hammond for bringing the motion to the house. I also note the speech by the member for Enfield, but I will get to him. We do miss members as they leave this place, and when I heard this speech this morning I had a strong vision of one member, the previous member for Hammond, the Hon. Peter Lewis. What an absolute diatribe that was—totally irrelevant to the subject. I also note the speech of the member for West Torrens. It was more of a rave, I believe, than a speech, particularly when he mentioned the words 'being stupid' often.

It is all about the eye of the beholder, and it is all about mirrors. If you are going to live in a glasshouse, you do not throw stones. We have had many members over the years who have gone very close to the edge with some of their speeches, but if you are going to make comments like that, you want to be very careful about your own record.

It is all about a smokescreen. They are putting up these futile, spurious arguments from the other side, but the facts are there for us all to know about. It is a diatribe of verbosity trying to cover up the uncoverable, speaking about anything but the subject. The member for Enfield went on with a lot of absolute irrelevant rubbish. I know the man. He went on to talk about South Australia's AAA rating.

Do you know how we came to have this AAA rating? You got into government and five minutes after you got there you got the AAA rating, so we will claim the credit for that just as you are going to claim the credit for losing it. You lost it before, and you will lose it again. Why? For issues just like this. History will prove what has happened here. You add this \$1 billion debt to your previous State Bank debt and see what the total cost South Australia is.

I bring us back to the subject. This is a massive blow-out in the WorkCover unfunded liability and it has nothing to do with the member for MacKillop being in a left-wing faction or whatever. That is purely a smokescreen—nothing to do with it. It is all about the WorkCover unfunded liability.

Yes, we do agree with the bill; we have from the outset. We agree with it, but we are the opposition; we have to remind the people of South Australia and the house how we got to this terrible situation. What was the member for Hartley doing? She has been here for two years and two months. What has she said? She has never ever mentioned this in the house. I bet she has never mentioned it in caucus. I bet she has never mentioned it in her electorate.

You sit over there and you totally ignore it, and now you are carrying on about us delaying it. You have had at least 18 months to deal with this, but you did not because of the federal election. I note that the member for Hartley has graced us with her presence.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Will both sides just tone it down a little, please? The member for Schubert.

Mr VENNING: One billion dollars; and you have known about this for two or three years.

The Hon. R.J. McEwen: Why didn't you fix it?

Mr VENNING: The minister, the member for Mount Gambier, says, 'Why didn't we fix it?' When we were in government, this guy always gave us gratuitous advice. Now he is saying, 'Why didn't we fix it?' We are not in government. It is on the record. Pick up the *Hansard* and have a look. We have been hammering you and the government about this problem for five years and what have you done about it? Nothing!

It goes up every single day. As we discuss it here it is ticking away, thousands of dollars a second. Why didn't the member for Hartley speak up 18 months ago? She was here. She is not short of a word or two. She knows how to speak the language. She was a previous journalist—she knows how to write articles—but not a sound in the print media or anything. We are not delaying this.

Ms PORTOLESI: I rise on a point of order. I am not a previous journalist. I ask the member for Schubert to withdraw that statement.

Mr VENNING: I am sorry, I withdraw that, but many years ago before I was an MP I did a journalist training course and you were actually one of the tutors—remember that? Anyway, I will withdraw that, just to make sure there is no problem. It is not important.

We are not delaying this matter in the other place. That is another red herring put up by the government. All members are entitled to support their constituency, the workers. This hurts the workers, and the genuinely injured worker will be very much disadvantaged by this. That is where the scheme has let us down. We have all known for three or four years that we have a problem. As an employer I have had injured workers with fingers jammed in doors, machines, etc., and when you go to the doctor, the first thing they ask you is, 'Is this WorkCover?' Well, you know damn well that as soon as you say yes, boom! There is the fee. If it was done at home, it is done at another level.

We all knew in our personal lives that this was being rorted. It was out of control. We chose to do nothing about it. It is like the water problem here. The government has not done anything. You cannot make a decision on water; you cannot bite the bullet; you just avoid making a decision at all and hope it will rain to fix the water problem. Well, after three years, it has not rained. And where are we now? We are in serious situation.

It is the same with the WorkCover. You hoped that WorkCover would go away. You had neither the political will nor the expertise nor the courage to do anything about it, and this is two years ago. The member for Hartley has been here two years and two months and she has never mentioned this in this house. She never talks about the problem. She did not partake in the debate; she did not even make a speech during the second reading debate.

I have not read anything in her local media, and she gets out there often. Not a thing! Does she belong to any union? I presume she does. I do not know. Does she belong to a faction? I presume she does. Not a thing! Not a sound! I urge people like the member for Hartley to speak up—she can; she is capable—here in this house, in her caucus and in her electorate but she can't, can she? This really does highlight a problem. There are two or three people over there who have

made some comment, who have had the courage to stand up and say that they do not like this. Labor has a very strategic problem in relation to this.

I commend the member for Hammond for moving this motion and all I can say to members opposite, particularly the new ones over there, is that I do not believe the system is working when a member who knows that there is a problem cannot speak out in this house about the problem because they are locked in by two or three of the heavies on the front bench who lock them all in.

Well, all I can say to you is that in March 2010, seven or eight of you are going to pay the price. You will lose your seats—it will not be these down here—and the member for Hartley will be one of them. On this side of the house, my party allows me to speak for myself and my electorate; on that side of the house, you are forbidden. You cannot speak out, à la Normie Foster. The system is not working. This should have been addressed two years ago by the back bench, knowing you had a problem and raising it. But, no, you are probably not even invited to make comment in your caucus. You are probably not even told. It is probably a snow job by the Treasurer and the Premier, and the Minister for Infrastructure probably does a lot, and you just get told, 'This is what we are doing' and you probably have no say at all.

This was a scheme that was put there to assist genuinely injured workers and, because we have let the scheme get totally out of control—just blown the money—injured workers will now have to pay the price. Sir, I object. I honestly believe that injured workers are entitled to be looked after if they are genuinely injured at work. We know that the system has been rorted. We need a better system, but we have not addressed that. We have attacked it at the wrong end.

I want to commend the member for Hammond for his motion. He has done some work on it, and he has presented it very well. I join in the condemnation of the member for Hartley. She has less than two years to enjoy her time here, so I hope she makes the most of it.

The Hon. R.J. McEWEN (Mount Gambier—Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, Minister for Forests) (12:23): What needs to be put on the record again today, as needs to be put on the record each time these motions are moved, is that the Liberal Party is causing itself great embarrassment with its key constituencies for the sake of playing politics. Peter Vaughan, and many others, are going around shaking their heads in disbelief that the party they thought would stand up for them would rather simply play political games.

I have often been asked to explain why Martin Hamilton-Smith and his team would continue not to do the right thing, not only by industry but by the state. Why is that the case? The answer is simple: they do not want to be part of a solution. They do not have a vision for the state; they do not want to—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. R.J. McEWEN: I am just repeating—

Mr Pengilly interjecting:

The Hon. R.J. McEWEN: The Mr Bean of Backstairs Passage. He cannot help himself; he has to interject. Let me tell Mr Bean of Backstairs Passage that I am only repeating what big industry and big business is saying to me. They are saying to me, 'I can't believe where they're going on this. Who is in charge of the political strategy here? We actually believed they were in this place to look after us and to look after the state but, no, they would rather hold all this up.' They keep on saying that we've got this debt that keeps building up, that it is a ticking time bomb, but what do they do? They keep it ticking. They have no credibility on this issue, and it is damaging them. They know it is damaging them, but they cannot control the strategy within their own party. They know that this is hurting them. They ought to stop moving these silly motions—

An honourable member: It should have been fixed a year ago.

The Hon. R.J. McEWEN: It should have been fixed a year ago; it should have been fixed five years ago. Let's fix it today. Let's not leave it another day. They keep on saying that it should be fixed and that it should have been fixed years ago, and what are they doing? Delaying it, delaying it, delaying it. So, you cannot believe a word they say. They are either going to help fix it or they are not. They cannot make up their mind.

All they are telling their end of town is, 'We're not capable of representing you in this place; we're not capable of standing up for what we believe in; we're not capable of standing up to the constituency. We would rather play games because we would rather stay over there.' We heard the member for Unley say that: 'It's not our fault; it's not our problem. We're not here to fix things; we're

not part of the state. We want to sit over there; we want to do nothing. We're not capable of showing any leadership.' That is fine; industry knows that, and you keep telling it. Every minute of every day you admit there is a problem. You are not part of fixing it: you are part of the problem. You are no more than that: you are part of the problem. Wake up to yourselves for once, stop the silly games, get your mates up there to fix it, and stop talking absolute rubbish and making hypocrites of yourselves. For your sake I say: wake up to yourselves and fix it!

Mr PISONI (Unley) (12:27): I am just wiping the water off the wet lettuce leaf from the minister. The minister's only defence is to fabricate what other members say. That is the minister's only defence of his colleagues on the government side.

We heard a speech last week from the member for Enfield about the big brothers coming in to clean up the mess of the little brothers. That is what we saw again this morning. We saw two completely different styles. We saw the member for West Torrens loaded up, flies in, drops a lug and flies out again. The member for West Torrens gets his instructions from Don Farrell. He comes in, loads up—bang, drops a load and out he goes again.

The member for Enfield has a much more conciliatory approach. He sits here through all the debate and writes his material for his stand-up. I can see that the member for Enfield is going to have a great career. I would pay \$50 or \$60 to see the member for Enfield at the Festival Centre. That was a very entertaining and well-researched bit of stand-up. As a matter of fact, I say forget about *Seinfeld*, what about a sitcom called 'Rau'. That is something that I would pay to see.

We saw an academy award performance from the Treasurer the other day when he said that he was wrong and Jane was right about the grandstand in Victoria Park. That was an academy award winning act if ever I have seen one. Then, of course, we have the member for West Torrens dedicating almost entirely all his speech to lines from Hollywood movies.

We can see how important the rehabilitation of injured workers is to members opposite. The government is more interested in using the opportunity to have a joke, have a go—anything other than actually talk about the problems of rehabilitation in the WorkCover system.

I think that the member for Hammond's motion is relevant. It is strange that members opposite do not seem to be reading the whole motion. They are stuck on the first couple of lines. Further on, the motion states that the member for Hartley has not taken any interest in the blow-out of WorkCover's unfunded liability since or before taking office.

I remember when the Hon. Rob Kerin, when leader of the Liberal Party in the lead-up to the last election, raised the WorkCover issue on ABC Radio, to which Matthew Abraham said that no-one had raised it with him. I would have thought that, with the contacts the member for Hartley has in the media, and if she were really concerned about WorkCover, she would have used every contact she had to raise those concerns in the public arena. If you have contacts in the media, use them to raise these important issues. Don't sit on your hands and do nothing about it. At the very first opportunity, the member voted to cut workers' entitlements. That was the only option—not putting anything else forward. Also, they did not inform the public until after the federal election.

We hear other members in here telling us not to delay legislation. The fact is that this government has delayed its own legislation for political purposes. This government was made aware (and finally conceded it back in February last year) of the dire straits WorkCover was in but, because of the federal election and the Labor Party's strategy run by Mike Rann, who was a senior vice-president of the ALP, now President, they decided that it was worth racking up the extra million dollars a day to hold off this legislation to cut workers' entitlements until after the federal election. Their attitude was effectively, 'We are going to crush the Liberals at the federal election by running an anti-WorkChoices campaign,' and they claimed in that campaign that WorkChoices was disadvantaging workers by cutting their entitlements when, all the while, they themselves were planning to cut workers' entitlements after the election here in South Australia. They knew that.

Mr Venning: It was dishonest.

Mr PISONI: It was a dishonest campaign by this government and every dollar that racks up because of this legislation still in the upper house is the fault of this government and nobody else. As a matter of fact, the Attorney-General could not help himself. When we encountered an unfortunate situation on the weekend, he stepped in and said that we have to pass the bikie bill immediately, but he did not tell his upper house colleague the Hon. Paul Holloway that that is what he wanted. So, we took the advice of the Attorney-General and made sure that the bill was debated immediately. That has now been passed, so South Australia is a safer place because of that legislation.

This government was more interested in cutting workers' entitlements than making South Australia a safer place. That is the formula for this government. Don't blame us for the state of your crisis management. You have had 18 months to deal with this legislation, and now you are in crisis because you have delayed legislation for political purposes and you are trying to push the blame onto other people. The member for Hartley has remained silent on this whole WorkCover issue—not contributing to a single debate in this parliament nor a single media release regarding her concerns about WorkCover—and she should be condemned for this.

I challenge the member for Hartley. Get up here today in your defence and say that you support cuts to workers' benefits. Get up here and say it, because that is what you voted for. Despite the fact that you said in your maiden speech—

Mr KENYON: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, I believe that the member's remarks should be addressed through the chair.

The SPEAKER: Yes, the member for Unley must direct his remarks through the chair.

Mr PISONI: Thank you, sir. The member for Hartley should get up in this house today and say that she supports the cuts to workers' benefits, because that is what she voted for.

The Hon. R.J. McEwen: What do you support?

Mr PISONI: I did not stand up and say in my maiden speech that I am a friend of the union movement. I did not make the claim that the member for Hartley made in this house back on 4 May. This member made the claim that she is a friend of the unions. *Hansard* states:

The Labor movement will always have a friend in me.

She has got to where she is by climbing on the backs of union members who continually pay their dues to the union movement. She has got here and now she has shafted them. She is not interested in them any more. She went on to say:

To my corporate friends in the corporate sector—and there are significantly fewer of those...

Obviously, she is keen to have more of those friends at the expense of her union mates. That is her choice. She can do that. She can ignore the base that supported her. Those members who live in Hartley should be very wary of the member for Hartley. She will do and say whatever she needs to do and say to get to where she wants to be and then she will change her mind and do what suits her at the time. That is what is most concerning about the actions of the member for Hartley.

Mr KENYON (Newland) (12:35): It is quite a long time since we have seen such militant hypocrisy. It is not just hypocrisy but, rather, militant hypocrisy. Members opposite are moving motion after motion, all exactly the same. Time after time, member after member is saying the same thing. They are often hypocritical. It is the same problem, as with the previous motions. Not one member opposite in the chamber at present has ever asked a question about WorkCover or spoken about WorkCover prior to this motion being moved.

Mr VENNING: I have a point of order, sir. The honourable member is deliberately misleading the house. He only needs to read *Hansard*.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Schubert knows very well that allegations of misleading must be done by way of substantive motion. If the member for Schubert feels that the member for Newland has said something that is incorrect, then he can correct the record by way of personal explanation at the appropriate time. He is not to get up by way of point of order and accuse a member of misleading the house.

Mr KENYON: I can say that the member for Hammond has never asked a question about WorkCover since he has been here. Before the bill was introduced, he had never made a grievance about WorkCover. I would be surprised if he raised the issue in his own party room. We know that the Liberal Party as a whole has never examined alternatives or, if they did, they did not find any because they have not brought them in here.

If at any point they wanted to make changes to WorkCover, they could have introduced a private member's bill. They could have moved amendments to the government's bill. Did they do that? The answer is no. This sort of militant hypocrisy that we are seeing time after time further exposes members opposite for their complete lack of ability and any sort of plan for the future for the state.

The member for Unley—and I think the member for Finnis; and I apologise if it was not—in the weeks when we have been debating these militant hypocritical motions has been saying that

they will fix it when they get elected to government. That brings me to another point. What will they do to WorkCover should they happen to win the next election? What will they do? How will they further cut workers' entitlements.

The come in here to criticise us, but they are setting themselves up for further hypocrisy in the future. I want to know whether they will reveal their plans in detail before the next election. Will they take plans to cut workers' entitlements to the next election? Will they do that? We have not seen their plans, and I suspect that we will not see their plans. They will try to dump them on us afterwards, should they happen to win the next election.

They come in here to criticise us about elections, and so on, but never once during this debate have they revealed any plans whatsoever for WorkCover. People are entitled to be afraid of what they might do. I am reminded of Colonel Kirk in *Apocalypse Now*—and I hope the writers of that movie will forgive me for my paraphrasing—'The hypocrisy, the hypocrisy.'

Mr PENGILLY (Finniss) (12:39): It has been an entertaining hour or so this morning listening to the contributions that have been made by various members in this place, and I have found it to be quite a bizarre experience. I seriously question why, indeed, these members on the other side cannot defend themselves and they have to bring in the light artillery in the form of the member for Enfield and the member for West Torrens. They are hardly heavy artillery, but I suppose that, given that the member for West Torrens and the member for Enfield cannot get any closer to the frontbench, they at least have to come in here on Thursdays and try to support their poor old colleagues.

At least it gives them an opportunity to speak, because they are articulate in their own way. One of them is particularly articulate and has quite a good turn of phrase in endeavouring to support the member for Hartley. However, I could not understand most of what the other one said; it seemed to be mostly gobbledegook, to be perfectly honest. But never mind; the members for Enfield and West Torrens at least had a chance to stand up and say, 'We're still here, Mike. We'd like to come down, but we're not allowed to. We can't come down because they won't put us down there. We're still back up here.' As I think our leader pointed out the other day to the member for West Torrens, they arrived in this place on the same day; the member for West Torrens is still where he was and our leader is where he is, so you have to ask the question: where are the members for Enfield and West Torrens going?

I think it is a bit of a sad indictment that these two particular members have had to come to the defence of the member for Hartley in this way this morning, but it does give them a little bit of air play, and I think that is important. Returning the motion before the house, I believe that the people of Hartley would have to ask their current member why, indeed, she did not make these changes to WorkCover, or bring this matter to their attention prior to the federal election.

It is an absolute cover-up—and this is the point of the motion: these members on the other side are all there through their union connections and whatever else takes place in the Labor Party (affiliations and heaven knows what else they have done to get there). They should really be telling their constituents what is coming. There is no doubt at all that Mr Rudd was giving his orders via Mr Rann prior to the election and then Mr Rann issued his instructions to his party members, 'Don't breathe a word of this. Don't let them know. You can't tell them the truth. We're going to dud them after the election.'

The SPEAKER: The member for West Torrens has a point of order.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: It is tedious repetition.

The SPEAKER: I think that, if I were to uphold that, we could lose a lot of chaps. The member for Finniss.

Mr PENGILLY: Thank you, Mr Speaker, for your protection on that matter. I must admit that I was not trying to be repetitive. There is a danger in this place that—with motions similar to this that have been taking place for a number of sitting days—things do get a bit repetitive, but after listening to the member for Enfield this morning, who had just flown in from the planet Mars to deliver his speech, they would have to. I do not know where it came from. I saw the member for Enfield in action earlier in the day, and at that stage he was truly magnificent. He makes a fantastic chairman of the Natural Resources Committee and, indeed, he is in his element. I would love to have the ability to do what he was doing this morning, but at some stage between half past 10 when he left there and when he came in here and spoke at about 11 o'clock, the wheels fell off. Things went haywire.

I have a feeling he got stuck into someone's medication. I do not know what happened, but certainly his cup of tea or coffee, or his piece of toast, did not agree with him; he came in here, and I really would have to say that, whatever he had, it certainly did not help him when he made his speech defending the member for Hartley.

Getting back to the member for Hartley, I was hopeful that she would have got up and spoken during the WorkCover debate, and that she would have thrown up some alternatives and had a lot of input. We know she is looking over the shoulder of the front bench members; she wants to get down there. I reckon she will beat the members for West Torrens and Enfield. She will be down there, and you will still be sitting there, Tom, I reckon. I will be sitting here, too, I might tell you, but, never mind; that is another story.

I strongly support the member for Hammond's motion. I thought the member made a profound contribution in this place. Clearly, his speech was well researched; it had relevance to the motion, and it was not repetitive in any way, shape or form. The member for Hammond deserves to be congratulated for his effort this morning.

With those few words, I support the motion and, indeed, I hope that members on the other side will join us in backing to the hilt this motion and passing it.

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (12:47): I appreciate the contributions made here today, but it did feel like we were back in the war-torn battlefields of Vietnam for a while. With the member for Enfield's contribution, I was not sure where we were. I acknowledge the contributions from this side of the house and the support in condemning the member for Hartley for not speaking up about the WorkCover issue in the two years and two months that she has been in this place. I commend the motion to the house.

The house divided on the motion:

AYES (12)

Evans, I.F.	Goldsworthy, M.R.	Gunn, G.M.
Kerin, R.G.	McFetridge, D.	Pederick, A.S. (teller)
Penfold, E.M.	Pengilly, M.	Pisoni, D.G.
Redmond, I.M.	Venning, I.H.	Williams, M.R.

NOES (27)

Atkinson, M.J.	Bedford, F.E.	Bignell, L.W.
Breuer, L.R.	Caica, P.	Ciccarello, V.
Conlon, P.F.	Foley, K.O.	Fox, C.C.
Geraghty, R.K.	Hill, J.D.	Kenyon, T.R.
Key, S.W.	Koutsantonis, T. (teller)	Lomax-Smith, J.D.
Maywald, K.A.	McEwen, R.J.	O'Brien, M.F.
Piccolo, T.	Portolesi, G.	Rankine, J.M.
Rau, J.R.	Simmons, L.A.	Stevens, L.
Thompson, M.G.	White, P.L.	Wright, M.J.

PAIRS (4)

Hamilton-Smith, M.L.J.	Rann, M.D.
Griffiths, S.P.	Weatherill, J.W.

Majority of 14 for the noes.

Motion thus negatived.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! It is all right; the Deputy Leader of the Opposition came into the chamber after the doors were locked. Her vote was not counted.

Mr VENNING: Mr Speaker, I question that ruling. Admittedly the member was not on the right side but—

The SPEAKER: Order! I am absolutely certain that the deputy leader came in after the doors were locked, and the deputy leader agrees with me.

SOUTH COAST PUBLIC TRANSPORT

Mr PENGILLY (Finniss) (12:54): I move:

That this house condemns the Rann government for failing to provide regular public transport services between Adelaide and the South Coast, particularly Goolwa, Middleton, Port Elliot and Victor Harbor.

This is an issue that I have raised before in this place, and it is an issue that will continue to be raised. Indeed, it is interesting to note that in the last couple of days the Hon. Dennis Hood, in the other place, moved a motion on public transport more generally concerning regional South Australia. In that he has included my own electorate, incorporating the desire to renew a rail service to Victor Harbor.

Whilst I have not had a discussion with the Hon. Mr Hood about this issue, I would just make a few points on the rail service in relation to my motion. The rail service which used to operate between Adelaide and Victor Harbor finished, as I understand it, in around about 1982. Since that time we have had the Steam Ranger operating from Mount Barker to Victor Harbor. My understanding is that the line is not in a terribly good condition and that it would probably take a substantial amount of money to upgrade it.

I have done a bit of research on the time that it used to take to travel and I have discovered that it took around about three hours to travel between Adelaide and Victor Harbor on those services when they concluded in the early 1980s. Whilst I am not dismissing in any way, shape or form the Hon. Mr Hood's ideas, and would like to have discussions and explore it further, I am not so sure that in this instance the cost of re-establishing a rail service on that corridor would be financially achievable. However, it is good to have it raised and it is good for us to go through having a discussion in the parliament about that and the other services that the Hon. Mr Hood has put together.

It could be that we would be able to build a different rail system through to the South Coast. It could be that we could run one down through the south, through Noarlunga, find a new track through there and put in a fast light rail through to the South Coast. The reason I say that is because the lack of regular public transport between the city of Adelaide and the South Coast is causing a great deal of concern to a lot of my constituents.

I have quite a number of elderly constituents in my electorate who do not like to drive. I think it is blatantly obvious to everyone that we do have our fair share of accidents on the Adelaide to Victor Harbor Road and, of course, those people who enter that road coming in from Goolwa and other places. I think, quite fairly to those older members of the community who do not want to drive, it is something of a challenge for them to get in their own vehicles and come to Adelaide.

