

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 4 June 2008

The **SPEAKER (Hon. J.J. Snelling)** took the chair at 11:00 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) (11:01)**: I move:

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

Motion carried.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: OLD STOCK EXCHANGE BUILDING

Ms CICCARELLO (Norwood) (11:02): I move:

That the 280th report of the committee entitled 'Old Stock Exchange Building' be noted.

In 2007, the old Stock Exchange building was identified as being a suitable site for the Royal Institution Australia, the first international satellite of the Royal Institution of Great Britain in Adelaide. The Ri Australia was launched on 2 October 2007. It will be established with state government support, but this is on the basis that, ultimately, it will become self-funding. There are Morris stained-glass windows within the building which are valued at \$1.2 million and which have been gifted to the state by the previous owner, Javier Moll. They will remain in situ and be available for public viewing.

Negotiations have begun concerning the use of the outdoor space on the eastern side of the building as a plaza for the activities of the Ri Australia and the public in general. The refurbishment will provide:

- an auditorium with seating for approximately 200 people;
- office space for up to 25 people;
- meeting rooms and flexible space for public events;
- provision for state-of-the-art audiovisual facilities and information communications technology;
- a media centre for broadcast quality production briefings;
- access for disabled;
- exhibition, library and storage space.

Although the building is structurally sound, following an earthquake assessment structural retrofitting is required for compliance with relevant Australian standards.

The western end of the building remains as a timber framed structure and has much of the original fabric intact. The eastern end has had the original floors replaced with concrete slabs. Additional floors have been introduced which compromise the full height spaces and result in an ungainly juxtaposition of floors with windows. Refurbishment will require compromising a number of heritage components of the original structure, including the disabled access by putting in place a new lift, and fire safety and emergency egress provision. A new entrance on the McHenry Street facade will enable access from the street to a new lift which will give access to all floors. New openings in the south facade and in the east facade will be contemporary, using the latest in glass technology.

The building can be divided internally into two almost discrete zones, the axis being the main stair which itself is in heritage condition. The zone to the west will be restored to heritage standard. It has much of the original ceiling and wall panelling intact. The zone to the east, however, has lost much of its heritage integrity. The conversion of the trading room on the first floor to the general office will feature a remounting of the share movement chalkboards which were abandoned when the building fell into disuse.

The old Stock Exchange building is one of the few remaining Federation/Edwardian style buildings in Adelaide. It was opened in 1901 to commemorate Australian Federation and was included on the state heritage list in 1984 and the Register of the National Estate in 1993. It is

proposed, within the limits of the budget, to conserve and expose the original elements and convert and utilise spaces for the required contemporary uses. Despite serious damage in one area, which has been penetrated by large air-conditioning ducts, overall the original timber ceilings appear to be in reasonably good condition. Where appropriate, the original timber wainscoting will be reinstated.

All the existing appropriate light fittings will be retained and supplemented, where necessary, to retain the necessary light levels. Original ornate door hardware (handles, escutcheon plates and push plates) will be retained and reused, as will the silvered window sash pulls. Original paint colour schemes will be employed where practicable. The building will act as a hub for science awareness activities in the state and will house the various initiatives which arose out of Baroness Professor Susan Greenfield's time as Adelaide thinker in residence.

The refurbishment will also provide a focus for a major civic hub in the crossroads of a very busy pedestrian precinct and will bring to life a historically and architecturally significant heritage building which has languished in a state of disuse since the early 1990s. The Ri will provide a venue for public events—discussions, debates, performances, workshops, training sessions, special projects and private facility hire.

Through these activities, the development will connect the energies of scientists, technologists and engineers with individuals and families, students, educators, media, government and industry. The Ri Australia will aim to foster a scientifically literate community which understands the relevance of science, engineering and technology to their everyday lives and which is open to education and career choices in these areas. More specifically, Ri Australia aims to:

- address the current skills shortage by increasing interest and participation in science;
- establish an international cultural institution in Adelaide that embraces the advantages of science and technology;
- assist teacher professional development in the science sphere;
- provide a hub for science engagement and public education; and
- recognise and celebrate our scientific heritage—present and future.

The refurbishment will provide events and office spaces to support a variety of functions to achieve these aims, including:

- a public program of science events based on the successful Science Outside the Square program for the general public;
- supporting partnerships programs and events with the Royal Institution of Great Britain;
- programs to coordinate public access to the science relevant to industry and the education sector and link it to developments in school science and mathematics;
- the creation of a hub and focal point for collaboration between leading scientists, industry and business;
- a Young Persons' Program of outreach activities to schools;
- a series of professional development opportunities and resources for teachers, linking them to active science researchers;
- a bursary system to provide scholarships to assist young South Australians as they embark on further study in science, maths and engineering courses; and
- media and communications training for scientists through the Australian Science Media

The declining number of Australians studying science and maths subjects in schools and further education institutes is a significant issue. Parents and teachers are the key targets for much of the activity of the Ri Australia. Thus, the project links particularly closely to South Australia's Strategic Plan 2007. Recently, the Premier was in London where he attended an elaborate opening by The Queen of the newly redeveloped Royal Institution, which was beamed into Adelaide via a video link between London and eminent scientists attending a special dinner for the occasion.

Under the path-breaking agreement with Santos following the removal of its 15 per cent shareholder cap, the company will now contribute \$5 million in support of the Royal Institution

Australia by the end of November. This centre will bring great benefit to South Australia. We must remember that two South Australians, Nobel Prize winners William and Lawrence Bragg, were previous directors of the Royal Institution London; so this is not only recognition of their association with the Royal Institution but also it honours their work in science.

The Australian Media Centre, which will be housed in the new Ri building (just as Britain's Science Media Centre is based at the Royal Institution London), will mean that many scientists, students, young people and researchers will have access to approximately 1,400 eminent scientists who will be able to provide information to people.

This will be a wonderful facility for us in South Australia, and it will continue to enhance our reputation as a university city and as a centre of learning. I commend the report of the committee to the house.

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (11:11): I rise to make a few comments relating to the report of the committee which provides for the restoration of the old Stock Exchange building to make it operational for the purpose of accommodating our new Royal Institution Australia. During his recent overseas trip, the Premier told us that The Queen gave her blessing (I suppose) to this new development when he attended with Her Majesty the opening in London of the redeveloped Royal Institution. This is a sister organisation, as I understand it, which has attracted the support of the government, and we now have the Public Works Committee's recommendation to proceed with the provision of this accommodation.

As a former tenant of a building adjacent to the Stock Exchange building at the time of the very significant fire and its near destruction, I was very sad to see the possible loss of this heritage building. As has been indicated by the member for Norwood (the Presiding Member of the committee), this building is a fine example of federation South Australian architecture which should be preserved and enhanced. However, I found it rather curious that the Premier, at his meeting with the Queen in London last week during the unveiling of the Royal Institution of Great Britain, should receive this accolade for its sister, the Royal Institution Australia to be accommodated in this facility, yet he is about to dismiss unilaterally the use of the title of the Royal Adelaide Hospital (which is just down the road) in light of the government's announcement last year to close that hospital and build the new Marjorie Jackson-Nelson Hospital.

In 1939 the hospital was given a royal charter to accept the title of 'royal'. So its title was changed from the Adelaide Hospital to the Royal Adelaide Hospital some decades after it had been opened as a major state hospital in the previous century.

We see, on the one hand, a government initiative, which is being accommodated by the recommendation of this report to house the Royal Institution of Australia and we see the decimation, at the other end of the city of Adelaide, of an even older institution which has had the patronage of Her Majesty. I find that curious, inconsistent and hypocritical but, nevertheless, in view of the government's proposal of the science institute, that has my support, as would be the case if they were to withdraw this ridiculous idea of abolishing the Royal Adelaide Hospital name.

Mr PENGILLY (Finniss) (11:15): It has been something of an interesting exercise to contribute towards the Stock Exchange building change of role and refurbishment and I, along with other members, I am sure, of the Public Works Committee, was very interested to go along and have a look at it and wander through the ancient floors and see a few things from our past that are still up there.

I have to say, though, that whilst I understand what the justification is ostensibly for the project I am somewhat concerned that we are spending \$8 million and it is going to be confined to a very small interest group. In my view, it could become somewhat elitist, I am afraid. They are my concerns that I put on the table here today. I think it is a little bit of an ego trip on behalf of the Premier, quite frankly—or \$8 million worth of ego trip might be more to the point. I do not know whether enough South Australians are going to benefit from it, or be able to participate in what goes on there.

I understand they are going to have a public program of science events (or they propose to), and we are going on partnership programs and all sorts of things. My concern is when we have these thinkers in residence, if they come up with half a good idea and then they disappear and ride off into the sunset and the government of the day decides, 'That's a wonderful idea and we'll spend \$8 million'—or however many million is required in any given opportunity—we are going the wrong way.

I say that because I think members have seen what has come out of the announcement on Sunday about the \$100 million for the football stadium down at West Lakes and the public reaction to that has been fairly large, to say the least. If you can believe the *AdelaideNow* poll, the vast majority of people do not support it. My worry is that we are going through this process with the old Stock Exchange building, we are spending \$8 million on it, and I would suggest if we went out in the community there would be a very small percentage of the South Australian community that know what is going to happen, know the story, know what the program is and have no idea that \$8 million is being spent on it to justify the foibles of the Premier.

It is interesting to observe and I will continue to monitor the progress and, in due course, I will monitor the outcomes from the decisions taken on this. We will have to justify whether that \$8 million is, indeed, justified. Until that happens, we are just going to have to sit back and watch. Whilst I have participated in it, I am not 100 per cent sure that that amount of money being expended is in the best interests of wider South Australians.

Mr PISONI (Unley) (11:19): This is an interesting project. The procurement process was interesting and the rental agreement is interesting. This is a rental agreement which was set up by a government, of course, that has a Treasurer that says it is not into welfare for businesses. Yet you can only really describe the peppercorn rental deal—as it is described in the *Hansard* of this report—as assistance for business.

Really what the Deputy Premier should be saying is that it is only in the business of welfare for businesses that suit the Premier's agenda, because it is clear that the arrangements that are made here have made it very attractive for the college to come to Adelaide.

It is a beautiful building—there is no doubt about that. It has been, the term is, bastardised over the years. We even saw an extra floor had been put in by the previous owners of the Stock Exchange, but it will, I believe, be a lovely building when it is finished. I was not convinced that the government was serious about the integrity of the restoration of the building. There were many things that I saw as I walked through the building that were of value to South Australians; not only their building heritage, but South Australians' heritage of artisans and tradesmen as well, that I feel we may very well lose in this restoration. I hope we do not. I hope that the cloth is cut well enough that the budget can, in fact, ensure that some of the traditional work that will be required to restore this building will be undertaken with the integrity that it deserves.

The location of the building, of course, is in amongst a lot of passing foot traffic. One of the things I did notice (that maybe the new owners may put some pressure on the council to deal with) was the enormous amount of cigarette smoke that was in the vicinity. Although it was outside during our inspection, it was very uncomfortable to be there at the base of all those multistorey office buildings, where people were coming out to have their morning fag at the time of our inspection.

The project is there, it has been endorsed by the Public Works Committee and I will be very keen to be there at the opening and see how well they have respected the integrity of the building.