The only alternative is the Premier Stateline buses, which does operate a service, but that also takes quite some time and goes to numerous other places on the way through. While it does fulfil part of the need, it is not the easiest thing in the world to accommodate. So, the whole means of transport between here and the South Coast is something that needs to be discussed in this place.

I have been to see minister Conlon on this matter and have had discussions and a briefing on it. The minister has indicated that the government will not be putting a brass razoo above what it is putting currently, which is not very much, into establishing public transport links between here and the South Coast. I think that is a smack in the face to the residents of that area.

There is a social justice issue involved here, wherein the residents of the greater metropolitan area of Adelaide have a regular, and rickety in many cases, public transport system, and I think we are seeing evidence of that in the media, the print press and everything else, just lately. So, it is distinctly uncomfortable what is happening. However, there are a few more people.

This government seems to stop at Gepps Cross, the Toll Gate and Darlington. It does not seem to care what happens outside of that area. It has dismissed the people of the south and, accordingly, the people in my electorate. We have a considerable number of pensioners down there and a large retiree population.

Some of the retired population have their own resources and are financially quite well off. There are growing numbers of others, however, who are aged pensioners on the government pension, who do not have very much money at all and who struggle to make ends meet. The cost of fuel is creating a great deal of impost on them. There is not much public transport within the South Coast area, and all credit to my councils down in that area who are working on a course of action to deliver some (albeit limited) public transport services to the people in my electorate.

Debate adjourned.

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

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

The SPEAKER: I direct that the following written answers to questions be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

GREEN CYCLE PATHS PROGRAM

124 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (31 July 2007). Why has no investment funding been allocated in 2007-08 for the Green Cycle Paths Program?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Elder—Minister for Transport, Minister for Infrastructure, Minister for Energy): The Green Cycle Path investment funding in 2006-07 was for four safe crossings of arterial roads on the bicycle route alongside the Glenelg tramway. The funding provided four traffic-signal controlled pedestrian and bicycle crossings on Morphett Road, Cross Road, Marion Road and Goodwood Road. All four crossings have been completed and are working.

The investment funding component of the Green Cycle Path initiative has therefore been completed. The Green Cycle Path initiative will continue in 2007-08 with \$250,000 of operating funding being made available to councils for the further development of the Coast to Vines Trail (formerly known as the Marino-Willunga Trail).

RECREATIONAL BOATING FACILITIES

282 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (23 October 2007). What are the details of each project approved as a recreational boating facility since 2001-02 including, status, location, nature of the work, project value, and whether any funding was allocated by the South Australian Boating Facilities Advisory Committee?

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

A central record is not kept of recreational boating projects unless funded by the state government, after consultation with the South Australian Boating Facilities Advisory Committee, from the recreational boating facilities fund.

Attached is a list of recreational boating facilities funded from this source since 2001-02.

Projects approved as recreational boating facilities since 2001					
Location	Nature of work	Project Value	Funding provided by State Govt	Year	Status
Arno Bay	Arno Bay boat ramp, small craft landing	\$31,563	\$8,364	2001-02	Completed
Point Lowly	Point Lowly boat ramp	\$196,937	\$87,000	2001-02	Completed
Lucky Bay	Lucky Bay boat ramp	\$62,500	\$10,313	2001-02	Completed
Coffin Bay	Coffin Bay boat ramp, installation of 4 pontoon fingers at existing ramp	\$117,000	\$43,450	2001-02	In Progress
Smoky Bay	Smoky Bay boat ramp	\$149,500	\$51,150	2001-02	Completed
Port Vincent	Port Vincent Marina boat ramp	\$50,000	\$25,000	2001-02	Completed
Point Turton	Point Turton boat ramp	\$542,000	\$250,000	2001-02	Completed
North Haven	Cruising Yacht Club pontoons	\$112,000	\$56,000	2001-02	Completed
Goolwa	Goolwa Wharf	\$734,531	\$367,266	2001-02	Completed
Lower Murray	Lower Murray sanctuary destinations	\$91,000	\$35,305	2001-02	3 of 5 approved are completed, 2 withdrawn

Projects approved as recreational boating facilities since 2001					
Location	Nature of work	Project Value	Funding provided by State Govt	Year	Status
Kingston-on-Murray	Kingston-on-Murray boat ramp	\$42,000	\$21,000	2001-02	Completed
Port Wakefield	Port Wakefield, channel dredging, upgrade of existing facility and additional boat trailer park	\$425,000	\$148,750	2001-02	Completed
Fisherman's Bay	Fisherman's Bay boat ramp, upgrade of existing facility	\$20,000	\$9,900	2001-02	Not commenced
Beachport	Beachport boat ramp, construction of new facility	\$994,000	\$497,000	2001-02	90% complete
Tumby Bay	Tumby Bay Marina boat ramp, widening of existing ramp and installation of new pontoon landing	\$296,000	\$148,000	2002-03	Completed
Kangaroo Island	Christmas Cove Marina, installation of 20 berth pontoon systems and 2 solar lanterns	\$690,000	\$284,000	2002-03	Completed
Port MacDonnell	Port MacDonnell boat ramp, installation of washdown facility	\$60,000	\$30,000	2002-03	Completed
Kingston	Kingston South East boat ramp	\$85,100	\$42,550	2002-03	Completed
Port Victoria	Port Victoria boat ramp, breakwater extension	\$52,000	\$26,000	2002-03	Completed
Narrung	Narrung landing	\$32,500	\$16,250	2002-03	Completed
Walker Flat	Walker Flat riverfront mooring area	\$38,385	\$19,193	2002-03	Completed
Port Augusta	Port Augusta west jetty pontoon landings	\$22,436	\$22,436	2002-03	Completed
Port Augusta	Port Augusta East jetty boat ramp	\$317,358	\$171,000	2002-03	Completed
Port Pirie	Port Pirie, Solomontown boat ramp, slipway cradle and maintenance bay	\$25,000	\$12,500	2002-03	Not commenced
Donovan's Landing	Donovan's Landing, construction of small craft landing	\$18,000	\$9,000	2003-04	Completed
Robe	Lake Butler boat ramp, extensions to 3 pontoon landings	\$9,060	\$4,530	2003-04	Completed
Blackfellow's Caves	Blackfellow's Caves, small craft landing	\$40,000	\$20,000	2003-04	Not commenced
Wallaroo	Copper Cove Marina	\$250,000	\$110,000	2003-04	Completed
Mundoo Channel	Mundoo Channel boat ramp, development of boat launching facility	\$113,500	\$56 750	2003-04	Completed
Avoca Dell	Avoca Dell, upgrade of existing facility	\$30,0154	\$69,635	2003-04	Completed

Projects approved as recreational boating facilities since 2001					
Location	Nature of work	Project Value	Funding provided by State Govt	Year	Status
Wongulla	Wongulla, upgrade of existing facility	\$48,411	\$24,206	2003-04	Completed
Port Broughton	Port Broughton boat ramp, redevelopment of existing facility	\$1,625,000	\$750,000	2003-04	Completed
Arno Bay	Arno Bay boat ramp, small craft landing	\$26,005	\$12,500	2004-05	Completed
Port Lincoln	Axel Stenross boat ramp, redevelopment of existing facility	\$1,545,529	\$772,765	2004-05	Completed
Tumby Bay	Tumby Bay Marina boat ramp, widening of existing ramp and installation of new pontoon landing	\$93,000	\$46,500	2004-05	Completed
Murat Bay	Puckridge boat ramp, major upgrade	\$570,000	\$285,000	2004-05	Completed
Port Neill	Port Neill boat ramp, upgrade of existing facility	\$229 050	\$112,500	2004-05	Completed
Kangaroo Island	Christmas Cove Marina, installation of 20 berth pontoon systems and 2 solar lanterns	\$13,300	\$6,800	2004-05	Completed
Stansbury	Stansbury boat ramp, major upgrade of existing facility	\$286,250	\$293,750	2004-05	Completed
North Haven	Cruising Yacht Club emergency services finger	\$410,466	\$205,233	2004-05	Completed
River Murray	River Murray, enhancements to existing Aids to Navigation	\$34,980	\$34 ,980	2004-05	Completed
River Murray	River Murray, modifications to lock holding points	\$5,500	\$5,500	2004-05	Completed
Bow Hill	Bow Hill wharf, installation of new wharf to replace existing stop-off point for river cruising vessels	\$150,571	\$7,585	2004-05	Completed
Thiele Reserve	Thiele Reserve boat ramp, improvements to existing facility catering for water ski and houseboat activity	\$133,860	\$40,000	2004-05	Completed
Streaky Bay	Moore's Landing, upgrade of existing facility	\$190,050	\$95,025	2005-06	Completed

Projects approved as recreational boating facilities since 2001					
Location	Nature of work	Project Value	Funding provided by State Govt	Year	Status
Coffin Bay	Coffin Bay road ramp, installation of 4 pontoon fingers at existing ramp	\$413,000	\$165,000	2005-06	In Progress
Robe	Lake Butler boat ramp, breakwater upgrade	\$275,000	\$68 750	2005-06	Completed
Port Hughes	Port Hughes boat ramp, installation of second pontoon landing	\$60,000	\$30,000	2005-06	Completed
Largs North	Largs North, new boat ramp incorporated in the marine precinct	\$1,296,456	\$550,000	2005-06	Completed
Loxton	Loxton boat ramp, upgrade of existing facility	\$212,000	\$106,000	2005-06	Completed
Cobdogla	Bruno Bay boat ramp, upgrade of existing facility	\$302,799	\$120,000	2005-06	90% completed
Port Pirie	Port Pirie, Solomontown boat ramp, major redevelopment of boat ramp and boat haven	\$484,632	\$195,000	2005-06	Not commenced
Cowell	Cowell boat ramp, upgrade of ramp access and parking area	\$60,000	\$25,000	2006-07	Completed
Kangaroo Island	Christmas Cove Marina, installation of 20 berth pontoon systems and 2 solar lanterns	\$326,644	\$120,000	2006-07	Completed
Wirrina Cove	Wirrina Cove Marina, installation of safety/security lighting at boat ramp	\$11,500	\$11,500	2006-07	In Progress
Cape Jaffa	Installation of a new boat ramp facility within the Anchorage development	\$1,324,637	\$650,000	2006-07	In Progress
River Murray	River Murray, Low water asset upgrades (distance markers, snag markers and lock holding points)	\$13,937	\$1,337	2006-07	Completed
Walker Flat	Walker Flat boat ramp, upgrade of existing facility	\$182,082	\$80,000	2006-07	In Progress
Fisherman's Bay	Fisherman's Bay boat ramp, upgrade of existing facility	\$43,450	\$21,750	2006-07	Not commenced
Kangaroo Island	American River and Shoal Bay boat ramps, major upgrade of existing facilities	\$1,300,000	\$650,000	2007-08	Not commenced

BLACK SPOT PROGRAM**285 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett)** (23 October 2007).

1. What has been South Australia's allocation under the Federal Road Safety Black Spot Program since 2001-02 and what was the expenditure by the South Australian Government during this time?

2. With respect to each project under this program:

- (a) what was the year of application;
- (b) which road intersection or location was addressed;
- (c) what was the treatment for the black spot;
- (d) what was the funding for each project; and
- (e) what was the region, council or department receiving the funding?

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

The Australian Government funded AusLink Black Spot programme is administered by the Commonwealth Department for Transport and Regional Services (DOTARS). State road transport agencies develop the annual programmes and coordinate delivery of approved projects within each state. In South Australia this role is undertaken by the Department for Transport, Energy and Infrastructure (DTEI).

Allocations are progressively paid directly to the state, based on the actual project expenditures reported to DOTARS and the State is responsible for distributing project funds against each approved project. In answer to the above questions I provide the following:

South Australia's annual allocation under this program is currently \$3.49 million. This allocation is managed on a rolling basis where funding is allocated to projects until they are completed. The total allocation to South Australia from 2001-02 to the end of 2007-08 has been \$24.34 million. Project expenditure to the end of 2006-07 was \$20.36 million with some projects to be completed in 2007-08.

The state government does not contribute funds to the AusLink Black Spot programme. South Australia established its own State Black Spot Programme in July 2002 to address safety infrastructure improvements on both state arterial roads and council roads at known or high risk crash locations. The state program has an allocation of \$7.2 million for 2007-08 and projects are prioritised on the basis of relative safety benefit to the community. Since 2002-03 \$33 million has been allocated to black spot road safety improvements under the State Black Spot program.

The details of each project under this programme since 2001-02 as requested are provided in the attached table.

National AusLink Black Spot Program					
Year	Road 1	Road 2— Location Description	Treatment	Funding \$	Organisation
2001-02	Rundle St	College Rd	Improve sight lines— median	39,998	DTEI, Metro Region
2001-02	Hutt St	Flinders St	Installation of traffic signals including mast arms	60,000	Adelaide City Council
2001-02	Mooringe Ave	Morphett to Marion	Improve site distance, parking, St lighting and access points	11,390	City of West Torrens
2001-02	Princes Highway	Glencoe- Kongorong	Staggered cross intersection	173,000	District Council of Wattle Range

National AusLink Black Spot Program					
Year	Road 1	Road 2— Location Description	Treatment	Funding \$	Organisation
2001-02	Footner Rd	Harris St	Flashing lights & boom gates—lighting	200,000	Port Augusta City Council
2001-02	Exhibition Rd	From Alexandrina Rd To Hutchinson St & Hampden Rd	Non skid surface—delineation—edge lines—parking—pedestrian refuge	39,000	District Council of Mount Barker
2001-02	Mount Barker-Flaxley Rd		Seal shoulders—widen pavement—guard fence	143,728	DTEI, Metro Region
2001-02	Adelaide-Mannum		Seal shoulders—widen—guard fence—speed signs—curve alignment	150,716	DTEI, Metro Region
2001-02	Main Rd North		Shoulder sealing—audio tactile edge line	180,920	DTEI, Mid North Region
2001-02	Adelaide-Mannum		Seal shoulders—widen—guard fence—speed signs—curve alignment	171,600	DTEI, Metro Region
2001-02	Adelaide-Mannum		Seal shoulders—widen—guard fence—speed signs—curve alignment	148,980	DTEI, Metro Region
2001-02	Lochiel-Clare		Seal widening—edge lines—delineation	111,184	DTEI, Mid North Region
2001-02	Adelaide Rd	Druids Ave	Traffic signals—right & left turn lanes	220,000	District Council of Mount Barker
2001-02	Lincoln Highway		Upgrade and seal shoulders	50,000	DTEI, Northern & Western Region
2001-02	Seppeltsfield Rd	Stonewell Rd	Staggered T layout	185,000	Light Regional Council
2001-02	Overway Bridge Rd	12 th St—15 th St & Ryde St	Crash barriers—improve kerbing—signage—delineation—lighting	69,000	Town of Gawler
2001-02	James Melrose Rd—Warren Ave	Morphett-Tapleys Hill Rd	Improve site distance—signage—parking—street lights—access pits	35,555	City of West Torrens
2001-02	Waterloo Corner Rd	Bolivar Rd	Modify roundabout—blister islands	65,453	DTEI, Metro Region
2001-02	Hiltaban-Iron Knob		Remove vegetation & cutting on crest and curve after crest	26,801	DTEI, Northern & Western Region
2001-02	Springbank Rd	From Goodwood Rd To Ingrid St	Painted median—bicycle lanes	18,983	DTEI, Metro Region

National AusLink Black Spot Program					
Year	Road 1	Road 2— Location Description	Treatment	Funding \$	Organisation
2001-02	Greenhill Rd	Unley Rd	Install mast arms	36,686	DTEI, Metro Region
2001-02	Prospect Rd	From Junction Rd To Regency Rd	Painted median—pedestrian refuges	55,000	DTEI, Metro Region
2001-02	Marion Rd	Sturt Rd	Install mast arms	36,748	DTEI, Metro Region
2001-02	Greenhill Rd	Glynburn Rd	Modify approaches & island to two lanes	128,442	DTEI, Metro Region
2001-02	Goodwood Rd	Cross Rd	Install mast arms	37,508	DTEI, Metro Region
2001-02	Richmond Rd	From Railway Terrace To Anzac Highway	Ban right turns – protected turning lane	30,990	DTEI, Metro Region
2001-02	Bagsters Rd	Diment Rd & Langford Rd	Channelisation—closure of crossing traffic—left turn lane	40,000	City of Salisbury
2001-02	Commercial Rd	Fisher Rd & Kettering Rd	Roundabout modifications	26,027	City of Salisbury
2001-02	Belair Rd	Angas Rd	Remove left turn slip lane & install entry threshold treatment	26,257	City of Mitcham
2001-02	David Terrace	From Torrens Rd To Port Rd	Painted median—bicycle lanes—pedestrian refuge	60,115	DTEI, Metro Region
2001-02	Coventry Rd	Dalkeith Rd	Stagger cross intersection	184,386	City of Playford
2001-02	Glynburn Rd	From Rosalind St To Greenhill Rd	Painted median—turn bay—marked parking lane—pedestrian refuges	16,638	DTEI, Metro Region
2001-02	Sixth Ave	John St	Roundabout	27,000	City of Marion
2001-02	Nelson Rd	Wright Rd	Modify approaches to roundabout	40,360	City of Salisbury
2001-02	Lipson-Ungarra Rd		Seal 8km of gravel Rd	200,000	District Council of Tumby Bay
2002-03	North Terrace	Frome Rd and St	Modify signals – install green arrows on mast arms	75,100	Adelaide City Council
2002-03	King William Rd And St	North Terrace	Modify signals – install green arrows on mast arms	52,000	Adelaide City Council
2002-03	North East Rd	2.1km Section	Guard fence—seal shoulders—edge line	206,876	DTEI, Metro Region
2002-03	Henley Beach Rd	Military Rd	Modifications to right turn arrangements & cross movements	153,000	DTEI, Metro Region
2002-03	Gorge Rd	From Ryan To Bermuda	Guard fence—shoulder seal—edge line & remove open drain	249,918	DTEI, Metro Region
2002-03	Gorge Rd	From Mosely	Painted median with	44,998	DTEI, Metro

National AusLink Black Spot Program					
Year	Road 1	Road 2— Location Description	Treatment	Funding \$	Organisation
		To Stradbroke	right turn lane into side Sts		Region
2002-03	French St	Birdwood St	Roundabout	109,645	City of Mitcham
2002-03	North East Rd	Sudholz Rd	Install mast arms	9,954	DTEI, Metro Region
2002-03	Burton Rd	Fairbanks Drive	Mini roundabout	85,000	City of Salisbury
2002-03	Cashel St	Day Drive	Roundabout	140,355	City of Mitcham
2002-03	Nelson Rd	Milne Rd	Mini roundabout – additional entry lanes— island approaches & pedestrian refuge	150,000	City of Salisbury
2002-03	Salisbury Highway	Kings Rd	Install mast arms	27,138	DTEI, Metro Region
2002-03	Gorge Rd	From Manresa To Ryan	Painted median with right turn lane to side street	53,563	DTEI, Metro Region
2002-03	Fenden Rd	Saints Rd	Indented right turn island with pavement parking	60,000	City of Salisbury
2002-03	Kings Rd	Horrie Miller Ave	Install traffic signals	161,385	DTEI, Metro Region
2002-03	Burton Rd	Whites Rd	Improve approaches to roundabout	40,000	City of Salisbury
2002-03	Stirling North— Hawker		Install 310 m of guard rail at five hazardous locations with crash history	31,148	DTEI, Northern & Western Region
2002-03	Princes Highway	4km North Of Policeman's Point	Widen seal by 600 mm each side and add edge lines	59,990	DTEI, Eastern Region
2002-03	Riddoch Highway	10km South Of Penola	Shoulder sealing	74,423	DTEI, Eastern Region
2002-03	Meadows— Strathalbyn	10km North West Of Strathalbyn	Install guard rail on curve	14,288	DTEI, Eastern Region
2002-03	Percy St	Hedley St	Roundabout	80,000	City of Mount Gambier
2002-03	Robe To Naracoorte	Mt Burr To Lucindale	Install traffic islands to provide perceptual countermeasures	52,273	DTEI, Eastern Region
2002-03	Main North Rd Rn3160	Various Sites In Horrocks Pass	Install 850m guard rail at five known hazardous locations with crash history	85,022	DTEI, Northern & Western Region
2002-03	Hayman Rd	Bethesda Rd	Staggered T intersection	105,092	District Council of Mallala
2002-03	Lake Terrace East	Lewis Ave	Improve sight on eastern side & offset access Rd to form staggered T junction	150,000	City of Mount Gambier

National AusLink Black Spot Program					
Year	Road 1	Road 2— Location Description	Treatment	Funding \$	Organisation
2002-03	Myponga— Hindmarsh		Shoulder sealing	234,600	DTEI, Eastern Region
2002-03	Waitpingera Rd	Range Rd	Modify Y-junction to conventional T- junction with indented right turn island	196,831	City of Victor Harbour
2002-03	Wellington Rd	Joyce St	Install safety bar medians and painted right turn lanes	3,252	DTEI, Eastern Region
2002-03	Pt Wakefield— Yorketown En 4009	From Port Clinton 2.5km South	Shoulder sealing and delineation improvement	172,047	DTEI, Mid North Region
2002-03	Pt Broughton— Kadina	2-5km South Of Pt Broughton	Shoulder sealing and delineation improvement	252,652	DTEI, Mid North Region
2002-03	Jenkins Terrace	Arthur St (Lankoop Rd)	Convert intersection to stagger T-junction	173,529	DTEI, Eastern Region
2002-03	Lipson— Ungarra		Seal remaining section of Rd	200,000	District Council of Tumby Bay
2002-03	Green Valley Drive	Commencing 480 M West Of Target Hill Rd	Shoulder repair - signing—pavement width at turning locations -pave marks—roundabouts	150,000	City of Tea Tree Gully
2002-03	One Tree Hill Rd	From Seaview Rd To Falkenburg Rd	Junction realignment— improve sight distances—widen sealed portion of Rd	300,000	City of Tea Tree Gully
2002-03	Overway Bridge Rd		Widen pavement- install crash barrier beam-guard rails on approaches-lighting & sign	91,000	Town of Gawler
2002-03	Commercial St West	Graham & Avery Rds	Traffic signals	99,562	City of Mount Gambier
2003-04	Vine Vale Rd	Light Pass Rd	Modify intersection including the construction of a turning lane	114,146	Barossa Council
2003-04	Lake Terrace East	Dohle Rd	Convert to stagger 'T' intersection and improve sight distance	180,000	City of Mount Gambier
2003-04	North Terrace	Adelaide to Port Augusta Railway	Install active protection at the level crossing	125,000	City of Port Augusta
2003-04	Hayman Rd & Dawkins Rd	Old Port Wakefield Rd to Boundary Rd	Line marking— signs—road sealing and lighting	75,337	District Council of Mallala
2003-04	Hallet Rd	Greenhill Rd	Pavement markings—approach angles—pole	33,000	City of Burnside

National AusLink Black Spot Program					
Year	Road 1	Road 2— Location Description	Treatment	Funding \$	Organisation
			relocation and curve delineation		
2003-04	Beulah Rd	Howard St	Line marking—sight lines—parking—pavement bars and markers	785	City of Burnside
2003-04	Tutt Ave	Harrow Terrace	Channelising traffic flows—delineation—surface treatment and median refuge	140,000	City of Mitcham
2003-04	Sheoak Rd	Upper Sturt Rd to council boundary	Driveway links to discourage through traffic and inappropriate vehicle speeds	120,000	Adelaide Hills Council
2003-04	Seppeltsfield Rd	Dorrien Bridge to Sturt Highway	Widen seal—seal shoulder and improve existing shoulders	402,000	Light Regional Council
2003-04	Spains Rd	Winzor St	Modify all approaches to roundabout	40,000	City of Salisbury
2003-04	Burton Rd	Martins Rd	Modify all approaches to roundabout	58,000	City of Salisbury
2003-04	McIntyre Rd	Nelson Rd	Widen junction—relocate pole and modify pavement markings	27,000	City of Salisbury
2003-04	Bridge Rd	Wynn Vale Drive	Install left turn lane on bridge and channelisation on Wynn Vale Drive	120,000	City of Salisbury
2003-04	Waterloo Corner Rd	Winzor St	Widen junction and modify pavement markings	42,000	City of Salisbury
2003-04	Meadows—Strathalbyn		Seal shoulders & provide guard rail in appropriate locations	267,472	DTEI, Eastern Region
2003-04	Mount Barker—Strathalbyn		Widen shoulders	87,071	DTEI, Eastern Region
2003-04	Princes Highway		Widen shoulders	144,442	DTEI, Eastern Region
2003-04	Stirling—Strathalbyn		Improve delineation—edge marking—raise pavement markers and enhance signs	24,973	DTEI, Eastern Region
2003-04	Waterloo Corner Rd	Bagster Rd & Martins Rd	Mast arms—right turn controls and modify lane arrangements	70,437	DTEI, Metro Region
2003-04	The Golden Way	The Grove Way	Modify radius on left turn slip lanes	20,143	DTEI, Metro Region
2003-04	South Rd	Anzac Highway	Install mast arms	20,938	DTEI, Metro

National AusLink Black Spot Program					
Year	Road 1	Road 2— Location Description	Treatment	Funding \$	Organisation
					Region
2003-04	Marion Rd	Oaklands Rd and Daws Rd	Install mast arms and modify left corner islands	34,558	DTEI, Metro Region
2003-04	Greenhill Rd	Hutt Rd & George St	Install mast arms	16,457	DTEI, Metro Region
2003-04	Grand Junction Rd	Ardtornish St	Install left turn slip	55,760	DTEI, Metro Region
2003-04	South Rd	Grange Rd & Manton St	Install mast arms	62,232	DTEI, Metro Region
2003-04	Henley Beach Rd	Holbrooks Rd	Install mast arms	20,391	DTEI, Metro Region
2003-04	South Rd	Flaxmill Rd and Wheatsheaf Rd	Install mast arms	26,661	DTEI, Metro Region
2003-04	Regency Rd	Churchill Rd	Install mast arms	37,746	DTEI, Metro Region
2003-04	Greenhill Rd	Glen Osmond Rd	Install mast arms	40,582	DTEI, Metro Region
2003-04	Golden Grove Rd	Grenfell Rd	Modify left turn slip lane and corner island	26,271	DTEI, Metro Region
2003-04	North East Rd	Muller Rd, Thistle Ave	Modify left turn slip lane and corner island	83,543	DTEI, Metro Region
2003-04	Grand Junction Rd	Sudholz Rd	Install mast arms and left turn acceleration lane	205,275	DTEI, Metro Region
2003-04	Main Rd	Tatachilla Rd, Aldersley, Liddiard & Field St's	Close one Rd and convert to staggered 'T' arrangement	250,000	City of Onkaparinga
2003-04	Kapunda— Gawler		Widen seal	251,481	DTEI, Mid North Region
2003-04	Crystal Brook— Hughes Gap	Warnertown— Jamestown	Improve sight distance by removing portion of embankment and widen seal	59,593	DTEI, Mid North Region
2003-04	Port Wakefield— Yorketown Rd	Minlaton— Stansbury	Reconstruct curve	157,757	DTEI, Mid North Region
2003-04	Port Wakefield— Yorketown Rd	RRD 0.1 to 4.3	Widen seal	311,991	DTEI, Mid North Region
2004-05	Prospect Rd	Regency to Staples & Marian to Fitzroy	Install painted median with turn lanes & cycle lanes	99,550	DTEI, Metro Region
2004-05	Marion Rd	Sturt Rd intersection	Install mast arms on north & east approaches & left turn corner islands	30,955	DTEI, Metro Region
2004-05	OG Rd,	Fourth Ave to Tregoweth Court	Install painted median with turn lanes & parking lanes	61,323	DTEI, Metro Region

National AusLink Black Spot Program					
Year	Road 1	Road 2— Location Description	Treatment	Funding \$	Organisation
2004-05	Bower Rd	Causeway Rd intersection	Modify & upgrade signals & provide 2 left turn lanes from causeway Rd	66,500	DTEI, Metro Region
2004-05	Semaphore Rd	Fletcher Rd intersection	70 degree left turn— sight distance— install solid median—upgrade lighting	114,751	DTEI, Metro Region
2004-05	Spains Rd	Beverley Drive intersection	Install dedicated left turn—deceleration lane	84,082	City of Salisbury
2004-05	Magill Rd	Glynburn Rd to St Bernards Rd	Install painted median with turn lanes & parking lanes	73,474	DTEI, Metro Region
2004-05	Coromandel Parade	Craiglee Drive to Horners Bridge	Install & upgrade guard fences & install CAMS & Reflective Raised Pavement Markers (RRPM)	90,000	City of Mitcham
2004-05	Bolivar Rd	Liberator Drive intersection	Modify approaches to existing roundabout (did not proceed—planning only)	12,720	City of Salisbury
2004-05	Robert Rd	Taylor Rd intersection	Upgrade intersection with a staggered t- junction layout	183,500	City of Playford
2004-05	Mulgundawah & Brinkley Rds	Maurice & Hindmarsh Rds	Change intersection priority install kerbs gutters signage & line marking	4,403	Rural City of Murray Bridge
2004-05	Tea Tree Gully— Mannum Rd	At Chain of Ponds	Install new guard fence widen pavement shoulder seal	60,000	DTEI, Metro Region
2004-05	Tea Tree Gully— Mannum Rd	Little Para Rd	Improve—reinforce signs	23,698	DTEI, Metro Region
2004-05	Hill St	500m including Kintore, Buxton & Weigal intersections	Line marking to improve delineation & install safety bars	2,768	Rural City of Murray Bridge
2004-05	Lyndoch— Chain of Ponds Rd	between Checker Hill Rd & Maidstone Rd	Install new guard fence sections & minor shoulder sealing work	103,050	DTEI, Metro Region
2004-05	Cudlee Creek— Lobethal Rd	2km south of Langley Rd	Install 4 lengths of guard fence & seal shoulders	190,393	DTEI, Metro Region
2004-05	Cudlee Creek— Lobethal Rd	South of Berry Hill Rd	Install 4 lengths of guard fence & seal shoulders	179,000	DTEI, Metro Region

National AusLink Black Spot Program					
Year	Road 1	Road 2— Location Description	Treatment	Funding \$	Organisation
2004-05	Tea Tree Gully— Mannum Rd	2km Rd Length east of Gumeracha	Install guard fence & seal shoulders	199,612	DTEI, Metro Region
2004-05	Main North Rd	7.4km section south of Tarlee	Seal sections of shoulder & install retro reflective pavement markers	321,296	DTEI, Mid North Region
2004-05	Balhannah— Littlehampton Rd	entire 6km length of Rd	Seal shoulder & install edge line	603,176	DTEI, Metro Region
2004-05	Tea Tree Gully— Mannum Rd	1km Rd length west of Gumeracha	Install guard fence & seal shoulders	208,034	DTEI, Metro Region
2004-05	Blackwood— Goolwa Rd	Gardiner St	Improve signage & minor intersection improvements	137,317	DTEI, Eastern Region
2004-05	White Hill— Murray Bridge Rd	Le Messurier to Standen Sts	Install painted median scheme	100,000	DTEI, Eastern Region
2004-05	King William St	Pirie St & Waymouth St	Install centre Rd traffic signal lanterns	18,006	Adelaide City Council
2004-05	Conyngham St	Greenhill Rd to Flemington St	Improve delineation line marking retro reflective pavement markers & vegetation removal	28,141	City of Burnside
2004-05	Rochester St		Improve delineation kerbing, signage and line marking.	6,401	City of Burnside
2004-05	Strathalbyn— Wellington Rd	Dalveen Rd	Remove vegetation & realign junction to near 90 degrees	98,247	Alexandrina Council
2004-05	Paxton Rd	Rufous Place Cameron Drive & Clark St	Realign intersection & install kerbing signage & line marking	11,000	District Council of Coober Pedy
2004-05	Laura— Caltowie Rd	Stone Hut to Caltowie Rd	Realign & reconstruct 4 curves & install signage & guideposts	104,000	Northern Area Council
2004-05	Nelson Rd	Kesters Rd intersection	Raise vertical profile of Kesters Rd approach	43,093	City of Salisbury
2004-05	The Parade	Shipsters Rd & Gurrs Rd	Improve delineation & geometry of junctions	33,071	City of Burnside
2004-05	Brooking St— Hindmarsh Is Bridge	Goolwa & Liverpool Rd	Install roundabout	300,000	Alexandrina Council
2005-06	Goodwood Rd	Rose Terrace	Modify to allow off peak right turns into Rose Tce but left out only	40,000	City of Unley
2005-06	North Parade	West St	Install signs line marking & traffic islands on	1,432	City of West Torrens

National AusLink Black Spot Program					
Year	Road 1	Road 2— Location Description	Treatment	Funding \$	Organisation
			approaches		
2005-06	River Rd	from Main South Rd to New Rd	Install guard fence	45,000	Onkaparinga Council
2005-06	North East Rd	Reservoir Rd	Remodel signals & extend right turn lane on north east Rd	178,392	DTEI, Metro Region
2005-06	Golden Grove Rd	Grenfell Rd (West)	Fully control right turns & add second right turn lanes	152,138	DTEI, Metro Region
2005-06	Reynell Rd	Malbeck Drive (Western End)	Install raised median scheme & install pedestrian fence across bridge	20,135	Onkaparinga Council
2005-06	States Rd	Richards Drive (Southern End)	Install raised median scheme to protect right turns	19,446	Onkaparinga Council
2005-06	Sellicks Beach Rd	Justs Rd	Implement staggered t- intersection & install St lighting	90,000	Onkaparinga Council
2005-06	Noarlunga— Victor Harbor Rd	Main Rd to Old Willunga Hill Rd	Shoulder sealing	387,969	DTEI, Metro Region
2005-06	Grants Gully Rd		Culvert extensions shoulder sealing & guard fence installation	351,297	DTEI, Metro Region
2005-06	Bower Rd	Old Port Rd	Modify left turn slip lane from Old Port Rd	100,000	DTEI, Metro Region
2005-06	Grand Junction Rd	Fosters Rd	Install additional traffic signal pole & mast arms	48,625	DTEI, Metro Region
2005-06	Porter St	Dublin St	Implement left turn only lane & amend corner island	8,999	DTEI, Northern & Western Region
2005-06	Murray Bridge— Wellington Rd	South Terrace	Ban right turns from South Tce & install solid median	40,000	DTEI, Eastern Region
2005-06	Hawker-Stirling North Rd	near Pichi Richi Pass	Seal shoulders install edge lines & raised pavement markers	30,000	DTEI, Northern & Western Region
2005-06	White Hill- Murray Bridge Rd	Swanport, Mannum Rd, Bridge St	Remodel signals install mast arms & flashing right turn signs	81,110	DTEI, Eastern Region
2005-06	Princes Highway	8km section between Millicent & Tantanoola	Seal shoulders remove roadside hazards improve delineation	290,000	DTEI, Eastern Region
2005-06	Barossa Valley Rd	9km Rd section	Install guard fence & remove hazards	292,799	DTEI, Mid North Region

National AusLink Black Spot Program					
Year	Road 1	Road 2— Location Description	Treatment	Funding \$	Organisation
2005-06	Hawker-Stirling North Rd	6km section between Quorn & Stirling	Seal shoulders install edge lines & raised pavement markers	150,000	DTEI, Northern & Western Region
2005-06	Nuriootpa— Angaston Rd	3.9km section between Nuriootpa & Angaston	Install guard fence improve delineation & signage	115,169	DTEI, Mid North Region
2005-06	Old Princes Highway	Schenscher Rd & Ferries McDonald Rd	Widen safety bar islands & improve priority signs	59,000	Rural City of Murray Bridge
2005-06	Kingscote- Penneshaw Rd	3km section of Rd	Seal shoulders improve delineation & remove roadside hazards	85,791	DTEI, Eastern Region
2005-06	Commercial St	Anthony St	Install traffic signals	81,472	City of Mount Gambier
2005-06	Everard Central- Templers Rd	Balaklava- Mallala Rd	Realign Rd to form a simple t-junction	397,000	DTEI, Mid North Region
2005-06	Main North Rd	2km section between Melrose & Murray town	Improve delineation seal shoulders & protect hazards	150,000	DTEI, Mid North Region
2005-06	Dixons Rd	School Rd— Hay Terrace— Atkins Rd	Realignment to form a staggered cross intersection	95,000	District Council of Grant
2005-06	The Cove Rd	Adjacent Bike Trail from Hallett Cove to Marino Rocks Station	Install approximately 1500 metres of fencing barrier	51,000	City of Marion
2005-06	Montacute Rd	5km section east from Campbelltown Council	Install guard fence improve delineation & signage	180,000	Adelaide Hills Council
2006-07	Ernabella (Pukatja) Rd	from Officer Creek I -S to Pukatja (Ernabella)	Installation of Rd delineation and warning signs	28,000	Department of Premier & Cabinet
2006-07	Angaston— Birdwood Rd	South of Angaston	Shoulder seal— delineation retro reflective raised pavement markers & edge lines	220,000	DTEI, Mid North Region
2006-07	Hill St	McShane St	Improve advance warning and delineation on all approaches	2,000	Campbelltown City Council
2006-07	Vine St	Edward St	Continue median through intersection	7,500	Campbelltown City Council
2006-07	Hawker— Stirling North Rd	Between Quorn & Stirling North through Pichi Richi Pass	Seal shoulders— install edge lines & audio tactile line marking	200,000	DTEI, Northern & Western Region

National AusLink Black Spot Program					
Year	Road 1	Road 2— Location Description	Treatment	Funding \$	Organisation
2006-07	Carpenter Rocks Rd	Dixons Rd and Burrungule Rd	Installation of staggered t-type cross intersection	185,000	District Council of Grant
2006-07	Happy Valley Drive	Windebanks Rd	Modify left turn corner island.	40,000	DTEI, Metro Region
2006-07	Cox Hill Rd	from Piggott Range Rd and Wheatsheaf Rd	Line marking, treatment of Roadside hazards, guardrail protection and installation of retro reflective raised pavement markers	200,000	Onkaparinga Council
2006-07	Main South Rd	Bains Rd and O'Sullivan Beach Rd	Control right turn filter movement— extend and install right turn lanes	220,000	DTEI, Metro Region
2006-07	Hogarth Rd	Goodman Rd	Install left turn lane on Hogarth Rd	10,000	City of Playford
2006-07	North East Rd	Sudholz Rd	Control right turn filter movement— extend right turn lanes on north east Rd	200,000	DTEI, Metro Region
2006-07	Berri—Loxton Rd		Seal shoulders—add edge lines and delineation	130,000	DTEI, Eastern Region
2006-07	Riddoch Highway	South of Padthaway	Seal shoulders— improve delineation and renew edge lines	120,000	DTEI, Eastern Region
2006-07	Brighton Rd	Sturt Rd	Modify left turn lane and corner island	50,000	DTEI, Metro Region
2006-07	Kingscote— Penneshaw Rd	Centenary Ave and Cygnet Rd	Reinforce priority signage and improve delineation	50,000	DTEI, Eastern Region
2006-07	Two Wells— Gawler Rd	4.4km section from Maintenance Marker MM8.6 to MM13	Shoulder seal— delineation with cams & edge lines	262,000	DTEI, Mid North Region
2006-07	Mallala—Two Wells Rd	North Of Two Wells	Shoulder seal through s-bend and improve delineation	92,000	DTEI, Mid North Region
2006-07	South Rd	Sturt Rd	Install mast arm— control right turn filter movement- modify island & right turn	100,000	DTEI, Metro Region
2006-07	Marion Rd	Finniss St	Control right turn filter movement— extend and install right turn lanes	90,000	DTEI, Metro Region
2006-07	Palmer— Murray Bridge Rd		Seal shoulders— improve delineation and renew edge lines	270,000	DTEI, Eastern Region

National AusLink Black Spot Program					
Year	Road 1	Road 2— Location Description	Treatment	Funding \$	Organisation
2006-07	South Rd	Daws Rd	Install mast arms— control right turn filter movement extend right turn lane	75,000	DTEI, Metro Region
2006-07	Goodwood Rd	Grange Rd and Edward St	Control right turn filter movement—& extend right turn lanes—modify turn radius	175,000	DTEI, Metro Region
2006-07	Princes Highway	Glencoe— Kongorong Rd	Improve priority— delineation— signage and widen lanes	70,000	DTEI, Eastern Region
2007-08	King William St	Pennington Terrace	Extend median across Pennington Terrace	40,000	Adelaide City Council
2007-08	Mt Barker— Strathalbyn Rd	from Treutler Rd to near train line	Install guard rail and delineation at various locations	130,000	DTEI, Eastern Region
2007-08	Stirling— Strathalbyn Rd	8km North East of Strathalbyn	Install guard rail and delineation at various locations and seal shoulders	508,189	DTEI, Eastern Region
2007-08	Williamstown— Birdwood Rd	4.4km length south of Williamstown	Shoulder sealing— improve delineation— drainage and protect Roadside hazards	490,000	DTEI, Mid North Region
2007-08	Montacute Rd	St Bernards Rd and Newton Rd	Install mast arms and extend right turn lanes	60,000	DTEI, Metro Region
2007-08	Hanson Rd	Torrens Rd (Arndale Shopping Centre Entrance)	Change medians to add right turn lane— close median access & modify signals	60,000	DTEI, Metro Region
2007-08	Kimba—Cleve Rd	4km section, north of Cleve	Upgrade speed signage and install guideposts and curve alignment markers	27,000	DTEI, Northern & Western Region
2007-08	Lincoln Highway	5km section between Boston and North Shields	Seal Shoulder To 1.5m Width	170,000	DTEI, Northern & Western Region
2007-08	Lincoln Highway	4km section between Poonindie and North Shields	Seal Shoulder To 1.5m Width	136,000	DTEI, Northern & Western Region
2007-08	Gawler Rd	Germantown Rd	Realign intersection to create staggered T—upgrade signage and line marking	177,000	DTEI, Mid North Region
2007-08	Seacombe Rd	Miller St	Install raised median with right turn lane &	28,000	City of Marion

National AusLink Black Spot Program					
Year	Road 1	Road 2— Location Description	Treatment	Funding \$	Organisation
			relocate pedestrian refuge & ramps		
2007-08	Angaston- Loxton Rd	4.2km length between Keyneton and Sedan	Install guardrail at hazardous embankment dropoffs	130,000	DTEI, Eastern Region
2007-08	Mount Pleasant- Walker Flat Rd	4km length between Mt Pleasant East and Sanderston	Shoulder sealing and delineation (edge lines)	200,000	DTEI, Eastern Region
2007-08	Haig St	Birdwood St	Install roundabout	155,000	City of Mitcham
2007-08	Riddoch Highway (Penola Rd)	Wireless Rd	Widen median to allow vehicle to stop while turning	150,000	DTEI, Eastern Region
2007-08	Fourth Ave	Hookings Terrace	Install a roundabout	45,000	City of Port Adelaide Enfield
2007-08	Regency Rd	Churchill Rd	Right turn arrow lanterns—lengthen right turn lane and full control right	100,000	DTEI, Metro Region
2007-08	Ral Ral Ave	Thurk St	Reinforce give way priority—extend kerb—improve delineation & sight distance	39,000	DTEI, Eastern Region
2007-08	Park Terrace	Commercial Rd	Improve sight lines— left turn lane— upgrade lighting and pedestrian facilities	150,000	DTEI, Metro Region
2007-08	Montague Rd	Bridge Rd	Additional right turn lane—install mast arms and additional traffic signal	280,000	DTEI, Metro Region
2007-08	South Terrace	Alfred St	Modify western approach to roundabout— upgrade lighting and signage	26,000	City of Salisbury
2007-08	Jenkins Ave	McDouall Stuart Ave	Install signage and clear sight lines	6,000	City Of Whyalla
2007-08	Nicolson Ave	McDouall Stuart Ave	Install signage and clear sight lines	6,000	City Of Whyalla

REGISTRATION AND LICENSING TRANSACTIONS

304 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (20 November 2007). How many business and customer complaints have been received by the minister and the department in each month of 2007 relating to simple registration and licensing transactions and what are the nature of these complaints?

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

Enquiries are received via various avenues including face to face, fax, mail, e-mail and via the telephone, through Customer Service Centres, the DTEI Call Centre, the Registrar of Motor Vehicles and the offices of the Minister for Transport and Minister for Road Safety.

Below is a table of formal correspondence addressed to the Minister for Transport, Minister for Road Safety and the Registrar of Motor Vehicles relating to registration and licensing matters. The correspondence relates to complaints about services, charges and obligations, and requests for exemption from or clarification of legislative requirements. Complaints and enquiries are not categorised according to their simplicity or complexity.

	JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC
Registrar of Motor Vehicles	30	38	30	27	21	30	27	17	21	25	30	26
Minister for Road Safety	1	2	1	4	7	9	17	16	15	15	15	16
Minister for Transport	14	19	15	4	20	13	9	8	5	2	4	5
Total	45	59	46	35	48	52	53	41	41	42	49	47

BARRIER HIGHWAY

370 The Hon. G.M. GUNN (Stuart) (18 February 2008). What plans does the department have to improve the Barrier Highway between Burra and Terowie and will the government ensure this stretch of road will receive a high priority in the allocation of federal funding?

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

On the section of the Barrier Highway between Burra and Terowie, the department recently completed widening works at the Mount Bryan S Bend. Currently, there is no other work planned for this section of the highway.

Although the state government submitted the Barrier Highway for inclusion on the AusLink Network, the then commonwealth government did not include it and therefore it is not eligible for AusLink National Project funding under federal legislation.

GOVERNMENT CAR PARK LAND, WALKERVILLE

408 The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (4 March 2008). With respect to the departmental site at Walkerville:

- (a) how much did the Government receive from the sale of the northern carpark;
- (b) how much will the expansion of the southern carpark cost;
- (c) will the southern carpark now have enough spaces to compensate for the loss of spaces from the northern carpark; and
- (d) who authorised the proposed removal of trees as part of the expansion of the southern carpark?

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

Question 1 (a)

The contract sale price for the land is \$4.7 million.

Question 1 (b)

\$1.3 million has been allocated for the southern carpark, the western service yard, the rear access lane and the land made available by the Corporation of the Town of Walkerville (Fuller Street).

Question 1 (c)

The southern car park, the western service yard and the rear access lane, in conjunction with land made available by the Corporation of the Town of Walkerville (located in Fuller Street), will be modified to ensure there is no negative impact on car parking numbers.

Question 1 (d)

The car parking redevelopment required development consent and on Tuesday 11 March 2008 consent was granted pursuant to Section 49 of the Development Act, to the application for the Walkerville car park development which included approval for the removal of three significant trees.

GOVERNMENT CAR PARK LAND, WALKERVILLE

409 The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (4 March 2008).

1. How much did the Walkerville Council receive from Holcon Australia for the sale of adjoining land at the departmental site at Walkerville?

2. Prior to the sale of the northern carpark at the department's Walkerville site, was the minister or the Department aware of any agreement, discussion or negotiation by the Walkerville Council to sell other land at this site to Holcon Australia and if so, what are the details?

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

1. Any payment received by the Walkerville Council from Holcon Australia is a matter between those parties.

2. The Minister and the department were aware that the Corporation of the City of Walkerville was endeavouring to assemble parcels of land to enable the Walkerville Town City Revitalisation Project. We were aware that the Corporation and the preferred developers Holcon Australia were discussing other land parcels to support the development.