The Hon. P.L. WHITE (Taylor) (11:22): I rise in support of this motion to note the report of the committee which recommends the expenditure of \$8.74 million on the renovation and upgrade of the old Stock Exchange building. It is a beautiful building, as has been said by all members who have spoken to this motion, and will be put to fantastic use.

It is true, as the member for Unley stated, that there are some significant aspects of the building that the committee members, having walked through the building, would like to see retained—and we have mentioned those to the proponents of this project. They include the carpets. From memory, it was only about eight years before the shutdown of the Stock Exchange that there was a major fire and refurbishment, so some of the features are in quite good condition.

One example is the carpets, which are unique South Australian-made carpets with emblems that are significant to the business of the Stock Exchange. There are other fixtures also, such as beautiful stained glass windows, and we were given assurances by the proponents of this project that those aspects would be dealt with appropriately. Of course, as mentioned I think by the member for Finnis, no-one will miss some of the additions from perhaps the 1970s which, by the look of them, were not exactly a positive step.

However, I want to take issue with some of the contributions of members opposite. First, I point out that both Liberal Party committee members (the members for Finnis and Unley) supported the committee's report, which was unanimous for this expenditure of public money.

However, we have had three Liberal Party members be rather critical in their comments about the use of this money, particularly the member for Finniss, who questioned the validity of the expenditure of this \$8.74 million, referring to the users of this building as a 'small interest group'. I want to set the record straight on that.

Mr Pengilly: I said I thought it may be a bit too elitist. I didn't say that.

The Hon. P.L. WHITE: Well, I wrote down 'small interest group'. If I have misquoted you, I apologise, but I do not think I did. We will check. He also said that it is a factor of the ego of the Premier that this has come about. I want to address that, because I pay full tribute to the Premier's role in this project. I have visited the Royal Institution of Great Britain, and I was also science minister when thinker in residence Baroness Susan Greenfield came to Adelaide for the first time (she was here for two visits, of course). This Stock Exchange project has come out of that connection and I want to explain the significance of it.

As the member for Norwood explained, this building will also house the Australian Science Media Centre and will be used by students and members of the public. Its whole focus is on improving maths and science in South Australia—in our schools and tertiary institutions—and awareness in the community, as well as skills enhancement in the areas of maths and science in South Australia which is a very important priority of this government. So I would think the expenditure of \$9 million for such a worthy aim is well placed.

I congratulate the Premier, and I congratulate the current (and probably the previous) minister of science—there have been two since my experience who have had a role in this. The building will be open to the public. It is significant to South Australia for its history, including its connection with the Braggs and with the Royal Institution, which is an incredibly powerful connection. The Royal Institution is a very well-funded, privately-funded institution that has done much for Britain's standing in science and mathematics. So, we hope that this facility will aid our capacity in science and maths in South Australia.

I do not often mention individual public servants, but Linda Cooper, who worked for me when I was in the science portfolio and is now in the Premier's department, is one of the real drivers. She is a very energetic woman with lots of ideas, who talks frequently with Baroness Susan Greenfield and has played a major role. I pay tribute to her energy in helping this project come to fruition. It is a good project, and I think it will have a lasting and important impact on science and maths-related skills in this state.

Ms CICCARELLO (Norwood) (11:29): I commend this project to the house. I had also written down that this is certainly not going to be an elitist institution; it is something that will be available to everyone in South Australia and, indeed, Australia. Its aim is to enhance the appreciation of maths and science in South Australia and Australia through its communications and media centre. The Bragg Initiative will endeavour to make science and maths as popular in the daily lives of young people, as are sports and arts.

The member for Taylor did raise the issue of the carpet, on which we did focus quite considerably when looking at the centre. I was speaking to the Minister for Tourism last night and she told me that she has been involved with the refurbishment of the centre. She indicated to me last night that the loss of the carpet was of concern to her because it was in such good condition. That carpet will be divided into—I cannot remember the exact measurements—sizable pieces and sold off to people because it is in very good condition; and that, also, will bring an income to the institution.

I do commend the project to the house. It is the first time in 209 years that the Royal Institution has agreed to have a branch, shall we say, in another country. Based upon the evidence presented to it and pursuant to section 12C of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1999, the Public Works Committee recommends the proposed public work.

Motion carried.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: RAIL REVITALISATION PROJECT

Ms CICCARELLO (Norwood) (11:32): I move:

That the 281st report of the committee entitled 'Rail Revitalisation Project' be noted.

The TransAdelaide rail network provides public transport services to 11 million passengers every year, delivering 36 per cent of the public transport task for Adelaide, as well as carrying nearly 1 million tonnes of freight from the Mid North to Adelaide. Parts of Adelaide's rail track and infrastructure are reaching the end of their useful economic life, with a reduction in train speeds in

affected parts of the network. This has a direct impact on train on-time running and passenger satisfaction.

The project scope includes concrete resleepering of the Noarlunga and Belair rail lines between Sleeps Hill Tunnel and Belair. Rail that has reached the end of its useful economic life will be replaced. Road crossings will be encased in concrete and improvements will occur to track drainage and formation to ensure ongoing track integrity.

The rail revitalisation project involves over 65 kilometres of new track, including the construction of a new base layer, drainage, long-life concrete sleepers and new rail where required. It will also replace turnouts and switching equipment and upgrade concrete bearers in locations with high usage and where assets are approaching the end of their effective life. Construction of new track crossover switches will allow for future operational flexibility.

Rail has a significantly longer life expectancy than sleepers, and the majority of rail on the track has a considerable remaining life expectancy. Rail that is approaching the end of its useful life will be replaced. The condition of the track base layer and drainage is critical to the ongoing life expectancy of the track. Track base layer and drainage will be improved, in conjunction with the resleepering, providing the foundation for extended track life and reduced maintenance costs.

Installation of new turnouts will provide significant flexibility and facilitate more rapid, reliable rail services. It will also facilitate more efficient ongoing track work, saving time and money in the future. Road level crossings will be removed, re-laid with new sleepers and formation, and then encased in concrete. This will provide a much longer life than bitumen and a smoother, safer transition for road vehicles using the level crossing. A number of small open deck bridges (where rail lines cross over waterways and culverts) are to be reconstructed as closed deck. These are more stable and safer for environmental and rail safety perspectives.

The resleepering that comprises the majority of works will necessitate closures of sections of the Belair and Noarlunga lines. Options for replacement services will be generated after consultation with the travelling public. It is in the best interest of the project to minimise disruptions to passengers and the general travelling public, and significant resources will be dedicated to the service planning for closures.

A key benefit will be reduced operational rail noise. Removal of rail joints and replacement with continuously welded rail on the new concrete track will significantly reduce wheel and rail impact noise. Construction noise will be an unavoidable issue during construction works, given the proximity of the rail alignment to residential properties, but all reasonable mitigation measures will be implemented. Fortunately, works in any particular location will be relatively short in duration thereby minimising disruption to residents.

A significant volume of ballast fines material within track infrastructure is contaminated, mainly from arsenic-based weedicides. Other contamination includes hydrocarbon from grease and oil spills and the use of contaminated fuel materials (for example, combustion waste from steam locomotives) during original construction of the railway. Removal of the material will be subject to a detailed remediation management plan in order to ensure it is handled according to appropriate safety requirements and does not generate excessive dust.

The project supports South Australia's Strategic Plan objective of increasing the use of public transport to 10 per cent of metropolitan weekday passenger vehicle kilometres travelled by 2018. The project is intended to be the first stage of the revitalisation of the rail network leading to patronage increases in the medium to long term. As such, it will provide a platform for future upgrading of services, including making provisions for potential future standardisation, increased services frequency and electrification.

The project will also improve sub-surface conditions and provide adequate drainage to improve track life and integrity. Improved track structure will allow an increase in maximum train speeds, as well as encourage increased patronage due to reduced travel and delay times and increased passenger comfort.

Speed restrictions associated with track condition will be removed, thereby resulting in a more rapid, reliable service. The economic assessment equates to a net present value of benefits of approximately \$61 million and a benefit cost ratio of \$1.8 million. Sensitivity testing suggests that the benefit cost ratio could be as high as 2.8 under certain assumptions. This project will reduce passenger and rail worker safety risks by reducing the risk of derailment, track buckling and general hazards. There will also be savings in long-term future investment of around \$2 million per

annum, which would otherwise be required to maintain the rail infrastructure to an adequate and safe technical standard.

The improved track will also avoid further bids for recurrent infrastructure maintenance, rolling stock maintenance, and fuel cost increases, averaging \$1.3 million per annum over the next 25 years. The project will sustainably extend rail infrastructure life to 60 years instead of the current life of 20 to 30 years. There will also be a reduced ecological footprint with a substantial reduction in reliance on river red gum timber for sleepers and a reduction of 6,000 tonnes of greenhouse gas emissions due to the extent of the shift in transport usage from cars to rail.

The project is estimated to cost \$121.1 million, and construction will commence in mid-2008. The work on the Belair line is expected to be completed by the end of 2008, and the Noarlunga component will be completed by the end of 2010 or early 2011. Therefore, based upon the evidence that was presented and pursuant to section 12C of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991, the Public Works Committee recommends the proposed public work.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher) (11:39): I welcome this project and its endorsement by the Public Works Committee. It does not sound very sexy—rail revitalisation, putting in new sleepers and upgrading the track—but it is a first step in what I hope for and to which the member for Norwood alluded: electrification and standardisation of the tracks. One would hope that it is not all that far away, because it needs to happen in Adelaide.

Once the rail lines are standardised, you can then integrate with existing light rail, because the existing Glenelg tram operates on a standard gauge track. With some vision and implementation, you can have an integrated system, which I believe in the long term should be light rail. Light rail can be tram or train, but it is the way of extending services in the future to Aldinga. I also believe that some bold vision is required in providing right rail out to the eastern suburbs, even to areas such as Happy Valley. Trams can easily go up a reasonable incline. There is no engine—

Mr Pengilly interjecting:

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: Yes, and they come down even faster than they go up. There is no impediment to having light rail go out to areas such as Happy Valley and Aberfoyle Park. I do not know what is in the budget, obviously, but I would like to see from the government a bold public transport plan, which is genuinely 21st century and which is focused on light rail, whether it be trams or light rail trains.

The public transport system in Adelaide, over time, has grown a bit like topsy. It is not as well integrated as it could or should be. It is unfortunate that, with the upgrade of the Oaklands Park Station (Warradale), it is not part of the nearby shopping centre. We have to blame, I guess, people of years ago for a lack of vision and foresight. Studies show that, if you integrate public transport with shopping centres and shopping areas, patronage will increase substantially. Patronage is increasing at the moment. I come in on the train whenever parliament is sitting and at other times, and patronage is up because, I guess, petrol prices are up.

Apart from the fundamental issue of resleepering these lines and converting them, ultimately, to electrification and standardisation, other things that are needed are improved park and ride facilities at stations. I noticed yesterday that work has commenced at Mitcham station on some upgrading of what I assume are parking areas.

I think that the park and ride facilities need to go a bit further and should follow the Perth model where people can leave their car knowing that it is under surveillance all day. If you think about it, for the cost of, say, a dollar a day—I am sure that most patrons would not mind paying that—if you have 200 cars there all day, that is \$200, and that would easily pay for a security guard or for appropriate infrastructure to protect those vehicles.