The details of any discussion or agreements between the Walkerville Council and Holcon Australia are a matter for those parties.

GOVERNMENT CAR PARK LAND, WALKERVILLE

410 The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (4 March 2008).

1. Prior to the sale of the northern carpark at the department's Walkerville site—

(a) was this land offered to any other government department and if not, why not; and

(b) was this land declared surplus to government requirements?

2. Why was the northern carpark declared surplus to departmental requirements when the department continues to operate at this site?

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

Question 1 (a)

In 2003, Corporation of the Town of Walkerville approached the department with a view to purchasing the land to form part of its 'Walkerville Town Centre Revitalisation Project'. On 2 September 2004 Cabinet approved the waiver of Premier and Cabinet Circular 114 (Purchase and Disposal of Government Real Property (including Crown Lands)) for other than community purposes and approved the sale of the land by direct negotiation with the Walkerville Council.

Question 1 (b)

The land was not declared surplus to government requirements.

Question 2

The land was not declared surplus to requirements.

WATERFALL GULLY ROAD

414 Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (11 March 2008).

When will repairs commence to that section of Waterfall Gully Road where a cyclist died in February 2007 and where another very serious motor vehicle accident occurred in July 2007 resulting in the hospitalisation of two youths.

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

The Department for Transport, Energy and Infrastructure will commence an annual pavement inspection of arterial roads in the metropolitan area in April 2008; this will include the entire length of Waterfall Gully Road. Once the inspections are complete, the department's 2008-09 major pavement maintenance program will be finalised.

MOTEL ACCOMMODATION

In reply to **Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)**. (Estimates Committee).

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): In 2006-07, \$14.7 million was expended on motel, bed and breakfast, serviced apartment and like accommodation, including the cost of carers. Of this expenditure \$1.89 million was for the cost of accommodation and \$12.81 million for the cost of carers.

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Minister for the Arts (Hon. M.D. Rann)—

South Australian Film Corporation—Report 2006—2007

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

Fire and Emergency Services Act, Review of—Report

By the Minister for Education and Children's Services (Hon. J.D. Lomax-Smith)—

Education and Children's Services, Department of—Report 2007

Senior Secondary Assessment Board of South Australia—Report 2007

Teachers Registration Board of South Australia—Report 2007

QUESTION TIME

PRISONS

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite—Leader of the Opposition) (14:02): Did the Premier, as leader of the government, approve the government's new rack 'em, pack 'em and stack 'em policy for prisons? Will young offenders be required under this new state Labor policy to share bunks and cells with paedophiles and hardened criminals?

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Ramsay—Premier, Minister for Economic Development, Minister for Social Inclusion, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Sustainability and Climate Change) (14:02): Can I just say that we are rapidly judging you on some of the most bizarre things that have been said in this parliament. What did yesterday's figures reveal? What yesterday's figures revealed is that people are being sentenced to longer in gaol. Violent criminals are being sentenced to longer in gaol than they were when you were in cabinet, because you were soft on crime and soft on the causes of crime.

We do not back away from the fact that we have toughened up the criminal law, and I am pleased that common sense has prevailed in the upper house and we have now seen, I am told, passage of legislation on bikies that the police in this state wanted, because we are working with the police whereas you, in government, worked against the police. The fact is that there are more people locked up, more criminals in gaol, more violent criminals in gaol—

The Hon. K.O. Foley: Five hundred more.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Five hundred more in gaol than when you were in power, because you were soft on crime and soft on the causes of crime.

PRISONS

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite—Leader of the Opposition) (14:03): I have a supplementary question. Was the Premier's—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The leader.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: In light of the Premier's answer to that question, was his rack 'em, pack 'em and stack 'em policy approved by the Public Service Association on behalf of corrections officers or by Monsignor David Cappo and the Social Inclusion Unit before it went to cabinet and caucus for approval?

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) (14:04): That's the difference. If he was Premier, the unions would tell him what to do. That is what he is saying today. But he has written letters to other people saying that he and the Liberals are going to pass the WorkCover bill without one single amendment, but he is not going to do it even though he has agreed to pass all of it because he would rather play games for the next month. That is the difference. Basically, game playing is what this man is about.

We make no apologies for being tough on law and order. We make no apologies for introducing DNA testing of criminals, even though we were opposed, even though the Liberal spokeswoman said that we should not DNA test von Einem, for God's sake! That is the difference between us. We have also gone in much harder, with more police—record numbers of police. You can oppose us on law and order if you like, but go out and meet some real people out there who want to see violent criminals locked up, and that is what we are doing.

GENERAL MOTORS HOLDEN

The Hon. L. STEVENS (Little Para) (14:05): Will the Premier inform the house of today's important landmarks in the future economic development of South Australia?

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) (14:05): It is so good to get a Dorothy Dixier from the Leader of the Opposition once again.

An honourable member: Two.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Two in a row. Yesterday, he wanted to underpin the fact that there were no police on the APY lands when he was in government.

Mr PENGILLY: On a point of order, Mr Speaker: relevance to the question?

The SPEAKER: I think that the Premier needs to turn to the substance of the question.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I am delighted at this question. I wish I had more notice! It was my great pleasure this morning to mark the 50th anniversary of a manufacturing icon in South Australia. It is 50 years since the concrete was laid to begin manufacturing at the General Motors Holden Elizabeth plant. Simultaneously with being out there at Holden's, celebrating its 50th birthday, once again employment levels broke new records in South Australia this month, with historic highs achieved in job numbers.

The Leader of the Opposition laughs—87,500 more jobs under this government compared to when he was in cabinet. Again, that is the difference. We broke all the records for jobs growth today. Despite the closure of Mitsubishi, the predictions were that those figures would show up today, and maybe they did. However, we have record numbers of jobs in the state's history, record jobs growth in the state's history, and manufacturing is an important part of that. So, what was then a dairy farm is today a world-class manufacturing facility.

Holden Elizabeth employs 3,400 people and is gearing up for its exports of the SS Commodore-based Pontiac G8. Holden's Elizabeth plant accounted for around 35 per cent of all the vehicles manufactured in Australia last year. Last year, more than 36,000 of the vehicles produced at Holden Elizabeth—about one-third of production—were exported to destinations as diverse as Brazil, the Middle East, South Africa, the UK, the US and New Zealand.

By the end of this year—and this is the important announcement of today, a day when we got record jobs figures in this state's history—I am delighted to be able to announce to the house that it is expected that 50 per cent of all cars built at Elizabeth will be for the export market, and that is very good news. If our car industry is to be competitive, we have to be competitive internationally, not just in the domestic market.

That attests to the company's dedication, to its highly skilled workforce and the commitment to innovation and excellence shown by its management team. The state government has committed \$3.4 million to the company's Safety Enhancement Project to help identify fuel and safety improvements for its Australian-manufactured vehicles.

I have seen many changes at Holden since I first visited the plant with Don Dunstan in the 1970s, and then with other premiers and, of course, as the minister for employment, as the leader of the opposition and, of course, as deputy leader of the opposition, working for several days at the plant in 1994. If anyone has a 1994 model Commodore and they see anything uneven about its bumper bar, they can complain to me, because I was in the bumper bar division of the plant when I was working there.

The company's performance as an innovator and as an exporter, like that of the Australian automotive industry as a whole, requires public support. That is why, in the national review of the Australian automotive industry currently underway under the leadership of Steve Bracks, South Australia will, amongst other things, urge that tariffs remain at 10 per cent until 2015. So, when making that announcement, ahead of our submission to the review, we believe there should not be a drop in tariffs; in fact, tariffs should remain at 10 per cent until 2015. I cannot see the point of some kind of one-way free trade where other countries maintain their tariffs and subsidies but we do not. I congratulate the workers and management of Holden, Elizabeth. It was great to be there with my friends from the AMWU this morning.

Today is significant for yet another reason. Today's Australian Bureau of Statistics figures on the labour market show South Australia is outperforming the national economy. Here is some news the Leader of the Opposition will not like! Over the year to April our trend total job growth in South Australia was 3.2 per cent versus 2.8 per cent for Australia. There is now a record 777,900 South Australians in work, and there is now a new record of 536,800 of them in full-time jobs. Over the past year 83 per cent of all the jobs created have been full-time jobs. Since March 2002—a day that will loom in the opposition's memory—an additional 87,500 jobs have been created. So 87,500 jobs have been created since Labor was elected in this state, and I am looking forward to the day we celebrate the 100,000 mark.

PRISONS

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite—Leader of the Opposition) (14:11): My question is to the Deputy Premier—it is breaking news and probably a world first. When did the Deputy Premier shift his principles on the effectiveness and immorality of racking, packing and stacking prisoners in our gaols? Following a trip to Yatala on 24 August 1994 when in opposition, the Deputy Premier said:

If we want prisoners to go into that system and come out with a life, so that they do not reoffend, we have to give them the opportunity. It is without parallel for us to rack 'em pack 'em and stack 'em as we are currently doing in the Adelaide Remand Centre, Yatala and all our state's prisons...We should actually be trying to rehabilitate them...However, the government will never do it when it is racking, packing and stacking them in the prisons.

You are an idiot!

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Port Adelaide—Deputy Premier, Treasurer, Minister for Industry and Trade, Minister for Federal/State Relations) (14:13): I ask that the member withdraw that reflection.

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

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Clearly, in 1994 I was a bleeding heart liberal softie like the Leader of the Opposition—but I have toughened up over the years. Sometimes you have to admit you were wrong to do what is right. If I was a bleeding heart soft liberal back in those days, just like the Leader of the Opposition, I was wrong. The Leader of the Opposition wants to hold me accountable for things I might have said in 1994—14 years ago. I was in opposition in those days. I would have said a lot of things in 1994. I reckon in 1994 I did not think I would ever be in government, quite frankly.

Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Did he?

Members interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: A bit before then? I never expected to see government, but I did not realise how much members of the Liberal Party hate each other. Then the leaks started

coming. The Olsen forces started leaking to us and then, when Brown went, all sorts of people were leaking the other way. We got rid of them and—

Mr WILLIAMS: Mr Speaker, I rise on a point of order. My point of order is relevance. We are wondering when the Deputy Premier had a revelation that you should not be rehabilitating prisoners.

The SPEAKER: Order! Yes; I uphold the point of order. The Deputy Premier needs to turn to the substance of the question.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Clearly, as I said, in 1994, I was wrong. In 2008, I have hardened up and toughened up. If members opposite are concerned about the conditions of our prisons—

Mr Williams interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Okay, the opposition wants to rehabilitate prisoners.

The Hon. M.D. Rann: They want to let them out.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: They want to let them out, just like they used to. On average, 58 months was the time a prisoner spent in prison under Liberals. Under Labor, on average, it is 74 months. What is more, 500 more prisoners are in gaols because, as the Premier said, we are tough on crime; we are tough on the causes of crime. The triple bunking of prisoners occurred under the Liberal government, are you aware of that?

Mr Hamilton-Smith: Do you want to come over here and ask questions?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: No, I am happy over here. Racking, packing and stacking happened under your government, but you got them out as quickly as you could. We are racking, packing and stacking them, and we are leaving them there longer.

HEALTHY EATING PROGRAM

Ms FOX (Bright) (14:16): My question is directed to the Minister for Education and Children's Services. How are schools embracing the move to healthy food sales in school canteens?

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): The member for Bright would recall that, some two years ago, we signalled our intention to ban the sale of junk food in school canteens. Since that time, we have worked with school communities and we have held workshops across the state dealing with not just school councils and administration but canteen managers and also industry groups to prepare them for the reform in our canteen sales. We are continuing now to work with schools since the introduction of a junk food ban in canteens by providing additional information tips and budgeting advice (which the member for Unley's local school, Parkside Primary School, said was very helpful) and partnering successful schools with those that require extra assistance.

I take this opportunity to thank schools, canteens, students, parents and industry leaders who have worked with us on this initiative, which we believe is a significant one in the fight against obesity and the attempts to improve healthy weights and living in our young people. It is a particular pity that those opposite have sought, at every turn, to criticise and undermine our work on healthy food sales in canteens. In fact, they seem to forget that the data suggests—

Mr Pisoni interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Unley will come to order!

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH: —that, indeed, we are the last generation who can hope to live longer than our parents and, indeed, our children will be the first generation to expect to live less time than we do because of the weight, the intensity of the diabetes epidemic and general illnesses within our community. It is important that all of us look at these issues seriously. The member for Unley's latest 'stunt' has been to write to schools incorrectly suggesting there is financial assistance to prop up struggling canteens. This is nothing short of desperation. In fact, the reality is clearly the member for Unley would like us to return to the days of greasy chips and doughnuts in our canteens, and he, unlike us, does not put children's health first.

In fact, I believe that no parent would want to put the profits of a canteen ahead of healthy lifestyles for their children, and it would appear that many schools agree with us. I would like to

share with those opposite some of the views of our schools around the state. Some of these have been recorded in newspapers, but I will quote some of them:

'Canteen turnover has been better than previous years which surprised us a bit,' said the Hallett Cove South Primary School Principal Max Rayner.

Warradale Primary School Principal, Susan Clarke, said that the school began phasing in the healthy menus last year and the feedback so far had been excellent. She said that canteen turnover had remained steady and had slightly increased. Edwardstown Primary School Principal, Tony Sullivan, said:

We were a little bit concerned the menus could compromise the viability of the canteen but that hasn't been the case.

From the *Hills & Valley Messenger* in March:

Thiele Primary School Principal Steve Freeman said students were 'enjoying' more healthy foods, with the number of items sold at the school's canteen increasing 'significantly'. It was amazing how quick the take-up was. We've always had a healthy canteen, but this (program) has made it easier.

Quoting from the *Southern Times Messenger*, Woodcroft Primary School Principal, Anne Kibble, a fabulous school, said that the canteen was making at least \$500 a day compared with about \$440 before the policy was introduced in term 1. She said:

Our fruit salads are walking out the door and gradually we'll add soup and corn on the cob, so it's been a really popular changeover.

Hackham East School's K-7 canteen manager, Coralie Goodman, said that children had responded well to the healthy choice menu, boosting takings by about \$50 a day. In addition, the Principal of the Reynella South Primary School said that business at the canteen had never been better. He said further:

We've introduced some tasty things that are also healthy and nutritious and we certainly haven't noticed a drop off in sales.

The list goes on. Doing what is right is often going to be very difficult, but we do not resile from our determination to make healthy life styles a big initiative in our schools because we want to raise healthy young South Australians for the future.

MARCOS ENGINEERING LIMITED

Mr PISONI (Unley) (14:21): My question is to the Premier. Will the Premier tell the house what progress has been made on plans to establish an Adelaide manufacturing base for the British Marcos Engineering TSO GT coupe? South Australians remember the pictures from England in 2005 of our Premier meeting officials of the Marcos Engineering company and announcing—yes, breaking news from overseas—plans to build more than 300 specialist sports cars a year, and it was an overseas trip coup de coupe.

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) (14:22): I think the answer is: 'Not well.' There is the air warfare destroyers that is a big plus, the mining industry is a big plus, but I think the British sports cars was not, and I do not think there is any chance of seeing them—what was it, rack 'em, stack 'em and pack 'em? Although, when I heard the Deputy Premier talking about that yesterday on radio, I thought he was talking about what was going on in Liberal branch meetings with the current round of preselections. It sounds like what happened in Unley, and I understand there is a bit going on elsewhere around the place. No, I think the Marcos car is unlikely to be a goer in South Australia in terms of a massive manufacturing industry.

CANCER COUNCIL OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA

Mr PICCOLO (Light) (14:23): My question is to the Minister for Health. Will the minister advise the house of the benefits of the partnering agreement signed today between the government and the Cancer Council of South Australia?

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Kaurna—Minister for Health, Minister for the Southern Suburbs, Minister Assisting the Premier in the Arts) (14:23): I thank the member for Light for his important question and I acknowledge his very strong interest in health matters. Today, on behalf of the government of South Australia and SA Health, I signed a partnering agreement with the Cancer Council of South Australia. Under the terms of the agreement, the partnership will see a commitment of \$54 million by the Cancer Council. These funds will be matched by state funding for

cancer programs over the next five years and will be used to fund agreed joint projects to combat cancer.

In simple terms, this agreement will see a pooling of resources and a coordination of endeavours between the Cancer Council of South Australia and SA Health. This will ensure that there is no counterproductive duplication of effort in the fight against cancer in this state. It will also ensure the best possible outcome for every dollar spent by both the government and non-government sectors.

We will work jointly in three areas; namely, research supported by improved data collection; prevention and early detection programs; and support for sufferers and their families, carers and friends. Under the specific details of the agreement each party will grant the other a non-exclusive, non-transferable, irrevocable, royalty-free non-commercial licence to use, reproduce and adapt for its own use. This will mean doctors and researchers working under the auspices of both SA Health and the Cancer Council will share information and all new technological and medical advances.

The first cancer control project to be funded by the new partnership has already been approved and will be the \$4.4 million investment in the research infrastructure, including the redevelopment of the SA Cancer registries in the Department of Health and in our hospitals.

An upgrade of the registries will improve the accessibility, timeliness and accuracy of the data of cancer incidences in South Australia, which is critical for the evaluation and monitoring of cancer treatments and services. The upgrade to research infrastructure will put South Australian cancer researchers in a better position to compete for national funding, and make South Australia a more attractive research base for the nation's leading clinicians, which will further improve research outcomes for this state.

Each and every day, around 23 South Australians are diagnosed with cancer. It is a disease that will affect one in three people at some time in their lives. This partnering agreement is a significant step in the fight against cancer in South Australia, and will work in conjunction with the statewide cancer control plan launched by the government and the Cancer Council in 2006.

The Cancer Council is South Australia's leading non-government cancer control organisation dedicated to ensuring that South Australians are reducing their cancer risk and receiving the best cancer care. These objectives are, of course, shared by the government, and by working together we will be able to identify the best areas of research and provide help for those who are coping with the disease. I applaud the Cancer Council's initiative in this regard. It is committing very big funds to working on this very serious illness.

DOCTORS DISPUTE

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:27): Will the Minister for Health agree to the doctors' dispute becoming a matter open to public knowledge and, in particular, that the compulsory conferences and hearings in the Industrial Commission proceed henceforth in court and on the record?

Negotiations have been undertaken since October last year. On the minister's own admission, hundreds of surgical procedures have been cancelled. Now we have a public dispute between the government and the professionals as to who is telling the truth. In that regard, on 5 May 2008 the minister claimed that senior anaesthetists were earning between \$340,000 and \$389,000 a year under the new award, and there were no vacancies. On 6 May, Dr David Sainsbury, the Head of Anaesthesia at the Women's and Children's Hospital, said that these figures are 'rubbish', and that he has two vacancies. To date, some of the hearings have been in court (as in chambers) meaning that they are not open to the public.

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Kurna—Minister for Health, Minister for the Southern Suburbs, Minister Assisting the Premier in the Arts) (14:28): The Deputy Leader of the Opposition raised a number of issues, some of which are in my area of responsibility and some in my colleague's.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. HILL: I do not know whether there is a capacity in this chamber during question time for two ministers to answer a question seriatim, but if there is, perhaps we could take advantage of it. Let me deal with some of the issues. The dispute between the government and the doctors will eventually be resolved, as are all disputes between employers and employees. We would obviously like to resolve that dispute by negotiation, and we are continuing to offer to

negotiate with the union representing the doctors. It is now before the Industrial Relations Commission, and, of course, we take guidance and instructions from that body.

In general terms, the government has made, we believe, a very fair offer to the doctors. Senior anaesthetists, under the arrangements currently in place in South Australia, can receive a remuneration package of up to around \$350,000. Under the offer that we have made to the union, that would increase, I think, to closer to \$390,000. As I understand it, the request from the union would pay a senior anaesthetist something like \$480,000 or \$490,000. We are talking about very large sums of money.

In the case of anaesthetists, it is true that there is an international shortage. The training of anaesthetists, the decisions about how many anaesthetists, how many specialists are created, of course, is within the hands of the colleges that look after these things, and only to a limited degree can the government get involved in that. So, there is a reduced pool of available anaesthetists.

I am assured that at the Women's and Children's Hospital, in the area where the doctor who the member referred to works, the paediatric section, there is no vacancy at all in the area of anaesthetics. I understand the particular doctor has said that he would like to take on another trainee. Well, we would welcome him doing that. We have no problems with him taking on another trainee, as I understand it.

In relation to vacancies generally in the public health sector in South Australia, as I understand it, we currently have 4 per cent vacancies across the medical workforce. That is a relatively low figure. We would obviously like it to be zero, but it is a relatively low figure and it compares more than well with other states.

This is a difficult matter of negotiation. As I say, it is now under the management of the Industrial Relations Commission, which is taking, I think, a very good line and taking a strong interest in this case. If the matter cannot be resolved by negotiation, of course, it will then have to go to arbitration. That is the system we have got. It is a time-tested system and I am sure that it will ultimately resolve this matter.

MEDICAL STAFF, OVERSEAS TRAVEL

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:31): My question is again to the Minister for Health. Can the minister explain why it was necessary to send eight senior public servants and clinicians on an overseas trip to the United Kingdom in February this year to look at managing demands in public hospitals?

I ask this question in light of the fact that in 2006-07 the Health Department spent \$7,192 on travel to England to investigate health care reform initiatives in the UK; \$26,705 to attend expos in the UK; \$10,504 to attend the British Medical Council Fair; and \$11,771 for health department officials to accompany the minister and chief executive to the US to study their health system for health reform. In fact, health department headquarters itself spent \$110,854, and that does not include travel undertaken—

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I rise on a point of order. The explanation is way beyond anything needed to explain the question.

The SPEAKER: I uphold the point of order. Any member can rise and withdraw leave from the explanation. It does not require a point of order. I remind members that explanations should be contained to an explanation of the question itself, not offer anything other than what is necessary to explain the question. The Minister for Health.

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Kaurna—Minister for Health, Minister for the Southern Suburbs, Minister Assisting the Premier in the Arts) (14:33): I find it extraordinary that the deputy leader asks the question and is in the media attacking the government for not settling the dispute with the doctors about their pay and conditions. In fact, one of the items in all of that is the money that we put into the training of doctors and the opportunity for them to travel to learn about how other systems operate.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. HILL: They are all doctors. I do not know what the deputy leader is speaking about. I informed the house a month or so ago of a visit to the United Kingdom by a group of clinicians from South Australia to examine the public hospital system there and to look at the way they were managing demand in busy emergency departments. We sent doctors, nurses and a couple of senior officers to visit those hospitals in the United Kingdom. I think that is the trip that the

member refers to. I have given a full account to this house about that. I refer members to what I said at the—

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. HILL: I believe the member is talking about the same group. I will check that. We sent the clinicians over there to look at how the British medical system is adapting to deal with the increasing demand on its emergency departments. It is really about how one designs the care of individuals through the public health system, and they have reformed their emergency department and acute services in Britain quite substantially. We are looking at how we can adapt those initiatives into our system, particularly as we develop the Marjorie Jackson-Nelson Hospital.

As I understand it, the doctors and nurses who went on that visit were very impressed and are now working in their own workplaces in regard to that. As to other officials, I would point out that I am not entirely sure of the travel budget for the health department, but by a long chalk the majority of travel undertaken and paid for within health—and it is substantial—is to send doctors overseas as part of their legitimate expectations to be updated in their fields of expertise.

That is not something of which I am critical. It is an important part of their work and their role to maintain their skills and expertise, and doctors do travel a lot. They go to a lot of conferences, and they participate in a lot of international events. We would spend millions of dollars, I am sure, each year supporting that activity. There are some public servants—God forbid!—who are not necessarily clinicians who also participate in international events. We have a budget in health of something like \$3,500 million. The \$100,000 for public servant travel that the member referred to strikes me as being a very small proportion of that.