What we have before us today is a small step; it is an important step. It is over \$120 million, so it is not an insignificant amount of money, but I think it is something that needs to happen. I urge the federal Rudd government, which is sitting on a surplus of over \$20 billion, to allocate some of that money to Adelaide and South Australia to upgrade our rail system. It will not be inflationary in the short term, because these things take years to do. It will not blow the CPI out of the water, because it will take years to implement a conversion of our rail system to a modern electric standardised system.

You do not have to do every line at once. As is happening with this project, they are doing Belair and then Noarlunga. You do not have to standardise and electrify each line simultaneously; you can do it in stages. It is affordable, but not only is it affordable, it is essential. I commend the

government and the minister on this project. He gets a lot of stick, but this is a very positive step forward for public transport in South Australia.

Mr VENNING (Schubert) (11:44): I never let an opportunity go by; if it has anything to do with rail, I will always get on my feet. I certainly welcome this report to the parliament by the Public Works Committee. This is the sort of work that I miss doing on the Public Works Committee, having served on it for the four years previously. I read this report with a lot of interest, and I congratulate the committee and all those who serve on it.

Governments of all persuasions over the last two decades have talked about standardisation of Adelaide's metro rail network, ever since the main interstate railway line was altered from broad gauge to standard gauge. Way back in 1986, the question was: when will we do the rest of South Australia's railway lines, which is mainly the metro lines? Others such as the Gawler-Barossa and Gawler-Kapunda lines were included in that.

The 2007-08 state budget contained the \$121 million upgrade to the state's metro rail track, to be undertaken over four years, and I support that—and it is one of the few things that I did support. I hope that the project is underway and that the money has been spent, because the project is over four years and the year has now gone. It has been in the budget a couple of times, and I hope that we have seen some progress there.

I know that the Gawler line is included in the metro rail track, but a question I did ask was whether the Gawler-Barossa line is included as well. Again, members might say, 'Not again,' but one day I would like to see that line included, because that line is still broad gauge, as is the Kapunda line, which is still there and which I understand is still in reasonably good working order. I would be interested to know whether those lines are included, because it does not say anything about it in the report.

I believe it should involve railway lines all over the state. It should include making infrastructure safer and more user friendly, as the report does intimate. We have many bad and dangerous railway crossings, and we have had some frightful tragedies and accidents at railway crossings—and in the Barossa we have had more than our share. Some railway crossings have to become overpasses, as our trains will be travelling faster, will be longer in length and will be more frequent as the public transport modes change, as they will because of the cost of fuel. Every day, we are hearing about that issue.

I think we will all be using public transport a lot more in the future, so we have to make sure that it is user friendly, and we have to make sure that it is safe. I think we have to look at overpasses, even though we know they are very expensive, because it is the only permanent and safe way to do it, particularly when trains are whizzing past at 130 or 140 km/h. You can imagine the damage that is done when you are on the same level as trucks and cars. So, we do have to look at that issue.

Of course, the initial work will not change the gauge in metropolitan Adelaide, which is a bit sad. However, I understand that the extensive ongoing resleepering will be undertaken on the 75 kilometres of new track. These sleepers have a third attachment point to facilitate an easy change of gauge in the near future, and that is good. All they do is come along with a machine to move the rail from one hole to the other; in fact, they bring it in and make it narrower. It will be an easy conversion process. I presume that the sleepers that are being used are the multi-attachment sleeper, which would be the largest cost.

Later on, when we are looking at whether we will electrify the system, we will certainly need to have those type of sleepers as well. So, with whatever work we are doing, as long as we are thinking of the future and we do not waste our money, it will be valuable.

I also note in the report that 17 road level crossings will be upgraded and the bitumen will be replaced by concrete to make it smoother; in other words, there will be no bumps. I certainly welcome that upgrade, particularly because of the noise factor when trucks are going over these crossings. The people who live near these level crossings will certainly be very happy that it will be much quieter.

I also note that nowadays we have the option of running trams on these same lines, and the member for Fisher has just spoken about that issue. I have read lately about new types of tram-trains that can travel on normal standard gauge railway lines. I have previously said in the house that I support trams as being a good way to provide quick and easy public transport, and people like them. However, I do not support the new trams we are operating at the moment. We need to trade them in—sell them to the Victorians; sell them to Melbourne!—and buy these new trams—

Mr Williams interjecting:

Mr VENNING: As the member for MacKillop says, they were purchased only because they were the only tram that could be delivered before the last state election, which tells you something. I am sorry, but all the bad thoughts we had about the trams have been proven to be true. They are totally unsatisfactory, and it is sad that we have altered our whole corridor to fit these unsuitable trams. So, the government might as well admit we made a mistake—

Ms CICCARELLO: On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I ask that the member return to the report. The report is about rail sleepering, not about trams.

The SPEAKER: I uphold the point of order. While I am prepared to give a certain amount of flexibility to members in their speeches and I am not overly restrictive when it comes to member's remarks, it does need to relate to the report.

Mr PISONI: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, you may not realise it, but the tramline is regularly referred to in the *Hansard* report. I think the member knows that, and I believe the member has deliberately tried to mislead you on this issue.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member must not say that. If that is the case, I apologise to the member for Schubert, and he may continue his remarks.

Mr VENNING: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I understand that you cannot listen to and know everything; I appreciate that. There is no ill-feeling.

Ms CICCARELLO: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, I still think there is a differentiation between sleepers and talking about the replacement of trams. It is totally irrelevant.

The SPEAKER: Order! I will listen to the remarks made by the member for Schubert. I have to admit that I am not intimately familiar with the report, and I will rely on the member for Schubert to stick to the report.

Mr VENNING: In the last few sentences of my remarks I was talking about the resleepering having the third point so that we can move the rail in order to run trains on them. So, we are talking about resleepering, which is quite on the subject. I thank you for your tolerance, Mr Speaker. I think that trams are the future. These lines will have the option of running trains, both passenger and freight, and, indeed, trams.

I would not be at all surprised that when the government announces its budget tomorrow there is some money or some effort in the budget to purchase a new style of tram, which will be called the tram-train multihook. I think that, if the government has any nous at all, it will say, 'Hang on, we made a mistake. We will sell the trams we have to the Victorians, and we will buy new ones, alter the existing track and run these new trams over the whole system'—and the government will be able to do that with the new resleepering program.

So, I am being positive, member for Norwood. If I can, I will always be positive. I think this is the first instalment of a multimillion dollar upgrade. It is going to cost a lot of money to do the rest, but I believe we have to standardise the system. The question is, as always, can we justify the massive amount of money, probably \$1 or \$2 billion, for the few people who are currently using the public transport system. Well, we probably cannot, but unless we upgrade it and make it more user-friendly, it is a self-perpetuating problem. I think generally we have to say, 'Well, hang on, we'll bite the bullet and we'll do this.'

As I have said before in this house, I support trams as a good way to provide public transport, and I think with these new trams we get flexibility with multi-carriages with one driver; they are wider trams; they are lower; they have more hinges so they allow tight corners; and they look very smart too. I note that the member from Morphett is doing some work on this as well.

I note that the primary objective is to upgrade the track on the Noarlunga line. This could be part of a bold vision, after the upgrade of the track to Gawler and even the Barossa, to extend it beyond Noarlunga, and then we would have a fantastic transport corridor north-south and we could put in connecting services, be they other rail lines, buses, minibuses (including the O-Bahn), or even taxicabs or courier cars to link to it.

I choose to be positive. I commend the Public Works Committee on this report. Let us hope that it is a sign of better things to come.

Mr PISONI (Unley) (11:54): I think any work that can be done on our rail system should be cheered, and we should be pleased about it. Even Mr Rod Hook, who gave the presentation at

the Public Works Committee, said that there has been considerable interest in the shortcomings of our rail network. Mr Hook is very aware of the shortcomings of our rail network, and this project, I suppose, is a late but still welcomed project for the resleepering of the Belair line and the Noarlunga line. It is also interesting that Mr Hook referred to new rolling stock, and he also referred to different forms of powering the network and that this project of concrete sleepering was the precursor before any of that could be done.

I was quite surprised, and I raised with him in the Public Works Committee that at the same time there was a contract out for 7,000 to 8,000 timber sleepers a year to be supplied for the northern line. So, if concrete sleepering is a precursor to the electrification of the rail system then after significant investment in literally tens of thousands of new timber sleepers in the northern line, we can see that electrification at least of the northern line is a very long way away because the life of those sleepers will be 20-odd years or more.

It is also interesting that TransAdelaide and the department of transport do not seem to talk to each other, because Mr Hook denied any responsibility from his point of view for any of the work being done on the northern line because that was TransAdelaide, despite the fact that the Minister for Transport earlier that month had made a statement that Transport SA would be taking over all the responsibilities of rail and tram in South Australia. Mr Hook agreed that that was the case, but that referred only to the transfer of assets of the department, and TransAdelaide would still be responsible for maintenance.

We have a situation where the chief executive officer of Transport SA cannot tell us what TransAdelaide is doing. It is not his responsibility, according to Mr Hook, so it was very hard to get any information about the long-term plans for transport in South Australia under this government. It was very obvious to me—

Mr Pengilly interjecting:

Mr PISONI: As the member for Finniss interjects, 'There isn't one,' and I think that is very obvious. It is very obvious from this report that, when I asked questions about an overall strategy for expansion of the rail network, electrification of the rail network or public transport in general, I was told, 'Look, I'm not responsible for that. TransAdelaide does maintenance. I do something else. I'm not responsible for new sleepers on the northern line, but I'm responsible for the new sleepers on the southern line and the Belair line.' This is a bizarre situation, and it is no wonder that we have trains derailing, trams not running when it is too hot or too cold, and dress codes being introduced on the trams. We can see the chaos within the department and nothing showed more strongly that chaos than this hearing of the Public Works Committee on the new sleepers on the southern line.

What is also interesting about the way TransAdelaide and Transport SA do not talk to each other is that we were told in the report that we are moving to concrete sleepers because they are more ecologically sustainable. The report states, 'It would reduce the ecological footprint by reducing the impact of human settlements on activities.' That is from the report concerning the installation of concrete sleepers instead of river red gum sleepers sourced from native forests. These are all good things of course. It is good to use concrete sleepers, but the tender documents for the timber sleepers made no mention of a switch because of environmental or ecological concerns, so we have the north of Adelaide using old-fashioned technology and living red gums being cut down for sleepers, and we have the south using concrete sleepers.

The north is being managed by TransAdelaide; the south is being managed by Mr Hook and his department: it is an absolute mess. Then we heard that the train lines will be closed. There will be about a 12-week program for the Belair line and about an 18-month program for the Noarlunga line, and that buses will be brought in to deal with that. Of course, we have a shortage of buses in Adelaide at the moment.

Debate adjourned.

PREVENTION OF CRUELTY TO ANIMALS (ANIMAL WELFARE) AMENDMENT BILL

In committee.

(Continued from 3 June 2008. Page 3395.)

Clause 1.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: I move:

Page 3, line 3—Delete 'Animal Welfare' and substitute:

Offences, Enforcement and Other Matters

This morning I have been at the Sidney Kidman building at Kapunda. There is a plaque on the side of the wall which says, '1900—350 horses were sold'. Under these proposals, they would not be allowed to do that. The bureaucrats would say, 'What a terrible thing, they want to sell horses: they might get disturbed.' The title of this obnoxious piece of legislation is inaccurate. Clause 1 says 'Short title'. I want to change it to ensure that it clearly indicates to those long-suffering people who will have to put up with some of this nonsense that it does deal with enforcement offences and other matters.