SCHOOL-TO-WORK PROGRAM

Ms PORTOLESI (Hartley) (14:36): My question is to the Minister for Education and Children's Services. With the new SACE being introduced into schools next year, how will schools be supported so that young people will develop the skills they need for better jobs and careers?

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH (Adelaide—Minister for Education and Children's Services, Minister for Tourism, Minister for the City of Adelaide) (14:36): I thank the member for that question. It was somewhat unexpected, I might say, but I am delighted to hear about it. The changes that will occur over the next year are very substantial. In particular, we are introducing a range of school-to-work initiatives as a response to the need to make sure that the new agenda in the SACE is up to date.

Of course, next year we will lift the age of compulsory education to 17 which means that there have to be different programs within our schools, because those young people who are currently voting with their feet will need additional resources. Part of that will be the programs we are rolling out through the public and private schools, both Catholic and independent schools, to develop programs that will engage young people and produce the capacity to take them into meaningful employment.

Of course we do know that our new SACE will also include vocational training, and that vocational training will give a wider opportunity to younger people who have been disengaged in the past to link in with job opportunities in their regions. One of the reasons that we have been very uneasy about a national curriculum has been that the problem with senior secondary education is that many of the opportunities need to link into local businesses.

Those linkages from school to work can only really be employed if the local schools form relationships with local employers, and those local employers can then say what skills are needed. The school-to-work initiatives will be developed through a range of local opportunities and options for children in secondary schools. Those grants are going out now to the three sectors and will be used to inform the programs that are in place next year.

The other initiative that is extremely important is the year 9 testing. Members will be aware of testing in years 3, 5 and 7, but our state was the first state to agree to and take up trials of year 9 testing. Rather than collecting data with which one could beat up children or teachers by saying that they have not reached a benchmark, the whole reason for these tests is actually to allow remedial intervention, because year 9 is perhaps the last chance you have before a child goes on to senior secondary education.

That opportunity has been embraced over the last year. The results from last year were used in a range of programs and from now will be incorporated in the personal learning plan. Those year 9 tests, as with those in years 7, 5 and 3, were traditionally in August. This year for the first time those tests will be held in May which produces some significant difficulties. The advantage for our schools is that, by having the tests in May, the results will be back sooner and therefore remedial intervention can occur sooner. The disadvantage, of course, will be that the students who take the tests in South Australia will have had several months less schooling. So, one of the risks that we should expect is that there is a chance that the results will be poorer than previous years.

I understand that will be a difficult issue for us to address, because everyone would like results to improve year on year. But it is quite clear that, for a year 3 child particularly, having those tests three months earlier will have a significant impact on the numbers reaching benchmarks. We imagine there will be some difficulty across the nation in managing what might well appear to be a reduction in those achievements, but the advantage will be: sooner results, sooner intervention and sooner help for those children who are struggling.

For children in year 9 particularly, that will be useful, because we want their personal learning plans and their senior secondary education to take off, informed by not only where they struggle but where they have had intervention. Those changes will be occurring over this year, and further work will be done next year when we introduce our compulsory education up to the age of 17, as well as further trials on the work on the SACE certificate.

IMVS REPORT

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:41): Will the Minister for Health now release the KPMG due diligence report carried out on the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science and advise how much the report cost? The government has consistently denied that it has any intention of selling any part of the IMVS and yet the opposition's request for a copy of the report has been denied, with the government claiming it is commercial in confidence. The income statement of IMVS is disclosed in its annual reports, the last of which indicates to us that it has net assets, including the Frome Road property, of nearly \$100 million.

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Kaurna—Minister for Health, Minister for the Southern Suburbs, Minister Assisting the Premier in the Arts) (14:42): My colleague the Deputy Premier reminds me that on the weekend the opposition released a study into—

The Hon. K.O. Foley: A consultancy.

The Hon. J.D. HILL: —a consultancy into its grand plan to build a football stadium which would not cost taxpayers anything—about a third of the price of other stadiums around Australia. They would not even tell us who the consultant was, and their reason for not doing so was that it was commercial in confidence. I just say to the Deputy Leader of the Opposition: how can you practise such gross hypocrisy in this place?

The fact is that the government has introduced legislation in this place—which has been passed and is now in the other place—to make sure that we have an efficient pathology service in South Australia. We are combining the three pathology services: the IMVS, SouthPath and the Women's and Children's Pathology Service. This is about making sure the system is run focused on its goals.

KPMG did a report for us. The FOI officers, I understand, have said that vast proportions of that should not be released because it is commercial in confidence. The member asked me for it. I asked the department if we could give it to the member, and that was the advice I received, and I am bound by that kind of advice.

It is a commercial operation. The IMVS does operate in a commercial way. It does have a commercial arm; it is in competition with other suppliers of those services. If information about its business plan, business model and its operations were made public, it could damage its commercial operations. So, I thought that would have been logical.

As the deputy leader's party on the weekend claimed that same protection for an unnamed, anonymous report, I thought she would have understood the principles that applied. As to how much it cost, I am happy to get the information for the member.

FORMULA ONE EXHIBITION RACE

Mr PENGILLY (Finniss) (14:44): Can the Premier advise what progress has been made on plans to stage a novelty Formula One event in Adelaide as part of the Clipsal 500 and to base a

business-class-only airline in Adelaide? The Premier announced in 2005 in breaking news from England that he had met with Minardi racing boss, Paul Stoddart, to negotiate the staging of an exhibition formula one race in Adelaide. At the same meeting, negotiations were also held on the plans for Mr Stoddart to base his business-class-only airline (OzJet) in Adelaide.

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) (14:45): This reminds me of John Olsen's tower of inspiration. Remember that? Front page: knockers stand aside. It was going to be huge. It was going to be like the Empire State Building in the middle of Adelaide. Then of course there was the former government's SAMAG magnesium plant. Remember that—the SAMAG magnesium plant?

Mr Williams: I don't think you should talk about that.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Yes, I can talk about it because do you remember there was a big story that somehow we had lost this to Queensland? Apparently, it had gone to Queensland. It didn't go—

Mr PENGILLY: A point of order: the question was regarding the Formula One event in Adelaide, part of Clipsal 500.

The SPEAKER: No, I do not uphold the point of order. The minister is answering the substance of the question.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Absolutely. Basically governments have to get in there and try to win and secure projects, and that is why we have nearly 90,000 more jobs than on your watch. That is why we have a defence boom and a mining boom. But there was SAMAG, and apparently I had lost it to Queensland. It has not been built in Queensland. Apparently then it was lost to Egypt. I don't think it has been built in Egypt. Then it was lost to Dubai. I don't think it has been in Dubai. I am not quite sure who it has been lost to now or whether it will ever be built.

Then there was Australis. Remember the Australis announcement? This giant television centre that was going to be a giant call centre. About \$100 million was spent on call centres. What has happened to them? Then, of course, breaking news from the former government—there was going to be this fantastic world-class development down at Wirrina and there were going to be two jumbo jets a week from Malaysia.

Mr Koutsantonis: And the tram.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Yes, and you promised the tram. Who delivered the tram? We delivered the tram. Let me just say this: you have to be in it to win it, and I am very pleased that we have been successful because we are in it to win it. We have actually been getting some results in doing so.

RECREATION AND SPORT FUNDING

Mr BIGNELL (Mawson) (14:47): My question is to the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing. How is the government supporting recreation and sporting organisations to understand better what grants are available to assist their members?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT (Lee—Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Finance, Minister for Government Enterprises, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:47): I thank the honourable member for his question and I know he has a very strong interest in this area. The government is pleased to be able to provide over \$11 million in grants to community based active recreation and sporting organisations, peak industry bodies, local government and schools through five grants programs managed by the Office for Recreation and Sport.

These groups use their funding to build new community sporting facilities, purchase new sporting equipment and run programs to get people more active. The government has just finalised the Recreation and Sport Funding Handbook which details the funding opportunities available and provides a very useful introductory source of information for the South Australian community. It outlines the five grants programs available:

- the Active Club Program;
- the Community Recreation and Sport Facilities Program;
- the Inclusive Recreation Inclusive Sport Program;
- the Move It! Making Communities Active Program; and

- the Statewide Enhancement Program.

It also directs the reader towards the program most suited to their organisation's needs. These five grants programs play an integral role in developing physical activity opportunities for all South Australians.

The Recreation and Sport Funding Handbook has just been published and, in coming weeks, it will be sent to all state parliamentary electoral offices, local government and state sporting and recreation organisations. I am sure this funding handbook will further assist recreation and sport organisations to apply for funding so they can continue to provide increased sporting programs and services to their communities.

MURRAY-DARLING BASIN

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop) (14:49): Why has the Minister for Water Security, on behalf of South Australian water users, failed to bring pressure on the New South Wales government to curb illegal diversions of water which would otherwise flow down the Darling River and into the Menindee Lakes? The waters flowing into the Menindee Lakes remain under the control of the New South Wales government until storage reaches 640 gigalitres, at which time control diverts to the Murray-Darling Basin Commission which may then release up to 160 gigalitres of that water from storage to be shared equally between New South Wales, Victoria and South Australia. The opposition has been told that illegal diversions have become commonplace in the Darling system and that the 640 gigalitre trigger is being actively avoided.

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) (14:50): Of course, if there are illegal diversions out of any system in the Murray-Darling Basin, the South Australian government is most concerned, and if the honourable member has information about these illegal diversions I hope he has reported them.

Mr Williams interjecting:

The Hon. K.A. MAYWALD: I think the Leader of the Opposition needs to put on the record who is making illegal diversions and who is acting illegally in the Murray-Darling Basin.

Mr Williams interjecting:

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

The Hon. K.A. MAYWALD: The opposition misunderstands the constitutional rights of New South Wales in the Murray-Darling Basin at present, and the opposition continues to argue that we should not be supporting the national plan. The national plan is necessary so that we can have better management of the Murray-Darling Basin; so that things such as diversions that are occurring in New South Wales at present under the legal constitutional rights of the New South Wales government can cease and be brought into a new cap on both ground and surface water. The basin-wide plan will deal with these issues. If the honourable member is asserting that illegal activities are occurring, then he should bring forward the information so we can do something about it.

Mr Williams interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. K.A. MAYWALD: Put it on the record. I am making no assertions: the opposition is making assertions. Let me tell you about the kind of assertions which the opposition is making—

Mr Williams interjecting:

The Hon. K.A. MAYWALD: —and which consistently mislead the public.

The SPEAKER: Order! I have given the member for MacKillop a fair go. He needs to be quiet and listen to the minister's answer. He might not like what she is saying. If he has something to add, he has plenty of opportunity to do so. I am more than happy to give him the call to ask another question if there is something he would like to clarify with the minister. Until such time, he should show her courtesy.

The Hon. K.A. MAYWALD: Thank you, sir. The taking of water in the Darling region by New South Wales is an issue that is of concern to South Australia. South Australia has been fighting for decades to have unregulated flows better shared across all the users, including the

environment. That does not occur at present because South Australia does not have the constitutional rights to enforce it.

Under federation that water belongs to New South Wales until a trigger level is reached in the Menindee Lakes of 640 gigalitres. Until that trigger is actually activated through the levels in the lakes, the water is available to New South Wales to do what New South Wales wants with it. Unfortunately, we have no way to intervene in that, and that is why it is so important that members opposite get behind the national plan, that they get behind the state government in South Australia, that they get behind the establishment of an independent authority, and that they get behind what we are trying to do in order to get those issues dealt with at the national level.

It has taken decades to get to the stage that we are at now. We are finally going to see some independence in the Murray-Darling authority management of the river systems. We will get the states' right of veto out of the system. We will have an independent authority that will develop a basin-wide plan that will include groundwater and surface water for the very first time. The authority will answer to one minister, namely, the federal minister. The federal government will show the strong leadership necessary to adopt the plan developed by the new independent authority, or it will need to lay its reasons for not doing so on the table in both houses.

Members opposite are misleading the public in a number of different ways in relation to what is happening with the national plan. I will quote from a letter to the editor, recently written by the member for MacKillop as the shadow minister for water security. The letter refers to the Victorian food bowl project. The letter states:

The project is supposed to free up the water for Melbourne, with stage 2 to receive up to \$1 billion from the federal government.

I do not know how many times the state opposition has been told that the project being funded through the \$10 billion plan is not the pipeline to Melbourne: it is not the pipeline to Melbourne. Minister Wong has said over and over again that the project will be subject to due diligence.

Mr Williams interjecting:

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

The Hon. K.A. MAYWALD: Stage 2 of the project, which is to be funded by the federal government, is subject to due diligence. That means no water, no money.

The Hon. P.F. Conlon interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I apologise to the minister. The Minister for Transport should also take some of his own counsel and show courtesy to the minister on her feet.

The Hon. K.A. MAYWALD: Constantly and knowingly, the member for MacKillop goes out there and continues to mislead the public. It is an absolute disgrace. The water for the stage 2 development is a 100 gigalitres for the environment, 100 gigalitres for the irrigators. That project is agreed to be funded conditionally—

Mr Williams interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I warn the member for MacKillop.

The Hon. K.A. MAYWALD: —on the basis that it stacks up. It is not a project that has been supported unconditionally: it is conditional on that water being delivered. And that water is net, net savings to the environment. I think that is a very important point that the member for MacKillop continues to overlook. But he is not interested in getting progress on the Murray-Darling Basin, because let us look at his track record on water.

The member for MacKillop does not want forestry in the water balance in the South-East. He does not want to include forestry in it. Isn't that correct? You do not include forestry in the water balance and you have a big impact. What have you also supported in the South-East? You have supported the notion that water falling from the sky belongs to the farmer and he should be able to catch as much as he wants. That is what you support. You are on the record as saying that. Now that is—

Ms CHAPMAN: Mr Speaker, I rise on a point of order. It is clearly out of order for the minister to be pointing at the honourable member and saying what 'you' want. She is speaking to the speaker which is totally out of order. She is debating the matter and asking the questioner—

The SPEAKER: Order! The minister is answering the question, but I do uphold the point of order. She must not use the second person pronoun when talking about the member for MacKillop.

The Hon. K.A. MAYWALD: My apologies, sir, I meant the member for MacKillop, the shadow spokesperson on water, who has an atrocious water record in water policy.

The SPEAKER: The member for Kavel.

COUNTRY HEALTH SA

Mr GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel) (14:57): Thank you very much, Mr Speaker.

The Hon. K.O. Foley interjecting:

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: Kevin, I don't know, you have got all mean and nasty lately, mate. You used to be a good bloke, but recently you have got mean and nasty. I don't know what's happened.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: My question is to the Minister for Health. When will the staff of each of the country hospitals be advised whether or not they have a job after 30 June this year? The government still has not published its country health plan, and under the Health Care Act 2008, the health department CEO Dr Sherbon will become the employing authority.

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Kaurua—Minister for Health, Minister for the Southern Suburbs, Minister Assisting the Premier in the Arts) (14:58): Of course, the changes to the Health Care Act, which will come into place from the middle of this year have been long awaited on this side of the house. It is not with any help of the other side that we have got those changes in place, but it will mean that, for the first time, all the country hospitals will be brought together as one organisation, Country Health SA. Of course, Dr Sherbon has been the employing authority for some time, as my colleague here introduced changes to the laws some time ago in relation to employment. Dr Sherbon has delegated that authority to the individual boards in this period, and then from 1 July he will exercise that authority directly, although I assume that, once again, he will delegate it to Country Health SA.

There is no suggestion that anyone who is employed by any of the individual hospitals will lose their jobs. If they are permanently employed, they will maintain that level of employment. If they are on contracts, of course those contracts, part-time employees and so on, will be subject to whatever the demands are from time to time.

APY LANDS, SPORT AND RECREATION

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (14:59): My question is to the Premier. When will the audit of sport and recreation facilities on the APY lands be completed and the sport and recreation strategic plan released? In 2004, the state government allocated \$46,000 for an audit of sporting facilities on the APY lands. The government said that the audit, along with a strategic plan, would help it work out what additional programs and facilities were needed. The audit and plan were supposed to be finished by early 2005.

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Ramsay—Premier, Minister for Economic Development, Minister for Social Inclusion, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Sustainability and Climate Change) (15:00): I will tell you what I do know—and I was criticised for doing so—we negotiated with the federal government to put swimming pools into the communities, and we were attacked for doing that. It was about getting kids back to school. No school, no pool. I think that has been good for recreation and sport outcomes and, of course, members would be aware of the Aboriginal football initiative that we have announced. I am happy to get a report for the honourable member, and I am sure that his question is genuine.

ABORIGINAL POWER CUP

Ms BREUER (Giles) (15:00): Will the Minister for Multicultural Affairs inform the house about the recent launch of the Aboriginal Power Cup?

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON (Croydon—Attorney-General, Minister for Justice, Minister for Multicultural Affairs) (15:01): The Aboriginal Power Cup is an initiative arising from the To Break the Cycle report, prepared by the Commissioner for Social Inclusion, Monsignor David Cappelletti. The report was commissioned by the government to address serious and repeated youth offending. Monsignor Cappelletti made a concerted attempt to engage Aboriginal South Australians to find workable and long-term solutions to youth crime. The government has already endorsed all the recommendations in the report and has taken swift action on many of those recommendations.

The Aboriginal Power Cup is a partnership between the Attorney-General's Department, the Port Adelaide Football Club, the South Australian Aboriginal Sports Training Academy and the South Australian National Football League. I thank the Deputy Premier for kicking off the project last month. The Aboriginal Power Cup is a football carnival for Aboriginal students that takes participants through a series of tasks for wellbeing, resilience and learning. By engaging Aboriginal youth across the state in healthy competition through sport, the aim is not only to promote the importance of their own personal health and wellbeing and boost their self-confidence, but also to connect them with positive role models who will help shape their future. It is expected that the cup will also be an opportunity to showcase the talent of Aboriginal youth.

In its first year, the Aboriginal Power Cup will be open to students at six secondary schools across the state: the Para West Adult Campus, Kurna Plains Primary School, John Pirie Secondary School, Ceduna Area School, Port Lincoln High School and the Wiltja program, which is based at Woodville High School. The idea is modelled on a successful program in Britain based at Charlton Athletic Football Club. At Charlton in London last month, I saw for myself the benefits of positive engagement with young people at risk of a lifetime of criminal behaviours, to break the cycle of crime and antisocial behaviour. For their part, students will be involved in the preparation and planning of the football carnival, which will include designing their team guernseys and liaising with local media and their communities.

The first site visit by the Port Adelaide Football Club and the South Australian Aboriginal Sports Training Academy occurred yesterday at the Ceduna Area School. The visit introduced pupils to the Aboriginal Power Cup and encouraged their participation. The Aboriginal Power Cup grand final will be held on 15 August 2008. As the Speaker will know, that is a red letter day, the Feast of the Assumption of Our Lady. It will be a curtain-raiser on the Port Adelaide-Collingwood clash at AAMI Stadium. The social inclusion approach is very much about forging partnerships across government, non-government and community sectors, and about finding new ways to use the knowledge and experience in these sectors to tackle complicated social programs.

I was willing to sit down and sup with the Port Adelaide Football Club about this matter—something I thought I would never do. The Aboriginal Power Cup project is a great example of how collaboration between private and public sector organisations can benefit all South Australians.

MARATHON RESOURCES

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Port Adelaide—Deputy Premier, Treasurer, Minister for Industry and Trade, Minister for Federal/State Relations) (15:05): I lay on the table a copy of a ministerial statement on Marathon Resources delivered by the minister in the other place.

FIRE AND EMERGENCY SERVICES ACT REVIEW

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT (Lee—Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Finance, Minister for Government Enterprises, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (15:05): I lay on the table a copy of a ministerial statement made by the Hon. Carmel Zollo in another place.

RENAL SERVICE

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Kurna—Minister for Health, Minister for the Southern Suburbs, Minister Assisting the Premier in the Arts) (15:06): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.D. HILL: As the government announced in June last year, our internationally acclaimed renal service will bring its services together on one site at the Royal Adelaide Hospital. Our renal service is already recognised world wide for the quality of patient care, the standard of training programs and its extensive research program. The collocation services will enable it to grow further by expanding its research program. It will be co-directed by Professor Graeme Russ, the current Director of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital Renal Unit, and Associate Professor Kim Bannister, the current Director of the Royal Adelaide Hospital Renal Unit.

Since the announcement was made, planning has been undertaken for the move, and it is expected that work on a new ward will commence later this year, and that is expected to take 18 months to complete. The relocation of acute renal services is part of a suite of upgrades to the Royal Adelaide Hospital that was announced as part of the Health Care Plan funding.

The first component, totalling \$9.406 million, includes relocating dermatology, outpatients and other services, upgrading a number of wards, including the spinal injury unit, and the removal of asbestos. The second component of these upgrades relating to the renal unit include laboratory

improvements, upgrades and extensions to lifts, the medical breathing air system and the cooling tower in the allied health building, at a total cost of \$5.934 million.

While we build the Marjorie Jackson-Nelson Hospital, it is important that the Royal Adelaide Hospital continues to play its pivotal role as the major hospital in this state. South Australians deserve to continue receiving the best available health care while we reform the system as a whole. The need to increase the capacity and level of amenity at the Royal Adelaide Hospital was identified in the Health Care Plan, and the funding was committed in the 2006-07 budget.

Renal transplant patients will benefit from the new integrated renal service through access to a broader range of clinical services, including the intensive care unit and the complete range of services available only at a major tertiary hospital such as the RAH.

The current renal unit at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital will continue to serve western suburbs patients requiring dialysis or outpatient treatment. Other renal services offered throughout the state will remain unchanged. Presently, 86 per cent of renal transplant patients live outside the natural catchment area of the QEH, which is in the western suburbs. The move to a more central location will be more convenient for the vast majority of renal transplant patients and their families.

This move is in line with the new roles for our hospitals, as outlined in our reform agenda. The Health Care plan identified the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, Modbury Hospital, Repatriation General Hospital and the Noarlunga Health Service as general hospitals providing high-quality hospital services addressing the needs of their local communities.

As a general hospital, the Queen Elizabeth will tailor its services to meet the needs of the ageing population profile of the western suburbs. The relocation of the renal transplant unit from the Queen Elizabeth Hospital will allow 17 beds to be used to increase services in aged care, rehabilitation and palliative care services. The QEH will also take on more high-volume elective surgery procedures, reducing the possibility of elective surgery being cancelled in times of peak demand.

By relocating the renal transplant service to the Royal Adelaide Hospital now, the Queen Elizabeth Hospital can begin transitioning to its new role earlier. We will also be able to better allocate the new facilities as part of the QEH redevelopment. We have consulted with the doctors, nurses and allied health professionals and, of course, with patients during our planning of the integration of renal transplant services. The patients have been part of the planning team and have provided invaluable advice about the issues associated with the transfer, and I would like to thank them and the medical team for their cooperation through a process which I acknowledge has been difficult for them.

Car parking issues identified by patients are being addressed through a combination of alterations to clinical times, the provision of clinics for routine services outside the Royal Adelaide Hospital and the provision of some dedicated car-parking spaces during the two-week period post-transplant care.

Finally, I take this opportunity to acknowledge the long and distinguished history the Queen Elizabeth Hospital has in the provision of renal transplantation services. The renal unit has become internationally acclaimed for the quality of its patient care, the standard of its training programs and its extensive research program. Integrating the renal transplant service at the Royal Adelaide Hospital will enable it to grow further, to expand its research program and to take renal transplant services to an even higher level.