This particular piece of legislation and the clauses which will we be debating for I do not know how long—it is a pity that we are even debating them, in my view—are neither desirable or necessary to my way of thinking as a practical person. I am not someone who reads academic views: I have been involved. Remember this, members of the parliamentary Liberal Party will not forget this and it will be changed in the future. Those responsible will be called to account because we know that a little group of people have an obsession with this sort of behaviour. Their whole function in life is to make life difficult for people in rural communities.

Anything coming out of the Department for Environment and Heritage is not conducive to commonsense. We have a minister who is programmed by her bureaucrats and who has no practical understanding. We all know that. If members want to see what will happen, I suggest they look at what happened at the NRM parliamentary committee meetings last week and the week before when people played silly games and got cleaned up—and we have not finished with them yet: they will get the next lot of instalments. It is a lesson that bureaucrats should understand.

This coming weekend we have the Marree races, a small picnic race meeting, and they have other events. Will they be allowed to continue? We also have a plaque unveiling in honour of the great work that Tom Kruse did in servicing the outback. Just remember that these people are volunteers and this legislation is aimed fairly and squarely at them. We would not be voicing our opposition to these proposals if we did not have good grounds. We know what has happened at Marabel. Have the bureaucrats ever driven up the road past Marabel and seen the statue of the champion buck-jumper Curio? Have you seen it?

Mr Venning: Brilliant.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: Yes; brilliant. As I said, Sidney Kidman and those people would be turning over in their graves at this sort of nonsense. This will make life difficult for people in South Australia. The biggest rodeo in the world, the Carrieton stampede, should not have to put up with any of this nonsense. You may win the vote, but I will ensure you pay a political price for this. Let me make no mistake, you will pay a political price. I look forward to standing up at rodeos and telling people what is happening—there will be thousands of people there—what they can do to ensure that rodeos continue in the future and how to make those who are responsible pay the price.

Minister, you are normally a reasonably responsible person. I am amazed that you have gone on with this. This is the last chance these people have to have someone to stick up for them. Once it passes through the parliament, who will be there? They will be in the minister's ear telling her about all these so-called wicked things and they will be promoted by Channel 7. I rest my case.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: I would like to make a few comments in relation to this part of the bill. I think that, in a general sense, this measure is long overdue. I understand that the member for Stuart has concerns, particularly about rodeos. However, the reality is that, particularly in the city, attitudes to animal welfare have strengthened in the last few years. I know from people in my electorate who contact me frequently that there is a very strong voice amongst the urban population, at least, from those who are concerned about animal welfare. I understand that the money raised by rodeos has gone to good causes, and I would think that there is a place for entertainment but without inflicting cruelty on animals, and that that is something that could be achieved. Obviously, the member for Stuart does not believe that it will occur as a result of this bill.

We have a different standard in this country to many other countries about animal welfare. I just remind members that, for example, in many parts of Asia and the Middle East, animals are not stunned before they are killed in abattoirs. Japan has live fish with their flesh removed on the restaurant table. I have been there. I have been to a function where the fish was alive, it had had a lot of its flesh removed and it was sitting in ice whilst people had a meal sitting around it. If you tried that in Australia I think you would find yourself getting a visit from someone in a blue uniform.

People in the Middle East and people of certain religious faiths (including Muslim and Jewish faiths) have their animals bled to death in slaughterhouses, unlike the general practice in Australia. That practice is carried out in Australia in some areas, but it is not something that the general population in Australia would accept or wish to see practised. Currently, we have a very vigorous debate going on about the mulesing of sheep and lambs. It is a very difficult issue to address, because if an animal is stricken with a disease arising from being fly-blown it is awful for that animal and it often results in death. On the other hand, traditional mulesing is very severe and, I guess, quite painful, and measures are being taken now to use anaesthetic, clips and so on.

The point I make is that we have come a long way in terms of our treatment of animals and reducing cruelty to animals. I do not think members would find too many people in our society who would entertain the notion of cruelty to animals. But even recently (and I will not comment on a case which could be before the courts) we still have some people, whether it is through ignorance or malicious intent, I am not sure, who have little regard for the welfare of animals. I am not convinced that this bill will deal with the issue of puppy farming, which is something I wanted addressed in earlier legislation that I introduced to this parliament.

Nevertheless, I think that, overall, this bill is a positive measure, and I commend the minister in the other place for bringing it to the parliament. You will not please everyone on an issue such as this. It is a very sensitive matter. I understand what the member for Stuart is saying, that there are people in rural areas who see this as an unfortunate intrusion on their fundraising and rodeo activity, but I can tell him that the reality in the city is that there is a hardening of attitude towards people who are seen to inflict any form of cruelty on animals. I think that, overwhelmingly, the majority of South Australians would endorse this measure.

Some people will say that it does not go far enough. Some people would not want any activity to curtail or have controls relating to animals. Some people believe, for example, that cats should be able to do what they like, even if that means killing other creatures, but I do not share that view. I think the majority of South Australians would endorse this legislation. The opposition represents, particularly, parts of the rural environment, but I think that, overall and collectively, the people of South Australia support this measure, which I believe is long overdue.

In some areas it is probably not tough enough. I do not think that proposals to give people advance notice of inspections accords with common sense. If you tell people they are to be raided or checked, they will take steps to make sure that they do not infringe the law. It would be a little like giving criminals advance notice that the police will raid their premises. I do not think it makes commonsense to have provisions which give people unnecessary warning of an inspection.

We still have, despite this measure and others, some aspects of farming which are questionable, for example, intensive production of chickens in sheds. One of the large producers of chickens in South Australia contracts out to people to house chickens in these huge barns. The chickens never see daylight from the moment they are hatched to the moment they are killed, and I think those practices are questionable. People who visit these places say that if you saw the conditions you would never buy that brand of chicken.

It is not necessary in Australia or South Australia to have animals in such conditions where they never see daylight and never get out to free range at all when we have progressive producers who have free range production.

There is one chap interstate who is producing 18,000 chickens a week in free-range conditions, with irrigated pasture between the sheds. It is possible and it is economical. I know from my local chicken shop at The Hub, since they have switched to free-range chickens, their business has actually increased. They charge about \$1 more per chicken, but their business has gone up because people not only want to have better taste in what they eat, they do not like the concept of any form of animal cruelty.

In our society we have tolerated for far too long small cages where birds could barely move and the argument was that if you put them in together they will attack each other. Chickens are originally jungle creatures. They are fussy. We had people (and I think this is where the Hon. Nick Xenophon was misguided) coming to the defence of people who had chickens in small cages, which was outrageous because those people had eight years to upgrade and to get rid of those small cages and then, when the day of judgment came, they still were not ready.

This measure I think overall is a step forward. No bill is ever perfect, but I believe that people can still have their rodeos under this bill, but they have to keep them within certain constraints to ensure animals are not unnecessarily harmed. I think as a society—and I do not

classify myself as an animal libber—the treatment generally by humans towards other creatures is pretty appalling. If you think of the poor old dairy cow, and I like the odd milkshake, and it shows, but we get them pregnant and keep them pregnant to produce milk and then we slaughter the little calves. Humans are pretty outrageous in the way we treat other creatures.

It is one thing to kill them, it is another thing to treat them badly and I think this bill tries to impose standards which are a step forward from where we are, but I think we have still got a long way to go before we reach a point where we can genuinely say we, as a community, are committed to animal welfare.

Dr McFETRIDGE: Unfortunately I had pressing family matters yesterday afternoon and was not able to make a second reading contribution on this. I speak from a position of having had a veterinary practice for 20 years and certainly animal welfare, as it is known around the traps, is a big issue. But you need to define animal welfare, or to have some concept of what you mean by animal welfare. That is why I have lot of sympathy for what the member for Stuart is trying to bring across with his amendment here.

I will be supporting his amendment for animal welfare because it depends whether you are speaking to people from the far left, with anthropomorphic views of animals and how they should be seen as equals with humans, or whether you look at some of the examples given by the member for Fisher; the attitudes of some of the Asian countries where animals are seen as even less than a commodity in many cases, and there are atrocious acts of barbarism and cruelty perpetrated for what they think are perfectly sane reasons. Nobody in Australia and certainly nobody in this place would sanction that sort of treatment.

I have seen lots of atrocious cases of intentional animal cruelty. I have also seen some cruelty that has been perpetrated out of ignorance. I would speak to people who were clients about the way they treat their animals, the way they deal with the welfare of the animals, and they were very well-meaning at the time, but it came out of ignorance.

The term 'animal welfare' is a warm, fuzzy term; it is an all encompassing term. It will incorporate people who are really in their own minds acting quite innocently out of ignorance. That is no excuse, sure, but at the same time we need to ensure that the owners of these animals—the people that are operating certainly intensive animal production, and who are operating rodeos—are operating with strict codes of practices, that they understand that the acceptable attitudes and methods that are considered appropriate in Australia are adhered to and applied at all times, and an education process needs to go on.

That is why renaming this offences enforcement and other matters is a good thing because this is about committing deliberate offences. It is not about capturing people who are going about their lives in a normal fashion and are acting out of ignorance. I am not condoning their actions because it is out of ignorance, but it should not become an automatic offence.

I will not start on examples because it will take too long, but there are so many examples of where people are acting quite innocently, but under this Animal Welfare Act they are treated as criminals. They need to be educated, the whole public needs to be made aware of their rights and obligations under this sort of legislation.

The change of name is only a small matter, but I think it is a significant matter in that we are outlining the particular offences, particularly an aggravated offence, because if you are perpetrating some offence that is outlined in this act here, the full penalty of the law should be coming down upon you. I will be supporting some of the increased penalties in here—not all of them, but some of them—certainly as a method of deterring an offence, but as a criminologist will always tell you, it is the prevention of the offence occurring which is the important thing, it is not about penalising people after the offence has been committed.

If we outline the offences, if we outline the way those offences can be enforced so that that can be a severe fine, or it could be some other education process, or it could be some, hopefully, pre-emptive construction of a code of conduct for an industry or for an event or for even owning a particular animal, whether it is a licence, so that people understand their obligations, that is very important, but then we have also got other matters here. So we are not restricting this legislation at all. In fact, we are expanding it even further to fulfil the true aims of this legislation, and that is to prevent cruelty and then continue to ensure that the general welfare of the animals is going to be maintained and enhanced, as we hope it to be, under modern attitudes.

What we must not do is allow this legislation to be overwhelmed by the quite unreasonable attitudes of people who, as I have said before, have anthropomorphic attitudes towards their

animals, giving them the same rights as we humans and I for one do not believe that is the case. We have a responsibility as human beings to ensure their welfare but that is a much bigger issue than just saying, 'We're going to have a nice warm fuzzy term'—their welfare is much more than that.

We need to outline the offences so that people understand, without any ambiguity, what is an offence, what they must not do. These offences will be enforced rigorously by people who know what they are doing, not by well-meaning amateurs. Unfortunately, it has been the case for many years in the history of animal welfare that enforcement has been by well-meaning amateurs. They are well-meaning, sure, but let us make sure they have the experience and the right qualifications to put them in a position where they can judge what is happening at the time—not go in with preconceived views and (certainly, in some people's opinion) very misguided attitudes—and enforce this legislation that we are looking at today. I think this is a reasonable amendment which improves and broadens the aim of the legislation, so it should be supported.

The Hon. J.D. HILL: I thank members for their comments. I indicate to the house that the government does not support the amendment of the member for Stuart. All it does is change the name of the amending bill. I do not know why he would want to change it but, nonetheless, it is not a major issue. The member for Stuart made some claims that I would like to address. He implied, I think, in his suggestions, that the sale of horses would no longer be able to occur under this legislation. That is manifestly not true. I think he also implied that horse racing would no longer occur in this state. That is also manifestly untrue. The claims that the member made about my ministerial colleague in the other place and her being influenced by a clique, I guess, as he was suggesting, are all—

The Hon. G.M. Gunn: I didn't use that word.

The Hon. J.D. HILL: No, I know you didn't use that word—a cohort, or a cabal, or whatever. I cannot recall exactly which word the member used, but he meant a small group of people who have a particular view and that she is under the undue influence of those people. That is offensive to her. In fact, it might even be considered to be unparliamentary to suggest that the minister is not making decisions based on proper processes. So I reject that on her behalf.

I also reject the general claims in relation to the officers who work for the Department for Environment and Heritage. They have a difficult job to do and they do it to the best of their ability. They are not opposed to the public of South Australia, as the member suggests. At times they have to apply the law in the same way as police officers have to apply the law, and that sometimes puts them offside with the general public. That does not mean that they are hostile to the public: they are just doing their job as they are required to. So I reject all those claims and suggestions.

The member also said that there would be a political price to pay. That is fine. That is the job of being in government. You do what you believe is correct and, if there is a political price to pay, so be it. However, what I would say is that we think this is a balanced piece of legislation, which gets it right.

I thank the member for Fisher for his contribution and support, but I really want to turn to the comments made by the member for Morphett. I am sorry he has left the room because I do not like talking about someone in their absence. However, I think it was an extraordinary contribution by the member for Morphett and a very fine example of sophistry, trying to argue one way while going in the other direction.

In the last parliament the member for Morphett made a name for himself as being the charger on animal welfare issues. He raised a number of animal welfare issues in this place. It is interesting to see him resile from that kind of position of radical activism to one of supine support for the positions put by the member for Stuart. I think the difference is that the member for Stuart actually believes in the positions that he puts, whereas I think the member for Morphett may have a less sincere conviction in terms of his positions.

Ms CHAPMAN: I rise on a point of order. I think the comments of the minister are out of order. He is clearly reflecting on the intention and motives of the speaker to the amendment, and to suggest there is a reflection on his motives in doing that—

The CHAIR: Order!

Ms CHAPMAN: —and to suggest that he is not genuine is out of order.

The CHAIR: Order! There is no point of order. The member for Morphett can speak if he believes he has been offended. The minister.

The Hon. J.D. HILL: Thank you, Madam Chair. I would like to hear the member for Morphett justify his position again. It would be of great interest to me. I would be interested to see whether or not he spoke strongly about the need to have strong regulations in relation to animal welfare, in particular, rodeos, as he mentioned. It will be interesting to see whether he supports the member for Stuart's amendments which will reduce the amount of regulation that can occur in that area. So I will be watching very closely the behaviour of the member for Morphett.

I understand that the member for Stuart is sincere in his position. I do not agree with it. I think his arguments are exaggerated, particularly as they refer to the motivations of people who work in the department, and the minister, but we will have to agree to disagree on that. As I say, the government does not support the amendment.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: I wish to respond to the minister. My comments are made by someone who has had some association with the volunteers who run these rodeos and gymkhanas. I was with some of them on Sunday at the Carrieton rodeo. I am sure the minister will be pleased with my new-found interest in the arts, because I opened a large mural there. Those people were nearly all involved in the Carrieton rodeo, one of the biggest in South Australia. They are the ones who have been hassled. These are good, decent, upright South Australian citizens who only want to do good. It is a little community. The way in which those people who ran the rodeo at Marabel were treated was an absolute public disgrace. The Marree races (to be held on Saturday) and other events are run by volunteers.

The minister indicated last night that he had an anti-rodeo candidate stand against him: so did I. The Labor candidate at the last election went out of his way to say that no restrictions would be put on. I made an issue of it and he came along hook, line and sinker. Now the government has changed course halfway through the race.

People can make all sorts of comments about me, but I am only doing my job—make no mistake about that. I will stick up for these people. The government will get its way. Family First let down the families in rural areas over this issue. They cannot be relied upon; and I make no apology for saying that. We will tell families that Family First let them down. The minister will say that I have no right to criticise the minister.

The Hon. J.D. Hill: I did not say that.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: What I said was very mild, compared with what I could have said. In my experience, ministers in the government, other than this minister, do far better and are on top of their portfolio. I can give examples, and I might give some more examples this afternoon in relation to other matters. If we do not put matters in place now in order to improve the legislation it will be too late. As for the member for Fisher, I say to him: get in the real world, get in the world of reality, not make believe.

[Sitting suspended from 12:32 to 12:51]

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: In conclusion, my intention is based on my experience, observation and discussion with those people who conduct, run and plan rodeos and other events (such as campdrafting, and so on) in rural Australia. All these people want is be treated fairly, sensibly and reasonably. The more bureaucracy and impediments are put in place, the less inclined people will be to come forward to run these events, which provide entertainment and resources for small communities. I say to those people who have a misplaced view on these issues that what they are trying to do is change a traditional Australian culture; that is, managing and being with animals. This amendment to the title better explains the intention of this legislation.

The Hon. J.D. HILL: I thought the honourable member was moving an amendment, but now he is asking me a question about his amendment.

The CHAIR: I am sure it was a rhetorical question.

The Hon. J.D. HILL: I have already said what I want to say.

The committee divided on the amendment:

AYES (12)

Chapman, V.A.
Gunn, G.M. (teller)
McFetridge, D.
Redmond, I.M.

Goldsworthy, M.R.
Hanna, K.
Penfold, E.M.
Venning, I.H.

Griffiths, S.P.
Kerin, R.G.
Pengilly, M.
Williams, M.R.

NOES (22)

Atkinson, M.J.
Breuer, L.R.
Conlon, P.F.
Hill, J.D. (teller)
Lomax-Smith, J.D.
Portolesi, G.
Snelling, J.J.
White, P.L.

Bedford, F.E.
Caica, P.
Foley, K.O.
Kenyon, T.R.
O'Brien, M.F.
Rankine, J.M.
Stevens, L.

Bignell, L.W.
Ciccarello, V.
Geraghty, R.K.
Key, S.W.
Piccolo, T.
Simmons, L.A.
Weatherill, J.W.

PAIRS (6)

Hamilton-Smith, M.L.J.
Pederick, A.S.
Evans, I.F.

Rann, M.D.
Wright, M.J.
Koutsantonis, T.

Majority of 10 for the noes.

Amendment thus negatived; clause passed.

Progress reported; committee to sit again.

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

DAYLIGHT SAVING

The Hon. G.M. GUNN (Stuart): Presented a petition signed by 110 residents of South Australia requesting the house to urge the government to reconsider its proposed extension of daylight saving commencing October 2008.

LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE

Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens) (14:02): I bring up the 20th report of the committee.

Report received.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE

Ms CICCARELLO (Norwood) (14:02): I bring up the 294th report of the committee on the Royal Adelaide Hospital ward upgrade and increased capacity.

Report received and ordered to be published.

Ms CICCARELLO: I bring up the 295th report of the committee on the on the Royal Adelaide Hospital renal infrastructure and sustainment.

Report received and ordered to be published.

Ms CICCARELLO: I bring up the 296th report of the committee on the Strzelecki Track upgrade.

Report received and ordered to be published.

QUESTION TIME

STATE ECONOMY

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite—Leader of the Opposition) (14:03): Can the Premier explain the reasons behind the national account figures released today that show South Australia's growth has been 'the most sluggish of all states'? Today's national account figures released by the ABS show that, in real terms, South Australia's state final demand growth was again the lowest of all states over the last 12 months. It further shows that, in real terms, South Australia's business

investment has fallen 11.5 per cent since the March 2007 assessment. We are the only state to record a fall in business investment in the last 12 months. The falls in business investment are highlighted as the major cause for the sluggish South Australian economy.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Port Adelaide—Deputy Premier, Treasurer, Minister for Industry and Trade, Minister for Federal/State Relations) (14:04): The Leader of the Opposition is getting a very significant reputation as being a knocker and a whinger at every opportunity. Anyone who seriously suggests that our economy is sluggish in this state is in cloud cuckoo-land. I am not sure what data the leader is referring to, and I will have a look at it. I was just provided with a brief as I walked into question time.

I have before me now the official Treasury briefing note dated 4 June 2008—gross domestic product and state final demand March quarter 2008. The leader goes out with a figure of 2.8. Well, I am advised that the March quarter '08 compared to the March quarter '07 is—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Treasury briefings are smoke and mirrors? That is what you used to get in government—is 3.3 per cent: not 2.8. What I do acknowledge—

Mr Williams: It's a different figure!

An honourable member: Bring Chris Kenny in, for God's sake.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Fancy the member for MacKillop trying to give us some economic advice.

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: But, hang on, Kevin, didn't all those Independents do well that came in?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Only two.

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: Oh, that's right; two of them became ministers.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Two of them became ministers; one of them has remained but a shadow.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: When we look at the seasonally adjusted and real—when we look at the March quarter '08 versus the December quarter '07, we see South Australia 1.5 per cent, which in fact is the strongest in the nation. So, in the shorter time series our numbers are stronger in state final demand. On a longer time frame, they are the lowest in the nation. Why do you think that might be? We are going through the worst drought that the state has probably ever seen.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I think all the data that I have presented to this house on a consistent basis shows two distinct economies at work, and that is that we have a very strong and robust construction, business investment and manufacturing/service sector and a rapidly developing mining sector. That is giving us very strong GSP growth in this state.

What is dragging it down is the farm sector. In the farm sector, because of the ravages of drought, and through the lack of production that is being taken to market from areas such as the Riverland, we are seeing a significant—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I've now got a lawyer giving me economic advice. Jeepers!

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The deputy leader will come to order.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Who is blaming the farmers? Blaming the farmers? I am pointing out that when it does not rain, crops cannot be sown and when crops cannot—I say to the member for Schubert, how was your crop last year?

Mr Venning: Ordinary.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Ordinary! There you go; Ivan just told me it is ordinary. I say to the member for Stuart, how was your crop last season?

The Hon. G.M. Gunn: Down.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Down! There you go: both the member for Stuart—

Ms CHAPMAN: I rise on a point of order. The Treasurer is clearly not answering the questions; he is attempting to ask questions.

The SPEAKER: Order! The house will come to order. If I can interrupt the Treasurer—can I say to members on my left that they are quick to get up and demand that I pull the minister into order because they think he has left the topic of the question, but they consistently interrupt the minister. The Treasurer was giving a straightforward answer to the question that had been asked. I can only do so much if members insist on interjecting and interrupting and trying to talk over the minister on his feet.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: Point of order, Mr Speaker: does the Treasurer asking questions of the opposition constitute us interrupting the Treasurer?