SA AMBULANCE SERVICE

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Kaurna—Minister for Health, Minister for the Southern Suburbs, Minister Assisting the Premier in the Arts) (15:11): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.D. HILL: Like all aspects of our health care system, the SA Ambulance Service is facing increasing demands for its services. In fact, the demand for ambulance services in South Australia is expected to grow by approximately 10 per cent per annum over the next five years. In order to meet this growing demand, the SA Ambulance Service is currently developing a long-term strategic plan to ensure that South Australians continue to receive world-class paramedic care. New initiatives being examined include:

- a new ambulance dispatch system to deliver improved response times;

- the introduction of different ambulance resources, such as single response vehicles, which will provide backup for emergency crews; and
- increasing support to country communities with additional resources in seasonal populated areas and mining locations.

These reforms will focus on improving response times and ensuring an appropriate level of response to individual incidents. Further, we are aiming to increase the level of care that ambulance officers can deliver on site without the need to always transport patients to hospital emergency departments. This will be achieved by introducing clinical advisers to the emergency operations centre and introducing specific training programs to further enhance our paramedics' capacity to provide a first and final point of medical care, where appropriate.

Developing better out-of-hospital care in order to minimise unnecessary emergency department presentations is consistent with the broader health care reform philosophies outlined in the South Australian Health Care Plan. The emphasis on improving and expanding primary health care is shared by our federal colleagues.

Extensive consultation on these reforms has been undertaken with SA Ambulance Service staff, the Ambulance Employees Association, senior management and the Ambulance Board over the past 12 months. Further, it is hoped that these reforms will improve career pathways and opportunities for South Australia's ambulance officers. Ultimately, all reform of the SA Ambulance Service is about getting the right resources to the right patient in the right amount of time to enable the most efficient use of resources.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

APY LANDS INQUIRY

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (15:13): Today I will put some comments on the record in relation to the Mullighan inquiry. It is very important that the house and the people who read *Hansard* know that the opposition is very supportive of any progress that can be achieved in getting over some of the terrible conditions on the APY lands and, I should say, in the West Coast communities and other Aboriginal communities that are under a lot of stress at the moment because of the long history of dysfunctional communities, the unfortunate incidence of domestic violence and, in this particular case, the sexual abuse of children.

The Premier, in his ministerial statement, thanked the opposition for their bipartisan approach. The minister, in answer to a question, talked about the bipartisan approach that I had offered and will try to maintain. But I will say to the government that that does not mean for one minute that I will sit down and be quiet if progress is not being made.

Already I am pointing out some things that have been promised but not delivered. That is because I want these things to happen. It is not because I am being critical for the sake of it; I want these things to actually happen. It is vital that the Mullighan report be a new turning point for Aboriginal communities in South Australia. Both sides of politics are guilty, in many ways, for not having progressed the conditions of Aboriginal people in Australia generally but, particularly in our case, in South Australia.

The Premier comes in here and unfortunately rewrites history a bit. He has a long history with Aboriginal affairs. He was the minister back in the late 1980s and early 1990s and there are still some issues hanging around since then, promises that have not been fulfilled. The Premier has the money and he has the power. We just hope that he can actually progress the issues that are out there. From my 30 years of association with Aboriginal communities, those issues need to be addressed and overcome so that there is a future.

We have heard about the stolen generations; what I am looking at now is the future for many children that is being stolen, and that is something that we just cannot abide. The Premier's track record unfortunately is really not one that he can be proud of. He comes in here and says he is proud of it, but I do not think he is, because back in 1992 the then federal minister for Aboriginal affairs (Hon. Robert Tickner), when commenting on the government's response to the Royal Commission into Aboriginal Deaths in Custody, said in *The Advertiser* of 28 March 1992:

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

That is what the then federal Labor minister said. I hope that is not going to be the case now.

We know that Aboriginal leader Lowitja O'Donoghue a few years ago was appointed as an adviser to the government on APY activities. I will not embarrass Ms O'Donoghue with some of the things she actually said at the time, because they were quite blunt, but she advised the Premier that the first commonwealth state task force that was meeting and supposedly going to produce some results was not progressing. I think what Miss O'Donoghue said at the time was very frank and was a reminder to the Rann government that things needed to happen.

Then in April 2004, Bob Collins was appointed. I will not go into what has since transpired in the life of Bob Collins, but the recommendations that Bob Collins put up then were quite worthy of consideration and should be considered still. Two that are very pertinent now concern elections on the lands. From speaking to people on the lands just in the last few weeks, there is great concern that there is a need to have elections within communities that are supervised by the State Electoral Commission not the way they are conducted currently. That is a similar recommendation to that made by Mr Collins.

In April 2004, over four years ago, Mr Collins recommended that 'additional resources for SAPOL in the Lands should be endorsed by the government and implementation of these resources commence immediately'. He noted in recommendation 8:

That the distribution of the funds provided to the APY Lands Council for health and substance abuse programs has commenced and should be expeditiously completed.

He noted in recommendation 9 that there needed to be funding for night patrols, and that is something that we need to push.

Time expired.

MOTHER'S DAY

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (15:18): Here in Australia we will celebrate Mother's Day on the second Sunday in May. Countries all over the world celebrate Mother's Day on various days of the year because the day has a number of different origins. According to Wikipedia, one school of thought claims this day emerged from a custom of mother worship in ancient Greece which kept a festival to Cybele, a mother of Greek gods.

This festival was held around the vernal equinox around Asia Minor and eventually in Rome itself from the Ides of March. Ancient Romans had another holiday, Matronalia, and this was dedicated to Juno, though mothers received gifts on this day as well. In some countries, Mother's Day began not as a celebration for individual mothers but rather among Christians when people went to their home churches, and so mothers would be sure to see their children. Mothering Sunday in UK and Ireland falls on the fourth Sunday in Lent and so moves with the lunar cycles.

Women mother in different ways and take on the mothering role in many ways too—the most traditional way through birthing their own children. There are many ways to birth and each woman has in her mind how this might happen. Nature plays an important role in birthing and in most cases should not be hurried. At this important time in their lives, women appreciate and know they require special assistance and support.

In the recently released film *The Business of Being Born* by US celebrity Ricki Lake, among many things that I learnt was that babies were all born at home prior to World War II. From that time the medicalisation of the birthing process began bringing with it many welcome improvements for safe outcomes for mothers and babies and other changes that have transformed birthing almost totally.

An important celebration was observed on Monday 5 May—the International Day of the Midwife. This vital and often unsung role within our communities plays a pivotal role in birthing. The theme for the 2008 International Midwives Day was 'Healthy families: the key to the future'. Midwifery care for women and their babies is an investment in family and community that promotes healthy growth and wellbeing for present and future generations. Congratulations go to Ms Arianne Webber, who recently received the Australian College of Midwives 2008 Midwifery Excellence Award, and Rob Bonner, the recipient of the Nursing and Midwives Advocate Award.

I would like to quote from the message from the United Nations UNFPA Executive Director, Thoraya Ahmed Obaid, who said, 'Every day, midwives are saving women's lives by making deliveries safe.' She goes on to say that the care they provide is essential before, during and after delivery, and that when women are healthy, families are healthy; and when families are healthy, the wellbeing of communities and nations also improves.

The message advises that in developing nations a woman dies in childbirth every minute and that these women can be saved by having midwives in their communities, and that, by investing in midwives, governments can achieve universal access to reproductive health and the Fifth Millennium Development Goal—to improve maternal health.

There is an urgent need around the world for 334,000 midwives and, to keep them, midwives need incentives to continue their work. I quote again directly from the message:

When they are properly trained, empowered and supported, midwives offer the most cost-effective and high-quality path to maternal and newborn health. Midwives provide care for women during pregnancy, childbirth and the postnatal period. In the case of pregnancy complications and emergencies, midwives perform key life-saving functions.

The message concludes by saying:

A functioning health system is a system that can deliver to women when women are ready to deliver. If the health service can respond to the medical requirements for safe delivery, then it can respond to other emergencies. The work of midwives is an essential element of primary health care and helps strengthen health systems.

Today in the gallery, we welcome a delegation from the Maternity Coalition (SA Branch). It was my pleasure to attend a roundtable discussion last weekend, along with the member for Bragg and the Hon. Sandra Kanck, where leading consumer representatives and midwives from South Australia discussed the 2030 vision for maternity care and what mothers really have to celebrate on Mother's Day.

They are concerned about access to better birthing services, particularly in regional and rural areas, and a recognition that birthing is not an illness or sickness and should be treated in that way. They look forward to the introduction of and the debate on the new SA Nursing and Midwifery Practice Bill, and they look forward to the release of current intervention statistics of all maternity hospitals. This will mean mothers can make an informed choice on where to have their babies and know where safe, natural methods are supported and happening.

The South Australian President of the Maternity Coalition, Dr Lareen Newman, says that, among other things, South Australian mums want to birth close to home in situations that offer safe alternatives outside hospital. Other states are now introducing low-risk midwifery-led models, such as the Ryde (NSW) and Mareeba (Queensland) community birthing centres. These models are being brought to the attention of South Australia's statewide clinical networks, which have been formed to increase the level of a clinician's involvement in the planning of health services, to find ways to better coordinate delivery of the services and to ensure better health outcomes for all South Australians.

The report, 'A Framework for Delivering Best Practice Health Care', released in 2007, is one of the strategies underpinning South Australia's Health Care Plan and the ongoing reform of the health system to ensure that all South Australians continue to have access to high standards of health care.

The Maternal and Neonatal Clinical Network is developing implementation of a maternal and neonatal statewide service plan, including advising on the development of patient centres, sustainable and effective clinical services across the continuum of care using models of care based on population need. The models will be readily accessible, officially provided and evidence-based. Consideration will be given to a range of approaches to ensure services are equitable for rural and remote consumers, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders and special population groups. It is chaired by Professor Jeffrey Robinson.

The Pregnancy SA Infoline introduced in December 2007 provides a single point of contact for women and GPs to book the all-important first antenatal appointment at the closest public maternity service to discuss pregnancy care and birthing options.

Worryingly, caesarean rates are high in South Australia—way above the World Health Organisation's recommended rate of 15 per cent. Questions must be asked why this trend continues to rise. Women and midwives are also eager to pursue the planned home birth policy. Much work over four years has been done to develop the policy, which has been publicly available for six months.

Federal and state governments need to cooperate fully to ensure that a full range of services are available in every state and territory. Women need to be informed to ensure birthing provides a safe and happy experience. Above all, midwives need to be valued so that mothers continue to become mothers.

CHILDREN IN STATE CARE INQUIRY

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Stuart.

There being a disturbance in the Speaker's gallery:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I can understand the enthusiasm but applause is not permitted in the gallery.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN (Stuart) (15:26): It is not often that I get applause like that when I rise to speak. I acknowledge the gallery and thank those there profusely. Perhaps by the time I have finished speaking, they might not feel in a similar vein! The first matter I wish to raise is along lines similar to those of the member for Morphett's speech. As someone who has visited the Pitjantjatjara lands for a considerable number of years, and who has been concerned about the welfare of the communities living there (in particular, the young people), I am concerned that, following the report of Commissioner Mullighan, we move on and create opportunities and implement a range of policies and actions that will solve some of the problems.

We can have talkfests, and over the years I have seen lots of those. I well recall making some comments and having some very heated discussions behind the scenes when the Pitjantjatjara land rights legislation went through this parliament. Some of the things I said, unfortunately, have come true, although no-one took any notice at the time. Those in high positions knew better than I did, even though most of them have never had any association with members of the Aboriginal community. I had worked in shearing sheds and spent a considerable amount of my time in the company of Aboriginal people. That sort of knowledge was not accepted by those who were running the agenda.

What have we got? I went to Ernabella a short time ago, and I have to say that I was absolutely disappointed. Ernabella is a very attractive place with a long history of involvement, and I was absolutely disappointed. New houses were being built alongside burnt houses. Ask the member for Goyder what he thought. The old Presbyterian church was burnt out and, as a result, a lot of history was lost. But with all that damage and all the money that has been spent there, at the end of the day what have we achieved to improve the welfare of the current generation, not to mention the next? My concern is to create some opportunities for these people.

There is great potential but, we should not continue down the track of letting trendy lefties and others call the shots, because they have been doing that for too long. I could give you chapter and verse about some of the things that have been done to my colleagues and me when we have gone there—I, in my capacity as the local member—when we were deliberately excluded from talking to the people. They made it as difficult as they possibly could for us. We were left at the airport and all sorts of things happened, and that was done deliberately.

I remember that, on one occasion when I was at Umuwa some years ago, I wanted to have a discussion with the management and two or three of the senior people knocked on the door and said they wanted to see me. The person in charge there tried to get rid of me. Fortunately, I heard what they had to say and I said, 'Yes, certainly. I will finish talking to these people and I will come out to wherever you want to see me and we will sit down and talk for as long as you want'. The interesting thing was that, in the discussions I had with those people, I agreed with every one of the suggestions they made, because I thought they were sensible and would achieve something. But, of course, in the trend of those who know best, and with the people who have been involved in assisting those communities not being pro-development or wanting to encourage mining and tourism, it has been a closed shop. If you have a closed shop, you have the potential to let criminals and villains get into the place.

Those roads should be available to members of the community to drive on. I am not talking about people's homes. It is the same as driving through Whyalla, Streaky Bay or Port Augusta. If you close them off, you create the ability for people to hide their criminal activity. The criminal activity is appalling and they should be brought to justice. Those people who have been affected should get justice, and we should be creating opportunities for the next generation, whether it be cattle grazing or in the mining or tourism industries. They have to get a decent education and facilities have to be put there and maintained. They have to be taught how to maintain and manage the facilities, not wreck them, otherwise none of them will have a long-term future.

EVANSTON GARDENS PRIMARY SCHOOL

Mr PICCOLO (Light) (15:31): Today I draw to the attention of the house the centenary celebrations of Evanston Gardens Primary School—a school within my electorate. When one looks

at the history of a local school one is looking into the history of the community around it. As I said when I helped to launch the school's centenary year celebrations earlier this year, if you go through the enrolment book of the school you can trace the development and changes to Evanston Gardens and the surrounding community. Currently the school has an enrolment of 140 students, with about 50 per cent of them being eligible for School Card. The principal is Jan Webber and the chairperson of the governing council is Wendy Bessen.

Until 1968 the school was known as Gawler Blocks primary school, reflecting the name of the area until that time. Gawler Blocks was originally owned by Mr John Riggs in town sections of 630 acres. A move to establish Gawler Blocks began with a meeting in Gawler on 28 May 1890 which formed a branch of the homestead league. On 24 June 1891 the league received word that the government had purchased the 630 acres as requested by the branch for working men's blocks.

On 21 June 1892 the blocks were allocated in various acreages, with a maximum of 20 acres. These blocks were intended as a means of a little extra income to the working man, by producing milk, butter, eggs and other products on their land. At that time a labourer's wage was not much more than 25 pence per week. There was no sick pay, no holiday pay and quite a bit of unemployment due to seasonal conditions.

The majority of the early settlers in the area worked in Gawler in two large foundries owned by James Martin and the May brothers. The first houses in the area were somewhat basic, some being built of clay and straw. The settlers in the area were soon to be known as the blockers.

The first move to establish any community life was taken in about 1905, when residents decided that a church and Sunday school was needed for the rapidly growing number of young folk in the area. An approach was made to the Presbyterian Church in Gawler and services were started in a barn on Sam Hillier's property. Mr Jabez Hillier gave a quarter of an acre of land on which to build the church, and in July 1907 the foundation stone of the Gawler Blocks church was laid. The education department then rented the church for use as a day school.

Amongst the pioneer blockers were names such as Matz, Forby, Wiese, O'Toole, Turner, Emerson, Lucas and Risby, reflecting the British and German heritage of the earlier settlers. One of the best known local members of parliament for the area was the late Mr Jack Clark, a member of the Labor Party. He moved to Gawler Blocks in 1914 and resided there for a number of years in his early youth.

The school opened on 20 January 1908. Blanche Tims, a provisional teacher, taught at the school in 1908 and 1909. In 1909 Robert Morgan was appointed head teacher and held that position until 1911. One of the longest serving teachers was Joseph O'Loughlin, who was head teacher from 1923 until his retirement in 1944. In 1923 the education department built the present school. In 1951, 1961 and 1966 wooden prefab classrooms were added to the school as pupil numbers grew. Another wooden prefab classroom was added in 1974 when the nearby Gawler River school closed.

The 1960s and 1970s saw a huge influx of Italian and Greek migrants to the area—including me—and the school roll soon had names like Demertzis, Mammone, Sabattini, Varelias, Hondros, Markov, Manno, Miaolo and Tsalamangos added to it.

Mr Kenyon interjecting:

Mr PICCOLO: Not Piccolo. No, Piccolo went to Evanston Primary School. In 1945, the Gawler Blocks Progress Association was formed, and it has done much for the benefit of the district. It was through the progress association as a young councillor that I met two local community stalwarts, the late Jack Cooper and Stan Coles. In March 1946, the memorial hall (situated adjacent to the school) was built, with the land for this purpose given by Mr Hillier. The hall has been a focal point for social gatherings and meetings of various organisations of the district.

In 1951, the Gawler Women's Agricultural Bureau was formed. In 1980, the Glen Mann activity room was opened, with labour and funds to convert the existing shelter provided by the school council. In 1981, the school principal's residence became offices and staffroom. In 2004, the Gawler council agreed to name an appropriate new road 'Gawler Blocks Road' in Evanston Gardens or Hillier to acknowledge the history of the area. I wish the school well in its celebrations which take place on 16, 17 and 18 May. I thank the Gawler public library for assistance in researching for this speech.

CUMMINS RURAL CARE FACILITY

Mrs PENFOLD (Flinders) (15:36): Yesterday the final report into life/work balance was handed to parliament, and there has been much rhetoric about 'the Rann government being committed to supporting parents'. However, when you live in rural parts of South Australia, life/work balance is even more difficult, and this government appears to have forgotten about our parents. I speak in particular today of the town of Cummins, the hub of Lower Eyre Peninsula, which caters to families in surrounding farming districts. In this time of severe drought on Eyre Peninsula, families need 'off farm' work to relieve the financial debt burden. However, it is very hard for families when there is no care facility in the district.

Drought brings with it much more than debt. Stress and depression are common among our farming families. A rural care facility is essential for new mums in the community who want to help financially and return to the workforce after maternity leave. Many are qualified, skilled workers such as nurses and teachers who are highly valued and needed in the community. To lose them because of a lack of child care puts even more pressure on our rural communities.

Research initially indicated Cummins was adequately served by family day care. However, care providers subsequently left, leaving the community without any day care services. A public meeting was held in December 2005 to confirm the need and look at solutions. In May 2006, funded by a \$13,300 grant from the Cummins Bendigo Community Bank, a steering committee was established and a consultant employed.

In September 2006, the committee received advice from the Minister for Education and Children's Services that consideration of a rural care service for Cummins was dependent on the building, and that the current child and parent centre based at Cummins Area School was to be upgraded to accommodate the rural care facility for children aged zero to five years. The school agreed to provide the supervising manager role for the rural care program, once established. Having Rural Care based at the school keeps it simple for parents who have both school-aged and younger children.

On advice from the builders and DECS, the community successfully applied to Cummins Bendigo Community Bank for a further grant of \$37,000 to fund building costs to accommodate Rural Care. Since that time, there has been a raft of bureaucratic changes to the building plans causing the budget to blow-out to \$150,000. DECS has now advised that the renovations should be done in two stages: the first stage expected to come in at \$80,000—a bandaid solution. It has now been more than 20 months since the feasibility study and the grant submission, and the community is still waiting and costs are increasing.

The Cummins Bendigo Community Bank has donated a total of \$50,300 towards the rural care facility project, even though the facility should be funded by the Department of Education and Children's Services. I refer to a letter I received from Wendy Holman, Secretary of the Cummins District Financial Services, expressing frustration at the many 'hiccups' that have occurred. The letter states:

The Government makes a strong case for community/business/government partnerships to support infrastructure projects, but when a community manages to fund a project so it can be achieved it is then with considerable annoyance that we hear the stalemate is actually between government agencies.

DECS is responsible for funding a facility upgrade to appropriate licensing standards. DECS has failed to fulfil this obligation, which is why the Cummins Community Bank provided the second grant of \$37,000. Since then, the cost has escalated to five times the original estimate.

It is time to bite the bullet and build this facility in its entirety. Any further delays will only increase the amount of funding required. Drought is depleting Eyre Peninsula, and I do not want to see more families leave because of inadequate childcare facilities caused by the government's incompetence.

Many members of this parliament would not survive without childcare facilities. Why should our rural farming communities be further disadvantaged? They already have to deal with so many other disadvantages. I ask the minister and her department to at least fix this one for this wonderful, small can-do community. Poor project and money management by this government is a common theme in the issues I so often encounter in my communities. Perhaps the Yalata bus is the next one I should be speaking about.

GOMEZ, MR R.

Mr KENYON (Newland) (15:40): Today I rise to acknowledge the work of Mr Rudi Gomez of RMG Services. Members may know Rudi; he has been around for quite a long time in South Australia. He is a former Colombo Plan student. He came to Adelaide and studied metallurgy and then travelled around the Philippines and other countries, working in mining, and so on.

Rudi has returned to South Australia and is making a pretty strong contribution. Most noteworthy of late has been his discovery, in concert with the state government through the PACE plan, of the Carrapateena deposit in the state's north. It is not far away from Olympic Dam—about 100km—and it looks like it is going to be a pretty tremendous deposit up there. With any luck, it will be a big mine and that will be a good thing, but Rudi is also doing some other work: he is working away on some water recycling technology, which is pretty interesting. He is using ozone to clean up water. It completely removes bacteria, but also removes pharmaceuticals from the water, which is another step forward in the recycling of water and will no doubt be particularly useful at some point in the future, especially in some of the more arid areas of Australia.

Rudi is also working on some carbon sequestration technology, which is probably novel. It does not rely on putting carbon into underground aquifers, or anything like that: it actually turns it into an insoluble salt and can make it disappear forever. It is quite unique. He works on a number of other technologies: for example, converting coal to hydrogen gas and, again, sequestering the carbon. There is all sorts of stuff going on. Rudi has a huge number of patents, over 30 worldwide patents, I think. I hesitate to call all these tremendous enterprises inventions, because sometimes that can give rise to the image of some mad inventor, and he is certainly not that. But, even if a couple of the projects that he is working on in this state come to fruition, then Adelaide will become the centre of the universe, I think, especially in conjunction with the work that Greg Watson is doing in Green & Gold Energy. I have spoken about him before. But I think this is a really exciting time.

These things are in their very early stages, but they could be very interesting for Adelaide and for South Australia. I bring them to the attention of the house, and for those members who have never had the chance previously, it would be worth their while catching up with Rudi and having a good look at what he is doing, because it is very exciting.

SERIOUS AND ORGANISED CRIME (CONTROL) BILL

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

No. 1. Clause 10, page 6, line 25 [clause 10(1)(b)]—After 'order' insert:

in this State

No. 2. Clause 10, page 7, line 17 [clause 10(4)(a)]—After 'members' insert:

(provided that if the Attorney-General is satisfied that only some of the members associate for that purpose, the Attorney-General must be satisfied that those members constitute a significant group within the organisation, either in terms of their numbers or in terms of their capacity to influence the organisation or its members)

No. 3. Clause 14, page 8, lines 8 to 11 [clause 14(2)(a)]—Delete paragraph (a) and substitute:

(a) the defendant—

(i) has been a member of an organisation which, at the time of the application, is a declared organisation; or

(ii) engages, or has engaged, in serious criminal activity,

and regularly associates with members of a declared organisation; or

No. 4. Clause 35, page 22, lines 1 to 5 [clause 35(11)(b)(i) to (v)]—Delete subparagraphs (i) to (v) and substitute:

(i) 1 is a spouse or former spouse of the other or is, or has been, in a close personal relationship with the other; or

(ii) 1 is a parent or grandparent of the other (whether by blood or by marriage); or

(iii) 1 is a brother or sister of the other (whether by blood or by marriage); or

(iv) 1 is a guardian or carer of the other.