The SPEAKER: Order! No, if the Leader of the Opposition had listened to what I said, he would not be saying that. That is not what I said. I simply informed members on my left that it is very difficult for the chair to pull ministers into line when they are responding to interjections coming from my left, particularly when the Treasurer, or any minister on his or her feet, is giving what is a straightforward answer to a reasonably straightforward question. It is not necessary to interject and speak over the minister and to try to engage the minister on his feet. That is not the way question time works. Question time works by members asking questions and ministers answering them. Ministers have to be given an opportunity to do that without excessive interruption and without members attempting to engage the minister on his or her feet.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: As I was saying—and I must admit strongly supported by the two elder statesmen of the house, the member for Schubert and the member for Stuart—the response from the member for Schubert about his grain harvest was, 'Very ordinary' and the member for Stuart said—

An honourable member: 'Down.'

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Exactly correct, because it has not been raining. Output from the Riverland is down because it has not been raining in the catchment areas. Our farming sector is a strong contributor to an economy such as ours. We cannot affect that, and I have never hidden the fact in many contributions to this parliament that our farm sector has been very poor now for a number of years due to drought, but our non-farm sector has been doing very well—and how well you might ask?

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: I will. How well?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I will tell you how well it is going. Overseas exports, in the past 12 months—and for students in the gallery this is a lecture from someone who did not finish high school, but never mind—the value of South Australian goods exported totalled \$9.9 billion, an increase of 8.5 per cent (\$774 million) over the previous year—tick. At the same time that we went up 8.5 per cent in exports, the national increase was only 2.1.

The Hon. R.G. Kerin: It is still only the same as 2001.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: How is your crop? House price indexes: ABS data shows Adelaide house prices have increased by 2.1 per cent during the March quarter and were 22 per cent higher than a year earlier. Nationally house prices have increased 14 per cent. The wealth generation in our economy has been quite substantial in the past 12 months. I refer to the HIA figures on house sales. New home sales in South Australia bounced back in April: it rose by 14.7 per cent. South Australia was second only to the boom state of WA. Nationally sales increased only—you ask—0.1 per cent.

ANZ job advertisements—let us look at this leading indicator. The average number of South Australian weekly job adverts fell by 0.5 per cent during April and was 0.5 per cent lower than a year ago. However, nationally jobs advertised had decreased 1.3 per cent during April and were 7.5 per cent lower over the year. We are 0.5 per cent lower—nationally 7.5. What may you ask is happening in the retail trade market, shops—

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: What is happening?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Good, thank you. It is up 0.6 per cent during April. Our retail sector—we are all out there shopping because we have jobs, wealth generating in the economy and confidence—is now 9.7 per cent higher than a year earlier. South Australia's real and nominal retail trade has outperformed the national average in September 2007. Then, you may ask, motor vehicle sales—

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: What about motor vehicles?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Thank you. New motor vehicle sales in South Australia rose by 0.3 per cent during March to be 8.2 per cent higher than a year earlier on trend. South Australian sales of new motor vehicles in March were at their highest monthly level since January 1994—not bad for an economy. Then, of course, the real key that you would like to know about would be employment data.

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: Employment; how's employment going? That was just on the tip of my tongue.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: It was. Employment is up 3.2 per cent and 24,000 new jobs were created over the 12 months to April on trend data. Unemployment of 4.9 per cent, slightly up by 4.6 per cent in March—that is acknowledged—and 87,000 new jobs created since we came to office in March 2002. Then you might ask what is happening out there in—

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: What is happening about building approvals?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: My colleague asks about building approvals. Dwelling approvals fell 0.4 per cent in South Australia during March but were still 20 per cent higher than a year earlier. Falls in dwelling approvals were experienced in all states during April. Housing construction approvals fell 1.7 per cent in March but were still 21 per cent higher than a year ago. With respect to consumers, household consumption spending is up 4.6 per cent. Then members might ask—

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: What about business investment?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Business investment in new assets has grown 71 per cent from 2001 to 2007. We have a conservative figure of \$45 billion of projects in the pipeline, demonstrating consumer confidence.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Yes, down 11 per cent from a very high number. We would like it to keep growing every month, but we are realists: sometimes it will plateau, sometimes it will dip, but the trend is like that, going up. We have 10 operating mines; we have 28 mines in the pipeline to come through; we have Olympic Dam's expansion project; and the air warfare destroyer is yet to come on stream. We have got massive public sector—

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: We've got a battalion coming here.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: We have a battalion coming here. We have massive investment coming through the pipeline, and the opposition just hates it—it just hates it. I thank the Leader of the Opposition for that question. I know this has been a long answer, but I can see that all government members have thoroughly enjoyed it. I notice the member for Taylor taking notes and, I think, the member for Hartley taking notes. Where is she?

Ms Portolesi: I'm here.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: You're there. To wrap it up, farm economy is down, as the members for Schubert and Stuart have said, but the manufacturing and the non-farm economy is booming.

GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

Ms PORTOLESI (Hartley) (14:17): Will the Premier please inform the house what the state government is doing to reduce greenhouse gas emissions in the property sector?

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) (14:17): Thank you very much. The interesting thing is that I was watching members opposite, because, over many years, I have been a student of their psychology.

Mr WILLIAMS: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The member for MacKillop.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for MacKillop.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr WILLIAMS: The point of order is one of relevance. The opposition is sitting quietly, listening intently to the answer to the question and, again, we hear a lot of rubbish from the Premier.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I will hear what the Premier has to say. I do not think that anything he has said so far is unparliamentary.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: It is interesting that they did not even want to hear my diagnosis. When the Deputy Premier was reading out his address, the one sentence that caused members opposite to wince—

Ms CHAPMAN: A point of order, Mr Speaker.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: —was the fact that there are now 87,000 more jobs than when they were in cabinet.

Ms CHAPMAN: Mr Speaker, the point of order is that, clearly, the Premier has neither responsibility for nor qualifications in psychology, and he should stick to the subject.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I uphold the point of order. The Premier will get to the question.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Thank you, sir. It is true that my doctorate is an honorary one. Today I announced a \$2 million building tune-ups project to make commercial buildings in Adelaide's central business district more energy efficient.

I am advised that the property sector accounts for nearly 25 per cent of Australia's greenhouse gas emissions. While improved efficiency standards can be set for new commercial properties, the greatest challenge is to make existing buildings more sustainable.

The four-year project will bring the state government together with the Adelaide City Council and major property developers to reduce our CBD's carbon footprint. I am told that it has the potential to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by nearly 70,000 tonnes a year. This will be achieved by working with building owners to apply sustainable designs that will lift the performance of their buildings by at least one star rating.

The project will underpin the third sector agreement under the Climate Change and Greenhouse Emissions Reduction Act 2007 with the Property Council of South Australia. I am told that the agreement and the building tune-up program will place the Adelaide commercial building sector at the forefront of energy efficiency innovation in Australia. I understand the Property Council wishes to replicate this agreement in other states and territories in Australia, and once again this is about taking a leadership role and developing partnerships with industry and business to tackle climate change.

As emissions controls and carbon constraints become a reality, all levels of government and industry must start preparing now. That is why the sector agreements are a crucial mechanism through which we can tackle carbon emissions. The agreements are reciprocal and require both parties to take on a leading role in developing and funding activities to reduce greenhouse gas

emissions and to formulate and implement greenhouse action plans in support of the target in the legislation, which is to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by 60 per cent of 1990 levels by 2050.

I announced the building tune-ups project this morning at the Local Government Association's Beyond Carbon Climate Change Summit, where I signed another sector agreement with the LGA President, Joy Baluch. For the first time, every level of government will be working together with the unified aim of tackling climate change. Under the new agreement the state government, with the LGA, will work to have 25 councils with climate change adaptation plans completed by the end of next year. A community education program will also be launched to help households reduce their own carbon footprint.

I am advised that a 12-month work plan is being finalised and will include an efficient street lighting program with councils, an improvement in the purchase of green power contracts, access to research undertaken by Professor Barry Brook, Hubert Wilkins Chair of Climate Change at the University of Adelaide, to assist council areas affected by potential sea rises and flooding. These sector agreements provides us with the unique opportunity to work together in a way that is not only good for business, but also good for our local communities, good for our state, and good for our planet.

When we announced that as a state government that we would purchase 20 per cent of our power for schools and hospitals and government buildings, we challenged local government in this state to match us, and I was delighted that a large number of the councils responded positively. Now that we have made the decision to be the first government in Australia, by 2014, to have 50 per cent of our power coming from certified green power, I make a similar challenge to local government and to businesses to match us. This is putting our money where our mouths are and obviously we are looking forward to a very strong partnership for the future.

FIRST HOME BUYERS

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite—Leader of the Opposition) (14:23): My question is to the Premier. Why do young South Australians pay more state government taxes on their first home than home buyers in any other state or territory? A first home buyer buying a house at the median price of \$350,000 with a \$250,000 loan in this state pays just short of \$16,000 compared to zero in Queensland, zero in New South Wales, zero in Western Australian and thousands less in Victoria, Tasmania and the ACT.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Port Adelaide—Deputy Premier, Treasurer, Minister for Industry and Trade, Minister for Federal/State Relations) (14:24): 'Shame,' they say. I will get this checked—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I find that offensive, that I wouldn't care at all.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader of the Opposition has asked his question.

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: He's an unhappy and angry man.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: He's very angry and touchy today, but to say I don't care, do you honestly believe I don't care—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: —about housing affordability for young people?

Ms CHAPMAN: I rise on a point of order: clearly the Treasurer is entering into—

The SPEAKER: Order! I know what the member is saying. The Treasurer has made his point; if he can get on with his answer, please.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I tell you what!

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: Bring on Chris Kenny.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: What was that line you once said: he'd complain if—

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: He'd complain if he was in a spa bath with two super models. He'd whinge on his wedding night.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: That's right. That was a great line about the Leader of the Opposition. It came from the—

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: Mr Speaker, you call the opposition into line. You claim we interject. He invites interjections, he asks questions—

The SPEAKER: Order! The Treasurer will get on with the question, please.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I said I will get this checked, but my recollection is that we certainly improved our first home owners grant scheme a few years ago. I will get it checked, but I think it was the first time a government had improved the first home owners grant scheme for many a year, which included, from memory, the entire time the Liberals were in office. We will go back and have a look at that, but I think we will find (and if I am wrong I will admit it) that we improved the scheme, but during the opposition's years in government they did very little, if anything, about it. So it is very easy to have mock anger and mock sympathy for people, or to have a go at me for not having sympathy, when in government they did very little, if anything, themselves.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Flat out fixing my problems, my mistakes. I tell you what, I wish you could have done a few of them. Mr Speaker, I am not running away from the suggestion that we may not have the most generous first home owners scheme in Australia. I accept that. But, do you know what? It is not impeding or stopping people buying and building homes. In fact, if I go back to my earlier Housing Industry of Australia data, new home sales in South Australia bounced back in April. It rose by 14.7 per cent. Over the three months to April, South Australia's sales had decreased 5 per cent but were still 41 per cent higher than in the three months to April 2007. Housing affordability in South Australia still remains incredibly—

Mr Griffiths interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I will get that data for the member.

Mr Griffiths: I know what it is.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Do you? Wow!

Mr Griffiths interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: You are clever, aren't you?

Mr Williams interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Yes, we might be. Unlike you, Mitch, I am pleased to say there are a lot of people much smarter than me around—a lot of people. All I try to do in my humble way is do the job to the best of my ability. If you compare taxes across a whole series of taxation efforts, you will find in some areas we tax higher than other states of Australia, and in some areas we tax lower.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: WorkCover, she just said. The deputy leader just said WorkCover. Where have you been for the last three months? If you had passed the bill, employers would be paying less for WorkCover sooner.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Sooner!

The SPEAKER: Order!

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Yes, you are!

The SPEAKER: Order! The Treasurer will take his seat.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, the deputy leader! The Speaker is on his feet. I expect silence in the chamber. Members will come to order and stop interjecting, and the Treasurer will not respond to interjections.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Thank you, sir. I must say, there is a real sour look across the front benches. Has something happened in the party room today?

The SPEAKER: Order! The Treasurer will get to the question.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I am sorry, sir, they just look a bit sour, a bit grumpy and a bit sensitive—a bit touchy. The deputy leader says employers pay too much for WorkCover. Well, blow me down! Why haven't you passed the bill months ago, and then employers would get relief months earlier?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Williams: We have been calling on you to bring it in for years.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Yes, and then you are filibustering.

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: Then you won't vote for it. You voted against it on every clause.

Mr Williams interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Yes, you did.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: The member for MacKillop voted for union right of entry. You voted against every clause. You don't—

The SPEAKER: Order! The question was about taxes on first home buyers. It was not about WorkCover. I understand the Treasurer is responding to interjections. I ask members not to interject, and I ask the Treasurer to turn to the substance of the question.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I apologise profusely, Mr Speaker. I find it strange that the member for MacKillop, who opposed WorkCover at every moment, at every point and at every opportunity, would be denying workers—

Ms CHAPMAN: I have a point of order. Sir, you have just ruled on this topic and he is deliberately disobeying you.

The SPEAKER: Order! I thank the deputy leader for her assistance, but I do not require it. Has the Treasurer completed his answer?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I will leave it at that, sir.

RACING INDUSTRY

Mr PICCOLO (Light) (14:30): Will the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing advise the house what progress the state government has made to help ensure the prosperity and sustainability of the South Australian racing industry?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT (Lee—Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Finance, Minister for Government Enterprises, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:30): I thank the honourable member for his interest in this area. The government is committed to providing a healthy and self-sufficient racing industry in South Australia. The government has already overseen significant changes to the South Australian racing industry following recommendations made in the Bentley report in May last year.

Last week I had the pleasure of announcing two government initiatives of great importance to the South Australian racing industry—a \$6 million commitment towards a major upgrade of Gawler Racecourse and a \$5 million commitment for the construction of a second turf track at Allan Scott Park at Morphettville. The Gawler Racecourse upgrade will make the track South Australia's second metropolitan thoroughbred racing venue and boost Gawler's presence as the gateway to the Barossa. The funding will go towards the construction of a new racetrack and a multipurpose building to be used as a race day facility and a community function centre. Additional race meetings, plus making the multipurpose function centre available for other community-based activities, is expected to generate greater investment and economic activity in the region.

The future of the South Australian racing industry is dependent upon having two venues capable of hosting metropolitan race meetings. In order to ensure that Morphettville remains the state's premier racing venue, the state government is committing a further \$5 million for the construction of a second turf track at Allan Scott Park at Morphettville. The 2,100-metre course will be built inside the existing track at Morphettville, with construction scheduled to begin in October this year. The track is expected to be ready for limited racing by March 2009 and will be capable of holding additional race meetings as it consolidates.

The funding announcements made by the government will ensure that our state has two outstanding metropolitan racing facilities that are capable of sustaining a healthy and prosperous industry for many years to come.

BHP DESALINATION PLANT

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite—Leader of the Opposition) (14:32): Has the Premier backed away from his commitment to the BHP desalination plant in Upper Spencer Gulf and does he stand by his assurances that the project will definitely go ahead? On 6 February 2007 the Premier said:

This government has announced that it will invest in the biggest desalination plant in the southern hemisphere...The government has announced it will co-invest with BHP in the largest desal plant in the southern hemisphere.

On 19 February 2007, 2 May 2007 and 18 October 2007 the Premier repeated his definite commitment to the joint BHP-government desalination plant. Yesterday the Treasurer contradicted the Premier when he said:

The government has yet to agree that we will partner BHP in the Upper Spencer Gulf desalination plant.

Is it going ahead or not?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Port Adelaide—Deputy Premier, Treasurer, Minister for Industry and Trade, Minister for Federal/State Relations) (14:34): This Leader of the Opposition will knock anything. He would love nothing more than the BHP Olympic Dam expansion not to go ahead.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: BHP is still working through the scope and type of desalination plant it requires for its operation. We have said consistently that we wish to partner them, provided of course—

Mr Hamilton-Smith interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Hang on. We want to be a partner in that project because we see it as an opportunity to deliver desalinated water to the Upper Spencer Gulf and to take impact off the River Murray. That was at a time before Adelaide had committed to a very large desalination plant for our consumption. My advice—and I am being absolutely honest—is that, initially, when it was to be of potable standard, that is, drinking water, it was a very attractive option for us to be a partner. Do not get this wrong: BHP will build a desalination plant to service Olympic Dam. The attractive option for us as a government would be to then take an extra increment of that plant for our use. My advice is that BHP is now looking at non-potable water—non-drinking water. That makes it a more expensive and complicated option for us. This is what happens when you work through these projects.

We may yet be a partner if we think it is in the financial and economic interest of our state. We are building a major desalination plant in the south of our city—announcements about that are pending—and we are committed to ensuring—

Mr Williams interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Pull the pin?

Mr Williams interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Are you not listening? I am trying to be honest and upfront, and say—

Mr Williams interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the member for MacKillop. The Treasurer will just ignore the member for MacKillop, because he was giving a good answer. Ignore the member for MacKillop. I warned him; that is it.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: This is a moving feast. Until BHP decides exactly what it needs, it is very hard for us to be certain. I will give you an example. One of the options for us initially was to simply have an off-take contract; that is, we would say to BHP, 'You build the desalination plant and we might want X percentage of output for the Upper Spencer Gulf.' That is fine when it is potable water, but we are hardly going to enter into a contract with BHP to take non-potable water. For what purpose?

If we now must have a secondary process to turn the non-potable water into potable water, the economics for the government change. That is where we are at. We are working it through, and we will make a decision based on what is economically and financially appropriate. It is still our expectation that we will be a partner, but we have to work these things through.

I will get those facts checked, because this is a moving feast, to make sure that nothing that I have said is incorrect; if there is, I will correct it. The desalination plant has already been prioritised by BHP as its preference for supplying water to Olympic Dam. That is a no-brainer. The question for us will be: are we a partner? We will make that decision when BHP decides the type of product that will come out of the plant—whether it will be potable or non-potable water. From memory, my last advice is that it is non-potable, and that puts up another level of complication. I would have thought that that was the prudent and right thing to do.

RECONCILIATION, YOUTH

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (14:38): My question is to the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation. How is the government promoting reconciliation amongst young people?

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) (14:39): I thank the honourable member for her question. I know her particular commitment to reconciliation between Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal Australians.

Reconciliation is a much used term, but, fundamentally, it involves the concepts of recognition, justice and healing. Recognition involves all Australians understanding the past and how it affects the lives of Indigenous people today. It requires recognition of the way in which Aboriginal people have been treated in the past. It also requires understanding and recognition of the honoured place of the first Australians in their culture. Without this recognition, there can be no justice, because justice is fundamentally based on truth. Justice is more than legal recognition: it is about just outcomes being essential in everyday life.

A just community values everyone's participation and provides equal life chances for all. It also requires practical measures to address the disadvantage experienced by indigenous people in health, employment, education and general opportunity. It is only with recognition and justice that we can have healing. But, above all, reconciliation is personal and involves each of us changing the way in which we think and behave.

That is why I was honoured over the weekend to be able to present the prizes for the second annual Premier's Award Reconciliation Competition. The awards were announced during Reconciliation Week and invited South Australian students from years 9 to 12 to show their understanding of Aboriginal culture and heritage through a written or creative project based on Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people and Australian military campaigns. Prizes were given for both categories, and students could use their entries to gain accreditation towards assessment of a range of subjects.

The competition set students the challenge of uncovering how Aboriginal men and women have served in conflict from 1899 up to the present day. The best estimate is that something like 500 Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people served in World War I and about 3,000 in World War II, although there are no actual records of those who enlisted prior to 1980.

It is believed that more than a third of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people who served overseas were killed in action or died of wounds and disease, which is a much higher casualty rate than their non-Aboriginal counterparts. That many Aboriginal people returned home after distinguished service to a society that did not fully recognise or accept them makes their

service and sacrifice even more remarkable. The competition has given students an opportunity and an incentive to delve deeper into Aboriginal and Australian society and their history, as well as our military history.

Schools have reported that, because of the limited information on this aspect of our history, the topic stimulated a lot of class discussion and debate. I acknowledge the winners of the Premier's awards for 2008 for essays, who came from Annesley College, Blackwood High School, Eudunda Area High School and Fremont High School.

I must say that the winners of this project put an extraordinary amount of extra effort and time into their projects. They are fine young South Australians, and it was my great pleasure to personally present the awards to them. They are: Georgina Heddle, Maddie Kavanagh, Jack Gillespie, Kirsty Saville, Larissa Timmons, Alex Christophel and Georgia Mounkley. The winners for the creative project came from Aberfoyle Park High School, and they were: Holly Braidwood, Jarrad Law, Matthew Ward, Nicole Saegenschnitter and Susie Wilsch.

AAMI STADIUM

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite—Leader of the Opposition) (14:43): My question is again to the Premier. Can the Premier rule out the building of public transport infrastructure to AAMI Stadium at West Lakes? On 26 February 2008, in answer to a question regarding the provision of public transport infrastructure to bring AAMI Stadium, West Lakes to FIFA World Cup standards, the Premier said:

If you think it is smart to build rail...ahead of time, before we win the bid, then you are not qualified to be the premier of South Australia.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Elder—Minister for Transport, Minister for Infrastructure, Minister for Energy) (14:44): I can indicate that we have had tremendous success with the changes to public transport to AAMI Stadium in terms of the free buses we have put on. There has been a dramatic growth in patronage to the stadium.

The Hon. K.O. Foley: It is twenty-one per cent, I am told.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Yes. Well, it is carrying 21 per cent. I think it's actually more than a 150 or 200 per cent growth in the people being carried on those buses. What I can rule out is the proposition of the opposition's spokesperson on transport that we should electrify long haul rail in South Australia, including the Port Lincoln line. I think it is about 3,700 kilometres of long haul line and, at a 2006 cost of \$750,000 a kilometre, that brings us to about \$2.6 billion. But, of course, if we take it to 2008 dollars, it would be about \$4 billion. But then, of course, you have to put the electricity there, the 275 kV lines, and we add about another \$4 billion to bring it up to \$8 billion. I did get a call from the Port Lincoln—

Ms CHAPMAN: I take a point of order. This is a specific question in relation to road transport to AAMI Stadium.

The Hon. K.O. Foley interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I uphold the point of order. The minister will turn to the substance of the question.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I got confused about what I wanted to rule out. What I can say, there would be one small problem to add to that, that is, what would they do when they get to the border when the poles and wires run out? They grind to a halt.