No. 5. Clause 35, page 22, lines 7 and 8 [clause 35(12), definition of *domestic partner*]
—Delete the definition of *domestic partner* and substitute:

close personal relationship has the same meaning as in Part 3 of the *Family Relationships Act 1975*;

No. 6. Clause 38, page 23, line 12 [clause 38(1)]—Delete 'fifth' and substitute:

fourth

No. 7. Clause 39, page 23, line 23—Delete '10 years' and substitute:

5 years

Consideration in committee.

Amendment No. 1:

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendment No. 1 be agreed to.

Clause 10(1) of the bill sets up the matters about which the Attorney-General must be satisfied before he may make a control order. As passed by this chamber, these provide:

(a) that members of the organisation associate for the purpose of organising, planning, facilitating, supporting or engaging in serious criminal activity; and

(b) that the organisation represents a risk to public safety and order.

Amendment No. 1 adds the words 'in this state' to paragraph (b); that is, 'the Attorney-General will have to be satisfied that the organisation represents a risk to public safety and order in South Australia'. With or without these words, the Attorney-General's focus will be on the risk or threat the organisation poses to this state. That was always the intention of the provision. That is the purpose of the legislation. The government sees no difficulty with amending the provision to make this clear, as the amendment does.

That the government agrees to an amendment moved by the Hon. Sandra Kanck of the Democrats does not mean that the bill was 'fixed up' by the other place. It means that we are practical politicians in the Rann government, that we believe that half a loaf is better than none, that we are willing to compromise to expedite the bill. I believe this bill would have been just as good if it did not have this amendment. But, we accept the amendment in the interests of making a gesture of reconciliation to the other place and to the Hon. Sandra Kanck. Let not the Leader of the Opposition misrepresent amendment No. 1. We would be happy without it.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: I am pleased that the government has agreed with amendment No. 1. I note that, although amendment No. 1 has been moved by the Hon. Sandra Kanck, there are other amendments with which we will be dealing shortly, some of which have been moved by the government. I make the point that, as we deal with amendment No. 1, how fortunate indeed we are to have another place where sloppy legislation can be seen to, where it can be debated openly and fulsomely, and where it can be amended if necessary so that it is better law.

I make point to the Attorney that we are lucky even to be here this week debating amendment No. 1, it would seem. While he was out telling radio that he wanted to deal with the bill, his colleague the Hon. Paul Holloway was in the upper house seeking to adjourn it until June, so that he could deal with the WorkCover legislation. What a shambles of a week it has been for the government, and how fortunate we are to be dealing with amendment No. 1.

Amendment No.1, along with some of these other amendments, is an example of where the bill got it wrong. It went too far in some cases and needed to be pulled back to a commonsense point. Although, as the opposition has indicated, in other regards—and I guess time will tell—the bill may not go far enough. I guess we will see how it works once the police get their hands on it, and, hopefully, with the resources they need crack down on the bikie scourge so that the streets can be made safe.

As the minister knows, had the government had its way we would not be here today discussing amendment No. 1; we would be somewhere else, because this matter would not have even come before the parliament until June. To tell anyone anything other than that obvious fact is misleading, and he should desist from doing it on radio.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: I rise on a point of order. The Leader of the Opposition has accused me of misleading the public, and I ask him to withdraw immediately.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: I have not accused him of misleading the house. I have accused him of making remarks on radio that were misleading to the public. There is no call in standing orders to withdraw.

The CHAIR: Leader, there is no speech in relation to a point of order. However, I did note what you said and therefore I do not uphold the point of order.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: Thank you, Madam Chair. Anyway, I have made my point. The opposition has supported this bill from the outset, including the amendments before us today. We have made the point that it has been too long in coming. We have had the rhetoric; we have had the huff and puff; we have had several attempts at trying to sort the problem out, all of which have failed, according to the shootout on the weekend. However, with this amendment, that I think makes this bill a better bill, we will see if this new device of the government has any effect.

I do flag to the Attorney that if there are any more shootouts, if there are any more significant bikie problems and if the issues do not go away, then the government's credibility, the Premier's credibility and, most of all, his credibility, is on toast, to be perfectly frank. I will leave my good friend the member for Heysen to point out, as we go through the amendments, including amendment No. 1, this tricky point that the Attorney just cannot get his brain around, that you can have one clause in a bill that might go too far and another clause in the same bill that might not go far enough.

I know that this is a very difficult concept for the Attorney, because he seems to think that if the opposition, as we go through these amendments, raises any issue to suggest that one aspect of the bill might go too far and another might not go far enough, there is some sort of a powwow going on. Can I just reassure him—

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: No; powwow—have you got that?

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: What do you mean by that?

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: Well, if you want to ask questions, Attorney, come over here and be in opposition. If I remember, you were not very good at it when you were here, but you are always welcome back.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: You are there because we gave it to you on a silver platter; that is why you are there. You did not earn it, I can assure you, and don't worry, we have reflected on that at length and will not make that mistake again.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: You were not a good enough government to win; you had to have it given to you. The opposition is delighted that we are here, and I am personally delighted to be supporting amendment No. 1 and the other amendments. I will leave my learned colleague the member for Heysen to carry forward.

I will say to the government that if it is really serious about law and order then it should make sure that it brings these pieces of legislation forward and genuinely deal with them expeditiously, not just adjourn them because it wants to cut the entitlements of disabled and injured workers ahead of making the streets safe. As the record shows, that is what it attempted to do earlier this week in the Legislative Council.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: The leader's learned friend will shortly begin to talk about the amendments made by the other place, and unlike the leader she will talk about them sensibly because she understands them. We have just seen a leader of the opposition out of his depth with this bill. At no time have I ever said that I wanted to delay this bill until June. The Leader of the Opposition misleads the public when he claims that, because I have simply never said it or implied it. What I called for is for the other place to walk and chew gum at the same time; namely, to deal with this bill and the WorkCover bill. That is all I have ever asked for: for the other place to do a fair day's work.

Last night, instead of dealing with the WorkCover bill, the other place decided in the early evening to debate the Hon. Sandra Kanck's motion—funnily enough, it is exactly the same as the member for Mitchell's motion—on the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. I know that *The Jerusalem Post* was holding its presses back earlier today for the outcome of that debate. Well, I jest.

The other place thought that it was more important to try to give its solution to the Arab-Israeli conflict than to deal with the WorkCover bill, and to a man and woman every Liberal in the other place voted to make that the order of business, because the government asked (through our leader in the other place the Hon. Paul Holloway) the Parliamentary Liberal Party to deal with the WorkCover bill before it dealt with the Arab-Israeli conflict.

But no, they decided to deal with the Arab-Israeli conflict first. I would like the Parliamentary Liberal Party to explain that to the public of South Australia and in particular to explain it to small businessmen who are paying a WorkCover levy in South Australia of around 3 per cent while their competitors in Victoria will be paying 1.3 per cent of payroll. Explain that!

The Leader of the Opposition talked about our failed attempts to deal with outlaw motorcycle gangs and said that if there was another conflict on the streets we should be ashamed. So, if a crime happens some time after the proclamation of this bill, somehow this government should be ashamed. Is that the formula, may I ask the Parliamentary Liberal Party, that if crime happens, the Rann government should be ashamed and presumably resign? Is that the formula? No. I hear silence, because members opposite do not want to associate themselves with the crazed rhetoric of the dancing Leader of the Opposition.

This government has effectively removed the associates of outlaw motorcycle gangs from the doors of our nightclubs and hotels in the central business district. When we came to office after eight years of Liberal government in this state, the police advised us that 80 per cent of the companies providing crowd-controlling services to licensed venues in the central business district were associated with outlaw motorcycle gangs.

We introduced harsh legislation, that the Liberal Party tried to water down in debate, to remove associates of outlaw motorcycle gangs as doormen of nightclubs, and we did so using police intelligence and masking that police intelligence from the person who was the subject of the application. We do not apologise for doing it, and we do not regard it as a failed enterprise. On the contrary, it worked.

As a result of that, those people working on the doors of nightclubs in Adelaide should be free of drugs, free of alcohol, not be subject to charges of unlawful violence and not have a record of drug use or violence. I regard that as a success. Secondly, we decided to move to stop associates of outlaw motorcycle gangs getting control of the licences of hotels and nightclubs such as Heaven, and we succeeded.

Mrs REDMOND: I rise on a point of order. I am happy for the Attorney to talk at some length, but he has gone well and truly off the topic of the amendment No.1 which is what we are supposedly considering before the chamber at the moment.

The CHAIR: I do not uphold that point of order. It does appear to me that the Attorney is speaking about criminal activity in this state.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: This is what happens when a competent opposition spokesman who is fully seized of all the relevant facts of this bill is bumped so that her bumbling leader can talk about a bill of which he knows nothing.

Mr Hanna: He must be getting to you.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: I don't think so; no more than you are. Thirdly, this is the government that did something about biker fortresses. In 1999, after more than five years of Liberal government in this state, the Rebels Motorcycle Club bought the Gas Workers' Sports & Social Club on the corner of Chief Street and Second Street, Brompton. Then the Rebels applied to turn that club into their fortress. They applied to the Charles Sturt Council to build an edifice with nine-metre high concrete tilt-up walls in suburban Brompton, in my electorate.

The Gas Workers' Sports & Social Club was bombed, and the explosion shattered the glass in dwellings and businesses along Chief Street, Brompton, and rattled the windows as far away as my home in Wilpena Terrace, Kilkenny. Even in the aftermath of that bombing, the Liberal government of the time said that it needed to do nothing to interfere in the planning and development process.

So, as far as the Olsen and Kerin governments were concerned, the Rebels Motorcycle Club was free to build whatever it wanted at the corner of Chief Street and Second Street, Brompton. They did nothing, and they are on the record as saying that no action was necessary by

the government of the time. The parliamentary Liberal Party is not very concerned about anything that happens down in Brompton in the western suburbs.

As a result of the change of government, that development was stopped. It was not actually stopped by the anti-fortification legislation that we put through parliament: it was stopped by the Rann cabinet declaring it a major development. That is what stopped it. We took it out of the hands of the Charles Sturt Council and said, 'We're stopping it.' Then the anti-fortification legislation came through, which has had the effect that we have been able to cut down the fortifications at the new Rebels headquarters on Wood Avenue, Brompton.

The government's anti-bikie legislation, little by little, bit by bit, is coming into effect, and is having an effect. I do not say that it will stop all clashes between organised criminals; I do not make that claim. I am not the general manager of the universe. I do not have the ability to stop criminals being criminals and I do not have the ability to stop criminals fighting each other over turf, but I do have the ability—which this government is utilising—to disrupt and interfere with and dismantle criminal gangs in South Australia. Bit by bit, we are making progress, and this bill is part of that progress. This bill is not—as the Leader of the Opposition claims—invalidated because at some time in the future gangs might have a go at one another.

Motion carried.

Amendment No. 2:

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendment No. 2 be agreed to.

Clause 10(4)(a) of the bill provides that, for the purpose of making a declaration, the Attorney-General must be satisfied that members of an organisation associate for a relevant criminal purpose, whether or not all members associate for that purpose or only some of the members associate for that purpose. Clause 10(4)(a) recognises that not all members of groups, such as criminal motorcycle gangs, have criminal records or, indeed, engage in criminal activity, serious or otherwise.

The Rann government has never said that all members or associates of outlaw gangs are criminals; not all of them are. Amendment No. 2 adds to this provision a requirement that the Attorney-General be satisfied that the members of an organisation who do associate for criminal purposes constitute a significant group within the organisation, either in terms of their numbers or in terms of their capacity to influence the organisation or its members.

The government agrees that this additional requirement is reasonable and will give further comfort to lawful and law-abiding organisations that they have nothing to fear from this legislation. I refer in particular to the Christian missionaries organised as the Longriders, even though they may count among their membership a small and insignificant number of people with criminal records who have engaged or do engage in serious criminal activity.

Mark this point very carefully: if the parliamentary Liberal Party had had its way, before a declaration of an organisation could be made, the decision would end up being made by a Supreme Court judge after the outlaw gangs employed all their highly paid lawyers. There would not have been an organisation declared until after the next state election at the earliest if that had been the case. Fortunately, in another place, that amendment was defeated by 12 votes to nine. So, the Parliamentary Liberal Party tried to cripple this bill at its birth by making declarations subject to judicial review. Where I disagree with the Parliamentary Liberal Party is that I believe declarations of these organisations ought to be made on the recommendation of the Police Commissioner by a minister responsible to a representative house of parliament. That would be me and the House of Assembly. That is the way things should be done in a parliamentary democracy. Judges ought not to be governing this state.

Mrs REDMOND: I do not intend to speak at any length on this amendment. I think it clarifies a relatively small but important point and, as the Attorney has already indicated, it makes it clear that there must be an involvement in an organisation by a sufficient number of members (or members with sufficient clout within the organisation) to be a serious part of the operations of the organisation. I think it is technical really, rather like amendments Nos 4 and 5, which are not getting to the heart of the matter. I support the Attorney and I am pleased to see that we are going to get these amendments through. I note that overall of the seven amendments made, two amendments were made by the Hon. Sandra Kanck, two by the Hon. Stephen Wade and the other amendments were made by the Attorney's own counterpart in the other place. I will speak more about those in due course. We support this amendment.

Motion carried.

Amendment No. 3:

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendment No. 3 be agreed to.

As passed by this place, clause 14(2)(a) of the bill provides that the Magistrates Court may on application by the commissioner make a control order against a person (the defendant) if the court is satisfied that the defendant (a) has been a member of a declared organisation or engages or has engaged in serious criminal activity and (b) regularly associates with members of a declared organisation, and that the making of the order is appropriate in the circumstances.

Amendment No. 3 deletes clause 14(2)(a) and replaces it with a new subclause that makes clear that the court may make a control order against a former member of a declared organisation, even though he ceased being a member of the organisation before it was declared. This amendment ensures that former members of a declared organisation who may have left the organisation before it was declared, but who nonetheless continue to associate with members of that or another declared organisation, can be made subject to a control order if the court considers it appropriate.

The amendment also ensures that the members of criminal organisations cannot avoid the control order provisions by ceasing their membership of the organisation before a declaration is made about it. As members would be aware, that a declaration is being sought against an organisation must be made public. Clause 9 of the bill requires the Attorney-General to publish a notice of the commissioner's application for a declaration against an organisation in the *Government Gazette* and a newspaper circulating throughout the state.

That we are agreeing to such an amendment does not mean that the legislation was broken or there was something wrong with it. These amendments could have been made by a following bill that would be appropriate to amend this bill but, in the interests of making the amendments as swiftly as possible and acquiescing in opposition and minor party amendments, we are agreeing to this package of amendments.

Mrs REDMOND: I beg to differ with the Attorney on that point. I think, in fact, this amendment is a salutary lesson on not only the benefit of having a Legislative Council to review our legislation but also, knowing as I do, that the legislative councillors take a great deal of care to consider the implications of each of the provisions of the bill. Indeed, I think that house does a better job than us often, and I have mentioned this in debate before in terms of actually analysing legislation. Too often in this house members on both sides get up and make generic contributions on the topic without even having read the legislation.

I have a very firm view that, when we come into this place as members, we should be given a lot more instruction than most members receive on reading a bill, an act of parliament, statutory interpretation and all those sorts of things, because I know that the Attorney is an exception, as am I, and we both enjoy getting into the detail, but very often the debates in this house do not examine the detail of the bill.

What has happened in this case is—and I think that the Attorney has glossed over it a bit—the provisions of clause 14 as they appeared in the bill that went to the upper house provided that the court must make a control order if the court is satisfied that the defendant is a member of a declared organisation. Subclause (2)—the clause that is being amended—provided that the court may make a control order if the court is satisfied that the defendant has been a member of a declared organisation. It all sounds very well until you start to think about it.

As the Attorney has already pointed out in his contribution on one of the earlier clauses, the people we are trying to target here can afford very good legal representation and it does not take Einstein or a great legal brain even, although I confess I did not pick it up on the way through this house, to see that, if a member of one of the targeted bkie gangs resigns now from that gang, then they could not come within subclause (1) because they are not a member of a declared organisation, nor could they come within subclause (2) because the organisation is not a declared organisation at the time of their membership which is now because we do not have declared organisations.

This amendment is designed to correct that loophole. As I understand the debate that occurred in the upper house, the Hons Mark Parnell and Robert Lawson highlighted the potential problem. Had they not picked up the problem, and had the government not recognised the

legitimacy of the argument and included this amendment to correct it, we could have had wholesale resignations of members from these outlaw motorcycle gangs, but none of them could have been made the subject of a control order.

I welcome the amendment and the government's acknowledgment that the amendment is necessary. Certainly, it is far more useful to do it now during debate on the bill, rather than to put all this into place, find it does not work and then introduce another bill to correct what is a problem which has been highlighted by our most revered and venerable members in the upper house—because we do get a valuable service from their considering the detail of this legislation.

Motion carried.

Amendments Nos. 4 and 5:

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendments Nos 4 and 5 be agreed to.

Clause 35(6) excludes from consideration for the new offence of criminal association some types of associations. These are listed in paragraphs (a) through to (f) of clause 35(6). The first category is that set out in paragraph (a)—associations between close family members. The term 'close family member' is defined in clause 35(11), as passed by this house. Clause 35(11) provided:

- (b) a person is a close family member of another person if—
 - (i) one is a spouse or domestic partner of the other; or
 - (ii) one is a parent, step-parent or grandparent of the other; or
 - (iii) one is a child, stepchild or grandparent of the other; or
 - (iv) one is a guardian or carer of the other; or
 - (v) one is a brother, sister, stepbrother or stepsister of the other.

'Domestic partner' was defined to mean 'a person who is a domestic partner within the meaning of the Family Relationships Act, whether declared as such under that act or not'. The term 'domestic partner' is defined in section 11 of the Family Relationships Act, and requires not only that the relevant person be living at the relevant date in a close personal relationship, but that they have done so for at least three years or three out of the preceding four years or that there is a child of the relationship. The government concedes that this is too narrow and would, in the absence of a declaration under section 11(b) of the act, rule out genuine relationships that have existed for less than three years or three out of four years, where there is no child of the relationship.

Amendment No. 4, therefore, replaces 'domestic partner' in the definition of 'close family member' with 'a person who is in a close personal relationship with the other person'. The term 'close personal relationship' is also defined in section 11 of the Family Relationships Act, and means 'the relationship between two adult persons (whether or not related by family and irrespective of their gender) who live together as a couple on a genuine domestic basis', not including marriage or relationships where one party provides domestic support or care for fee or reward. A relationship that is the subject of a declaration under section 11(b) of the Family Relationships Act would also be covered.

This amendment also adds to the list associations between former spouses and people who were, but no longer are, in a close personal relationship; so that covers the ex-partner. This recognises the need for former spouses and partners to maintain contact with one another for custody and property matters, and the like. It extends each of the relevant categories to cover relationships by blood and marriage. It recognises that such relationships are not independently created but, rather, are a function of marriage; so I gather that is covering the in-laws. Thirdly, it deletes subparagraph (iii), which refers to a person being a child, stepchild or grandchild of the other. These relationships are covered by subparagraph (ii) in that, if a person is a parent or grandparent of the other, then that other child is a child or grandchild of the first person. I have said it before—and I will say it again: these changes could have been made by a subsequent bill. They are not a clinching argument for the expense of having a second chamber.

Amendment No. 5 is consequential upon amendment No. 4 and inserts a definition of 'close personal relationship' into clause 35(12) of the bill.

Mrs REDMOND: I agree with the Attorney-General that the definitions are not vital. I think the previous amendment was vital to the operation of the act. This amendment makes for a tidier definition; it is neater. Using 'by blood or marriage', in terms of relationships, rather than the terms

'step-parent' and 'stepchild' is a neater way of referring to things. Obviously, we support the amendments.

Motion carried.

Amendments Nos 6 and 7:

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendments Nos 6 and 7 be agreed to.

The amendment to clause 38 of the bill reduces from five years from commencement to four years from commencement the date by which the Attorney-General must conduct a review of the operation and effectiveness of the act. It is consequential upon amendment No. 7 that reduces the sunset period in clause 39 of the bill from 10 years to five years. It seems that, for some reason, the parliamentary Liberal Party wants me still to be the Attorney-General when these things occur. I do not know why they want that. I would have thought they would push them out until such time as the member for Heysen had a chance of being attorney-general, but that is a matter for the parliamentary Liberal Party.

For the sake of amity, we have accepted these amendments. Although the government is confident that this legislation will disrupt the activities of criminal organisations, the government does not believe that, after five years, this parliament will be in a position to make a definitive judgment on the effectiveness of the legislation and whether its operation should be continued.

During the committee stage, I advised members that the risk in reducing the sunset clause to five years is that any gains made against organised crime will be lost if the legislation is repealed at that time. The 10 year sunset period is one of three measures aimed at ensuring the powers in this legislation are used properly and that, when so used, are effective. The three review mechanisms are designed to work together: an annual review of the use of the powers under the legislation each year; a review of the operation and effectiveness of the legislation after five years, each with parliamentary oversight; and the expiry of the legislation after 10 years. The government believes that this is appropriate and, for that reason, we opposed these amendments in another place.

However, to ensure that the Serious and Organised (Crime) Control Bill can be brought into operation as soon as possible, the government has decided to support the amendments. I will say once more that this has nothing to do with the desirability of having another chamber, a third chamber, or a fourth chamber. It has nothing to do with the legislation being broken. The fact is the opposition and the minor parties have us by the short and curlies and our hearts and minds have followed.

Mrs REDMOND: Obviously we support these amendments: they were moved by us in the other place. I agree with the Attorney; that is, with the exception of amendment No. 3 moved by the government in the other place, the amendments are simply improvements to the bill, but, in my view, amendment No. 3 would have been crucial to the operation of the bill. We did consider hard and long whether to seek to amend this sunset clause. Obviously amendment No. 6, the review provision, simply follows on from the fact that, if we move the sunset clause back to five years instead of 10 years, then you cannot have your review at five years. Amendment No. 6 corrects that to four years and, indeed, that is why it appears at four years.

We consider that the government and SAPOL have to be given sufficient time to bring this legislation into operation and to see whether it is working before they make a report to the parliament about its success or otherwise—and I hope that it will be success. However, the Attorney agrees—certainly his chief of staff stated to us that this is draconian legislation. It does change a lot of the bases upon which we have until now pursued most things in the criminal law. We do that with some hesitation, because it is no light matter to decide to change the burden of proof and to decide to empower police to make orders that will infringe potentially on the liberty of individuals. We are trying to ensure that this is only done against those individuals whom we really have intelligence that leads us to believe are a danger to the community because of their actions.

We finally formed the view that not to support this legislation would leave the police in this state trying to fight the battle against organised crime, and particularly outlaw motorcycle gangs, effectively with one arm tied behind the back. We do support the legislation. But that said, we considered that 10 years was a long time to wait if, potentially, we are taking away the civil liberties of the citizens of this state—and even criminals have some rights. We came to the conclusion that it was appropriate to reduce that sunset clause to five years. I am confident that, if in five years'

time this legislation is proving to be an effective weapon against outlaw motorcycle gangs, then it will not be difficult to continue the legislation in its operation. However, when you are dealing with something as precious to all of us as our freedom, then I think that we need to take it very carefully.

We support the amendment to reduce the sunset clause from 10 years to five years, and consequently the review from five years to four years.

Mr HANNA: I want to speak in relation to the sunset clause. I do think five years is much more reasonable than the 10 years originally proposed by the Rann government. I would have been happy with a two year sunset clause. The Attorney-General's speech to us in relation to this clause is belied by the rhetoric offered by his colleagues. It is said that the bikie gangs will be squashed by the implementation of this legislation—

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: I never said that. I said no such thing.

Mr HANNA: The Attorney-General seems to have a contrary view. One of them has got it wrong. It seems to me that, if this is properly implemented, then its aim should be achieved well and truly long before five years is up. I can certainly live with the five years. It is a bit better than the 10 years that we had before.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: I agree with the member for Mitchell to this extent. These are draconian provisions. They are departures from our conventional criminal procedure. But for the activities of outlaw motorcycle gangs, they would not be necessary, and I look forward to the day when they can be sunsetted or repealed. On the magnitude of the risk to the rule of law in this state, I disagree with the member for Mitchell. I believe he has run a scare campaign against this legislation. It is a pity he is not so frightened of the activities of outlaw motorcycle gangs. You will not hear much from the member for Mitchell about outlaw motorcycle gangs.

The member for Mitchell has run scare campaigns against our criminal law legislation before. One of his first scare campaigns—in which I think he was the only person in this chamber to vote against the legislation—was against the hoon driving laws. The member for Mitchell was against our laws against hoon driving. It was going to lead, in his view, to manifest injustice. How many years has the hoon driving legislation been in and how many manifest injustices have there been? The member for Mitchell is silent on that scare campaign.

I think that the member for Heysen has been imminently reasonable in her approach to this bill. I thank her for her cooperation. I thank the Parliamentary Liberal Party for expediting it and, if it were just down to the member for Mitchell and I, how swiftly and sweetly the criminal legislation of this state would be dealt with and how modest would the rhetoric that accompanied it be.

The CHAIR: Attorney, you might reflect on that. Did you just state 'if it were just down to the member for Mitchell and I'?

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: The member for Heysen and I. I am not referring to the member for Mitchell. It is the member for Heysen who has been reasonable and cooperated in the swift dispatch of this government business. I thank her for it and—

Mr HANNA: I rise on a point of order. Is it proper for the chair to enter into the debate and suggest corrections to the Attorney-General?

The CHAIR: Yes, the chair is able to suggest that a correction be made. Attorney, have you concluded your remarks?

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: Yes.

Motion carried.

TRAINING AND SKILLS DEVELOPMENT BILL

In committee.

(Continued from 7 May 2008. Page 3252.)

Clause 63.

Mr GRIFFITHS: I think it is fair to say that in relation to compliance notices, which clause 63 concerns, the consultation that the opposition has undertaken is that it is not generally supported. There is a concern that employers must fulfil their obligations under the training act, and we understand that. However, the organisations consulted do not necessarily support penalties and expiation fees—I note that the minister, through amendment, is intending to remove some penalties and expiations—which impose fees on the employer for breach of contract. It is inequitable that

penalties are imposed on employers, but not on the apprentice or the trainee, as put to us by a business case.

This bill introduces penalties for not complying within a specified time period and the only option available to the employer, should they wish to dispute the compliance notice for reasons as described in, I believe, clause 63(4)(a) and (b) is to apply to the Industrial Relations Commission of South Australia for a review notice to be issued.

Likewise under this bill, if the commission suspects on reasonable grounds that a party to the contract has contravened a provision of the training contract, it may refer the matter to the Industrial Relations Commission for a review of the notice. It is not clear how compliance notices will be reviewed. I ask the minister to comment on that, and I ask whether employers will be permitted representation and if there is an appeal process.

The Hon. P. CAICA: It is true that stakeholders have expressed some concern over how, more so, the provision is going to be applied and who has oversight for those decisions that are taken. But it is a new provision, it forms part of the strengthened suite of compliance tools, which, certainly in the government's view, support early intervention strategies and a greater field of presence. I do not wish to bang on for too long, but it is about completion rates, it is about early intervention, it is about all those things and ensuring that we have the tools in place to increase the level of completion rates.

I have been told, and I know from the discussions and consultations that we have had, that it is supported in principle by both the employer and the employee associations and it will be supported, of course, by the development of a policy framework establishing processes and procedures, together with criteria, to ensure consistency and fairness in the application of evidentiary requirements as well. I have given an assurance to Business SA and SA Unions that they and other key stakeholders will be engaged in the development of these processes and protocols.

Clause passed.

Clause 64 passed.

Clause 65.

The Hon. P. CAICA: I move:

Page 38, lines 7 to 9 (inclusive) [clause 65(2)]—Delete subclause (2)

I would like to refer to yesterday's discussion on clause 51. On reading the transcript overnight and, certainly, when I was speaking yesterday, I understood what I was saying, but I think that others may not necessarily have understood what I was saying. I wish to clarify certain aspects.

Yesterday, the shadow spokesperson raised a question relating to termination under that particular provision. I would like to clarify that by elaborating on yesterday's explanation by stating that the purpose of clause 51 is to stop unlawful terminations of a training contract and to allow the training and skills commissioner to terminate a training contract where the parties mutually agree to that termination.

It also gives the Training and Skills Commission the ability to consider an application by one party to terminate a training contract; however, this would be done only under exceptional circumstances. As I stated yesterday, the process will have an educative focus and not a sledgehammer to crack a walnut approach.

Clause 65 provides the South Australian Industrial Relations Commission with the ability to include the termination of a training contract as one option for consideration when making an order of an unresolved dispute relating to that training contract. I thank you for allowing me to clarify that particular matter.

Amendment carried.

Mr GRIFFITHS: The Liberal Party has not actually supported the involvement of the Industrial Relations Commission. Certainly, in the submissions that we have received from a variety of people there have been concerns about the involvement of the Industrial Relations Commission. The minister has certainly provided an explanation of the reasons that is occurring in the interest of simplicity and to ensure that there is a structured organisation that has control over it, but there is a variety of questions as to how it may work.

Some of this might relate to some of my confusion. As much as I made an effort to ensure that I was well briefed on it, my position was that there would be total Industrial Relations Commission involvement. Business SA, in its discussions with me, suggested an alternative model where an independent tribunal was involved and where there was an appointment of the IRC commissioner as chair of the tribunal, with a panel of people from employer and employee representatives—four or five people from each group—to sit in judgment but be removed from the Industrial Relations Commission. Can the minister give an explanation, for the benefit of anyone who reads this in the future, as to what the true intent will be?

The Hon. P. CAICA: The member is quite correct in his overview that the training tribunal will be headed by a representative of the South Australian Industrial Relations Commission, that the tribunal will be made up of an employee and an employer representative, and that they will deal with matters of dispute. If we have a look at the level of dispute that occurred under the auspices of the GDMC, we were talking about 35,000 training contracts, and in total very few disputes that arose.

The genesis of this matter and this clause was to look at a couple of factors. One is the timeliness by which matters can be dealt with, and, just as importantly, the ability to be able to close and finalise those particular matters. To that extent, we needed to put it in a jurisdiction that was able to impose lawfully whatever penalties or orders may be required at that particular time.

There has been some consternation about the South Australian Industrial Relations Commission. I draw the committee's attention to the fact that, whilst historically if a matter went to the GDMC the relationship between the employer and the trainee and the employer and the apprentice was such that there was very little opportunity for conciliation and re-forming a meaningful relationship.

We should look at the most recent history of the South Australian Industrial Relations Commission in its dealings with matters of conciliation. The idea and the thrust behind this legislation is to have early intervention measures so that conciliation will in all likelihood occur to a great extent before it goes to the commission. The most significant role of the commission in the lead-up to any matter that is heard will be attempting to settle by agreement between the parties.

I highlight that, in 2006-07, 83 per cent of unfair dismissal applications before the South Australian Industrial Relations Commission were settled by agreement; 14 per cent of the rest were settled at the arbitration stage before determination; and 3 per cent were ultimately determined by the commission. The figures were very similar for the year 2005-06.

I wish to make the point that we are engaging people through the SAIRC who are experts and who have expertise in conciliation. More than anything else we want matters to be resolved between employers and employees so that the original intent of the contract, that is, the training and vocation of young people, can continue to the extent that they complete their award or qualification.

Mr GRIFFITHS: My question relates to clause 65(3)(h), which states:

It may order an employer to pay compensation for any breach of the training contract.

My concern is that, on my reading of the bill, there does not appear to be a definition for 'paid compensation'. This implies that damages are able to be awarded to an apprentice or a trainee, but neither the Industrial Relations Commission nor a trainee disputes tribunal, even though that option is not going to be taken up, must not be able to order an employer to pay compensation to an apprentice or trainee. We cannot see that there is any similar provision for employers. Therefore, can the minister give us some explanation as to what is intended by that paragraph?

The Hon. P. CAICA: Paid compensation, as highlighted in paragraph (h), allows for the SAIRC, in cases involving suspension, to make an order requiring the employer to pay compensation for any non-monetary benefit to which the apprentice or trainee would, but for the suspension, have been entitled to receive. In other cases, compensation for any loss other than the loss of remuneration suffered by the apprentice or trainee as a result of the employer's breach of the training contract—for instance, loss of training time because an employer would not allow the apprentice or trainee to attend their classes—is the thrust behind this particular clause.

Mr GRIFFITHS: Therefore, it is non-direct financial remuneration, is it? I am a little confused. Can you provide a practical example of what that might extend to? I need some clarification, please.

The Hon. P. CAICA: The best example I can give—and you and I are both familiar with the trials and tribulations occasionally involving young apprentices—is that compensation may well be, for example, where the trainee or apprentice is required to undertake some training at night, outside normal hours; that is the only time it can be done, and that is the form of compensation to which we refer. That is probably the best example that I can give.

Mr PISONI: Minister, is it the intention of the clause that the IRC can actually award damages to the trainee for any loss of future employment they may have gained through the skills which they would have acquired had they completed their training but which they will no longer be able to acquire because a dispute is unresolved?

The Hon. P. CAICA: I thank the honourable member for Unley for his question, and I can say no.

Mr PISONI: Clause 65(2) states:

If the Commission suspects on reasonable grounds that a party to a training contract has contravened a provision of the contract or this act, it may refer the matter to the Industrial Relations Commission.

Does that mean it is the intention of—

The CHAIR: Order! Member for Unley, that subclause has been deleted.

Clause as amended passed.

Clause 66 passed.

Clause 67.

Mr PISONI: I think that this clause will go down as being the 'union clause' in this bill. Paragraph (a) provides:

Representation of a party by a legal practitioner or registered agent will not be permitted.

People would say that on the face of it that sounds fair and reasonable. We do not want these situations to be expensive. We do not want these resolutions to take a long time and be held up with a lot of legal argument. Paragraph (b) states:

If a party to the proceedings is a body corporate—the Industrial Relations Commission may, if the party seeks to be represented by an officer or employee who is not a legal practitioner or registered agent, permit such a representation.

What that is saying is that if you are a sole trader, if you are a partner or if you operate a trust, you as the employer are the only person who is allowed to represent yourself in that situation. There is no facility for you to appoint somebody else who may be a better communicator than you are. We have a huge skills shortage here in South Australia and we are seeing an increase in 457 visas to get more and more skilled tradespeople to come to South Australia. What happens when they get here? They decide it is a great place to live and they want to become permanent residents and Australian citizens. I welcome that; that is a great way of expanding our population and expanding our skills base, but they might have come from a non-English speaking country.

They may have enough grasp of the English language to understand the different colour codes for plumbing or to read plans for putting up house trusses if they are a carpenter, but they will not be in a position to represent themselves in the Industrial Relations Commission if there is a dispute to be resolved. We want to encourage them to take on apprentices, we want it to be easy to take apprentices on, and we do not want to put impediments or barriers in the way of taking on apprentices. They are daunted by this appearance to the Industrial Relations Commission. Then clause 67(1)(c) is the double-whammy because it provides that:

if a party to the proceedings satisfies the Industrial Relations Commission that he or she will be disadvantaged in the proceedings if he or she is not represented by another person—the Industrial Relations Commission may permit the party to be represented by a person who is not a legal practitioner or registered agent—

but only if that person is doing it for free. In other words, you get a union representative who might be legally trained to come in and advocate for the trainee but you cannot have a representative from Business SA or any other group to come in and represent the employer.

We have this huge David and Goliath battle between the immigrant carpenter or plumber, who is just getting used to the English language, and the might of the South Australian union movement, which is up against this small business person who is, to all intents and purposes, wanting to do the right thing, wanting to contribute to their new country. It does not necessarily have to be an immigrant. It could be someone who simply had difficulty dealing with the formalities

academic part of schoolwork but who is a very good tradesman who has very good skills to pass on to their apprentice. That person may not have the ability to articulate their case and does not have the ability to put their best foot forward in a situation of confrontation like this and may require some representation.

Is it the intention of the minister to exclude sole traders, partnerships and those who operate under trusts from being able to have someone who can represent them and articulate their case without paying for it? This says that they can only have that if that person is not really qualified to do that, and they are not paid to do it. They have to find a friend, a relative or maybe even a customer or client. I would just like to know the minister's intention in relation to that. Also, is it the intention of paragraph (c) to encourage more people to join unions so that they can have unions advocate for them in this instance?

The Hon. P. CAICA: The member for Unley raised a lot of points. What we are doing here is transitioning the circumstances before the GDMC, and parties were not allowed to be represented by legal entities in those proceedings. The reality is that, by the time the dispute gets there, it is a dispute between the members or party to that particular contract. We do not want a legal argument about the situation. What we want is the best possible environment in which the matter can be resolved. With the greatest respect to the member for Mitchell, we do not want it to be a lawyer's breakfast. We want the matter resolved and the best way of resolving disputes is between the two individuals who are upfront in the centre of that particular dispute.

In relation to the body corporate, a body corporate cannot physically represent itself and the process we are undertaking is not unknown. It is very similar to the minor civil court and the Magistrates Court that encourage some informality. We want it to be a safe, supportive environment for both parties, whether that be an employer or an employee.

Progress reported; committee to sit again.

[Sitting extended beyond 17:00 on motion of Hon. P. Caica]

WORKERS REHABILITATION AND COMPENSATION (SCHEME REVIEW) AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Elder—Minister for Transport, Minister for Infrastructure, Minister for Energy) (16:58): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I wish to advise this house that I intend to ask the Speaker to recall this house at 4pm on Monday 12 May 2008 in order to receive the WorkCover legislation from the Legislative Council. The government has already indicated its intention that the Legislative Council continue to sit until the WorkCover bill is passed. This bill is of great importance to the state and it is our intention to pursue its passage with all vigour.

TRAINING AND SKILLS DEVELOPMENT BILL

In committee (resumed on motion).

Clause 67.

Mr PISONI: I need a little more clarification. Are you able to advise the committee on the situation that I described? Will a sole trader or a partner, or someone operating a business through a trust, be able to seek to be represented by somebody else for a fee? If the answer is no, why are private and public companies able to have paid staff representing them, but not independent contractors who do not operate under that structure for their own reasons? They may very well have their own reasons for deciding not to incorporate. Why does this legislation deliberately discriminate against them and weaken their ability to be heard in a fair manner?

The Hon. P. CAICA: It is somewhat of a slur on the SAIRC to suggest that people will in any way be disadvantaged or, indeed, as the honourable member mentioned, discriminated against. The point that I wish to make is that the provision built into this clause is that any single person has—if they satisfy the Industrial Relations Commission that he or she will be disadvantaged in the proceedings if he or she is not represented—the ability to be represented by a person.

Again, the point I would make to a very great extent is that that person cannot be—in the thrust of the legislation—a legal practitioner or a registered agent, and that person needs to act

gratuitously. I know that there is a bit of concern, because Business SA, as you would be fully aware, provides a service for employers before the Industrial Relations Commission, and it charges a fee for providing the service—if that is not a contradiction in terms: fee and service.

If Business SA thinks it is being advantaged or disadvantaged beyond what it is, the unions might be able to provide support gratuitously—and the word is 'support'—because they are not there as advocates. They are there to provide support—and Business SA might like to reconsider its service arrangements to its members.

For the benefit of the member for Unley, I make the point that this is about resolving disputes, and the best way to do that is between the two individuals who are in dispute. That is always, I have found, the best way to resolve a dispute. The same applies to the Industrial Relations Commission.

I also reinforce the point that we need to keep in mind that, of over 35,000 training contracts, very few get to the dispute stage of the process. Through our proposed legislation, the SAIRC will be quick and inexpensive and it will bring about a swift resolution to the dispute that exists.

Mr PISONI: For further clarification, minister, if somebody is a member of an organisation, and that organisation does not charge specifically for the service of giving support to that person—whether it be an employer or an employee, or a trainee or a trainer—in this instance, are you saying that it is all right for someone to pay membership fees and then have a representative from that organisation support them in dispute resolution, providing there is not a fee for that particular service? Is that what you are saying?

The Hon. P. CAICA: No, I am not saying that. It is at the discretion of the SAIRC.

The CHAIR: Member for Unley, you have had three questions on this clause.

Mr PISONI: I would just like to know what the intention is. When you say it is at the discretion of the IRC, I think that people would want to know what the intention is. Is the intention that you can use a membership to represent you?

The CHAIR: Member for Unley, this is drawing something out that really has been explained.

Mr GRIFFITHS: Can I take up the point, then?

The CHAIR: You can.

Mr GRIFFITHS: It has been an issue that has been discussed with me, and I commend the member for Unley on his representation on this matter. The minister has just outlined that it is a matter for the Industrial Relations Commission. Therefore, do we have to wait until the first case appears before a formal position is gathered; and, until then, there is uncertainty as to what the resolution will be?

The Hon. P. CAICA: I thank the member for Goyder for his question. I reinforce the point that the Industrial Relations Commission has the discretion to provide support should that support be required, if, through the proceedings, the commission is satisfied that that individual will be disadvantaged without representation. It is attempting to be as fair as it can possibly be to ensure that, as the member for Unley asserted, people will not be discriminated against or disadvantaged either regarding their ability to articulate themselves or in any other way. The Industrial Relations Commission has discretion as to the level of support that may be provided to the individual in question, and I am extremely comfortable with that approach.

Mr GRIFFITHS: I understand the interpretation expressed by the minister, but it is the use of the word 'discretion' by a body that is not beholden to the rules of the parliament that concerns me. Given the answer that the minister has already provided, I am wondering whether the minister is prepared—and I know that he spoke in some detail—to indicate what his position would be if he were able to influence the way in which the IRC should consider this specific point.

The Hon. P. CAICA: Yes, I can do that because I can repeat the relevant provision in the bill. The Industrial Relations Commission may permit a party to be represented by a person who is not a legal practitioner or registered agent but only if that person is acting gratuitously; so, the parameters are pretty clear as to what the SAIRC will do, and the position I have just stated cannot be read independently of the first part of the clause if the individual concerned is able to satisfy the Industrial Relations Commission that he or she will be disadvantaged by not being represented.

Mr GRIFFITHS: The dilemma rests with the word 'may'; it is not 'must' or 'shall'. It would have been our preference to see some firm decision being made on this instead of merely an opinion being required. I know that the Industrial Relations Commission is a very reputable body, and I am certainly not casting aspersions on any decision it may make, but those who have spoken to us are concerned about what the Industrial Relations Commission may, in its judgment, determine. It may find against representation in a particular hearing, whereas the person concerned may sincerely believe that representation is necessary. It is potentially the case that the opportunity for representation has been removed because the legislation does not allow it.

The Hon. P. CAICA: In response to that, I point out that nothing has been taken away. The reality is that, under the proceedings of the GDMC, it is as it was. In no way am I being disrespectful to members of the legal fraternity, but the thrust of this measure is about ensuring that we have the best possible mechanisms, forum and processes by which disputes can be resolved in a timely fashion for the benefit of both parties and the training contract into which they have entered.

The other point I want to make in respect of the word 'may' is that the IRC ultimately is a judicial body and we cannot direct what it does. It needs that discretion to be able to function to its own satisfaction under that component of the clause.

Mr PEDERICK: Does this mean that, if you are a member of an employer group or union, you cannot have representation from either group?

The Hon. P. CAICA: No, it does not mean that. I do not wish to labour the point, but the clause provides that they may permit representation, whether you are an employer or an employee provided (1) that you have satisfied the SAIRC that you would be disadvantaged without it; and (2) that you need to be represented by a person (who is not a legal practitioner or registered agent) and only if that person is acting gratuitously.

Clause passed.

Clause 68.

The Hon. P. CAICA: I move:

Page 40, line 30 [clause 68 (2)]—Delete 'complete' and substitute:

absolute

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 69.

Mr GRIFFITHS: I want to take up a point in relation to subclause (2) and its relationship to other acts. Under the Fair Work Act 1994 or an act repealed by that act, the requirement for employers to employ apprentices or trainees in preference to junior employees remains in force. In my introductory comments outlining the opposition's stance on this bill yesterday, I talked about this fact and some concerns that have been expressed to us.

I appreciate the fact that it is absolutely important in the majority of cases that there be an opportunity for young people (male or female) who go into these apprenticeships or traineeships to have that option provided to them. I also respect that it is important for employers to have that opportunity to determine the person's suitability in the first instance, especially when it comes to gauging what the person's work ethic might be, and that they have the opportunity to employ them as a junior employee as opposed to automatically taking them on as an apprentice or trainee.

My understanding in discussing this matter with other bodies is that the minister had indicated that he was going to make an explanatory statement on this. I am wondering whether the minister can now define his position on this matter.

The Hon. P. CAICA: This matter is linked to industrial awards and, in fact, is contained within a couple of awards. First, there needs to be a position available. We assume here that the position is available for an apprentice within an organisation and if, for example, within the organisation an employee wants to become an apprentice or a trainee and that position is available, that person will get preference over the junior employee within that industrial award.

Clause passed.

Clause 70.

The Hon. P. CAICA: I move:

Page 41, lines 16 and 17—Delete the penalty provision and expiation fee

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 71 and 72 passed.

Clause 73.

The Hon. P. CAICA: I move:

Page 43, line 12—After 'Commission' insert:

or the Training Advocate (as the case requires)

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 74 to 79 passed.

Schedule 1.

The Hon. P. CAICA: I move:

Page 45—

Line 8—After 'associations' insert:

, including the South Australian Employers' Chamber of Commerce and Industry Inc
(Business SA)

Line 12—After 'Council' insert:

(SA Unions)

Mr GRIFFITHS: I indicate that the opposition is pleased to support these amendments. I know this has been the subject of negotiation between various groups in their representations to the minister, and I think it is a good step forward.

Amendments carried; schedule as amended passed.

Schedule 2.

The Hon. P. CAICA: I move:

Page 48—

Line 34—Delete 'occupation or a non-trade occupation' and substitute:

or a declared vocation

Line 37—Delete 'occupation or a non-trade occupation' and substitute:

or a declared vocation

Amendment carried; schedule as amended passed.

Title passed.

Bill reported with amendment.

The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton—Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education, Minister for Science and Information Economy, Minister for Youth, Minister for Gambling) (17:21): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

I thank the member for Goyder, as the lead spokesperson for the opposition, for his contribution and the opposition for its support for the passage of this important bill. I also thank my departmental officers, in particular Elayne Neill, for the exceptional work she has undertaken throughout this process, and parliamentary counsel for its role in drafting this legislation; in particular, I acknowledge the outstanding work of Shirley Fisher. I also thank my staff, in particular, Paul Ryan and Roger Zubrinich, who have played a very important part in the consultation and preparation of this bill and, indeed Dylan Slape, my parliamentary officer.

The consultation process has been exhaustive and extremely important because of the significance of this bill. Again I thank the shadow and his Liberal opposition for the supporting this bill. I wish this bill a very safe and speedy passage through the other place. I do so because it provides an extremely important foundation for this state and sets the future wellbeing of our state economy, given its link to the acquisition of skills, and the training and employment issues that will be driven by this bill. Again I thank everyone for their contribution.

Bill read a third time and passed.

At 17:24 the house adjourned until Tuesday 3 June 2008 at 11:00.