Ms CHAPMAN: Point of order. The minister is clearly defying your ruling and continuing on that subject.

The SPEAKER: Indeed. Order! The minister will turn to the substance of the question or we will move on to the next question. The Minister for Transport has finished? The member for MacKillop.

WATER TRADING

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop) (14:46): Does the Minister for Water Security concede that her actions have directly led to insider trading in the water market? Today *The Weekly Times*, published in Victoria, reveals that the minister admits that she discussed her pending carryover announcements with some irrigators before the 7 February announcement. The announcement resulted in temporary water value doubling from under \$200 a megalitre to around \$400 a megalitre. The CEO of South Australian water broker Waterfind, Mr Tom Rooney, is quoted in the same article as saying that 'some evidence that information about water policy announcements has leaked and in turn impacted water market behaviour'. The opposition has been told that some three to four days before the minister's formal announcement, a spike in the volume of water traded occurred with the price increasing immediately after the announcement.

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) (14:47): This is a very amusing question from the shadow minister for water security who actually has a lack of understanding and has also not taken time to consider the chain of events. What actually happened in the time frame that *The Weekly Times* refers to is that two announcements were made. On 7 February, there was a carryover policy announcement made: no surprises. That carryover policy had been widely consulted with the irrigation community; in fact, a draft policy was released in mid-January to industry leaders for consideration.

What actually happened on the day that the prices spiked—and this is really interesting—the day that the prices spiked coincided with—

Mr Williams interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for MacKillop has already been warned.

The Hon. K.A. MAYWALD: The volume of trade increased and the price increased two days prior to the carryover announcement on 7 February, because on 5 February there was another announcement. That announcement was that allocations were going to remain at 32 per cent. That information probably affected the price, as does any announcement that actually puts information into the marketplace about the resource availability. The spike occurred on 5 February, according to *The Weekly Times*, and *The Weekly Times* have tried to link that to the carryover announcement on 7 February. It had nothing to do with it. What caused the market to react was an announcement that the 32 per cent was likely to be maintained for the remainder of the year.

Mr WILLIAMS: I rise on a point of order. The relevance of the answer being given by the minister to the point I made—

Members interjecting:

Mr WILLIAMS: No, I am trying to get the minister to answer the question that I asked.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is no point of order. The minister is answering the substance of the question. If there is something that the member for MacKillop wishes to clarify then there is ample opportunity for him to do it, but there is certainly nothing the minister has said that strays from the substance of the question.

Mr WILLIAMS: I beg your indulgence, sir, but you have not heard my point of order. The point of order was that the question was nothing to do with the price spike before the announcement on 7 February. It was to do with a volume spike three to four days, not two days, before the announcement on 7 February.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is still no point of order. The minister is answering the substance of the question. The substance of the question was whether statements the minister had made had led to insider trading. That was the question the member for MacKillop asked. The minister is answering that question. If he does not like her answer, then he has other opportunities to make that known to the chamber or to follow up with other questions, but the minister is certainly not engaging in debate and is certainly answering the substance of the question.

The Hon. K.A. MAYWALD: The carryover announcement on 7 February was expected by industry. It was expected by industry because we had been consulting for well over two weeks before there was any impact in any markets. People knew that the state government was going to introduce a carryover policy. We had actually released the document to industry leaders for consultation. Those industry leaders were seeking input from their membership in relation to a

carryover policy and what it would look like, and we told the industry that we would be making an announcement in relation to carryover policy. That is not insider trading: that is information that was out in the public arena. It is good public policy to consult with people who are going to be impacted by decisions, and that is exactly what we were doing.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Attorney-General will come to order!

MURRAY RIVER IRRIGATORS

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop) (14:51): My question is for the Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries.

Members interjecting:

Mr WILLIAMS: You guys might think this is funny, but there are some serious things going on out there.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for MacKillop will get on with it.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Deputy Premier and the Premier will come to order!

Mr WILLIAMS: I am concerned about Riverland horticulturalists going broke, Kevin. Has the minister had his department investigate the capacity of Murray River irrigators to again purchase temporary water in the new water season to keep their permanent plantings alive? Murray irrigators have informed the opposition that, during the current water season, an amount of between \$75 and \$100 million has been spent on temporary water purchases, money which has undermined their equity. They now question their ability to again fund such purchases.

The Hon. R.J. McEWEN (Mount Gambier—Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, Minister for Forests) (14:52): I am wondering, Mr Speaker, with your indulgence, whether the member could further explain the question.

The SPEAKER: As I understand it the question was: has the minister asked his department to investigate the capacity of people to purchase water? I think that is the question.

The Hon. R.J. McEWEN: That is why I asked for further explanation because the obvious answer to that question is: of course, that is our responsibility.

MURRAY RIVER IRRIGATORS

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop) (14:53): My question is to the Premier. Premier, has your government requested Treasury to prepare a report on the impact on the state's economy of a further loss of permanent horticultural crops in the Murraylands and Riverland? The PIRSA website gives the value of Riverland and Murraylands horticultural products in the year 2005-06 (the last year noted on the site) at \$1.55 billion. The South Australian Citrus Board reports that 10 per cent of citrus groves were unwatered and allowed to die during the 2007-08 year and a further 10 per cent have been hibernated—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr WILLIAMS: Irrigators fear that the price of temporary water available on the market will see the loss of more permanent plantings in the next water year.

The Hon. R.J. McEWEN (Mount Gambier—Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, Minister for Forests) (14:54): I think that the light has gone on. Dim as it is, I actually think the light has gone on. There is no water. I think that, for the first time, the shadow minister has woken up to the fact that the one thing governments cannot do is create water. We have been working on this for two years now. Dean Brown has been working very closely with us, we have been doing socioeconomics and analysis, we have been working with the banks and we have been working confidentially with a whole lot of key stakeholders. Equally, the shadow minister has learnt for the first time that, over the last two years, around \$200 million has been spent on buying in water to keep crops alive, to keep our permanent plantings alive.

We cannot create water; and, as long as there is a drought, our horticulturalists will struggle. We all know that. We must work with them through these difficult times. Unless the

shadow minister has another solution to create water, we will continue to struggle until such time as it rains in the head waters and irrigation water is available. It will be tragic if we go into a third year of unprecedented drought on top of the \$200 million worth of borrowings that have had to occur to fund water purchases for the last two years, only a small amount of which is being carried forward. It will be tragic for all of us if we have to go into a third year. That notwithstanding, this government cannot make it rain.

AAMI STADIUM

Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder) (14:56): Did the department of the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing advise against the expenditure of \$100 million on the upgrade of AAMI Stadium?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT (Lee—Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Finance, Minister for Government Enterprises, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:56): As I said yesterday, this is a very important project. It has been very widely welcomed—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: —right throughout the community. As I said yesterday, this \$100 million project—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: —will involve a better roof facility, it will involve better entry and exit gates and it will provide a better community-type facility in the western grandstand. It has been very widely agreed to throughout the community.

WORLD FOOD EXCHANGE

Mr PENGILLY (Finniss) (14:57): My question is to the Minister for Tourism. How many people will attend the minister's self-praised initiative, the World Food Exchange, and for how many hours or days will it run? Yesterday, the minister confirmed that the one week long event scheduled for the Convention Centre has been postponed. It then shifted from the Convention Centre to the Hilton Hotel and was then postponed, part-cancelled and reduced to a luncheon at the Hilton. Minister, is it just you?

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH (Adelaide—Minister for Education and Children's Services, Minister for Tourism, Minister for the City of Adelaide) (14:57): There does seem to be a little interest in this event, and I am very delighted that the member opposite is keen to be invited. I am absolutely delighted to invite him to the event. As he observed so—

Mr Pengilly: Just you and me!

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Members on my left will come to order! The Minister for Tourism.

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH: As the honourable member observed so dramatically yesterday, the dates have been changed, and the reason is that we have a policy of spreading our events through the winter months. There was a strategic view that September—

The Hon. P.F. Conlon interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Minister for Transport will come to order! The Minister for Tourism has the call.

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH: —was a better time to have an event. I took the advice from the department because, indeed, we do not have a lot of major events in September. We have extended the season fairly dramatically to include a series of activities in June. We now have the International Guitar Festival in November and we have Classic Adelaide in about the same period. Moving events into September is a good strategic move by the department.

I can understand the disappointment of the honourable member opposite. He was obviously terribly enthusiastic about the June date. I must apologise for not specifically telling him of the change of dates, because, clearly, it has affected his diary adversely, and I apologise for

that. In the future, we will send him advance warnings, he will be personally invited and I would be very pleased to give him a briefing on the exact format of the event.

WORLD FOOD EXCHANGE

Mr PENGILLY (Finniss) (14:59): As a supplementary question, if that is the case, why is the minister still advertising it in the latest Food SA brochure?

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH (Adelaide—Minister for Education and Children's Services, Minister for Tourism, Minister for the City of Adelaide) (14:59): I have to say that this decision to change the dates was made some time ago. I am not sure what Food SA is doing with its material. Yesterday we were told that there was an inaccuracy on a website. We have been unable to find any inaccuracy, so I am not sure what the member opposite was talking about. Maybe the primary industry document is out of date, but certainly I recognise that the member is enormously disappointed that his diary has been thrown out of kilter. Now clearly he has very little to do in June, but I am very happy to send him some tourism data and information about where he might take a short break. There are great opportunities and some really good deals around regional South Australia—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH: Or maybe a long break. We can certainly help him with an itinerary if this sudden, gaping chasm in his diary is too much for him to cope with.

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: Order! I apologise to the members involved. I neglected to mention this earlier, but I acknowledge in the chamber students from Heathfield High School, who I think are still here. I welcome them. There are also students from St Andrews school and Adelaide TAFE, who are guests of the member for Adelaide, and students from Hallett Cove school, who are guests of the member for Bright.

QUESTION TIME

ENVIRONMENT PROTECTION AUTHORITY

The Hon. G.M. GUNN (Stuart) (15:02): Can the Minister for Small Business justify an increase in EPA fees to small businesses which has increased from \$1,180 to \$26,350? The Wirrabara sawmill and treatment plant, a small business in my constituency—and may I say established in a very nice location up in the hills—has been advised by the EPA that the business has been inspected and approved. However, due to a new licence fee structure imposed by the regulations and effective from 1 July, it was obliged to pay the sum based on the amount and type of pollutants discharged, which has been assessed at 50 units and the fee is \$527 per unit, which amounts to \$26,350, which is approximately 40 per cent of its total income.

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Kaurana—Minister for Health, Minister for the Southern Suburbs, Minister Assisting the Premier in the Arts) (15:02): I am happy to take this question on behalf of the Minister for Environment and Conservation. I will arrange for her to give a more complete answer but, as members would know, the EPA has changed the licensing arrangements, so we actually charge polluters for the amount of pollution that they create. Those businesses that do not pollute get a benefit from the arrangement. Those that do pollute pay more. I would have thought that the principle of the polluter pays would be supported by all members in this house.

PREMIER'S READING CHALLENGE

Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens) (15:02): My question is to the Minister for Education and Children's Services.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mrs GERAGHTY: Will the minister provide an update on the Premier's Reading Challenge and the Premier's Be Active Challenge?

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH (Adelaide—Minister for Education and Children's Services, Minister for Tourism, Minister for the City of Adelaide) (15:03): I thank the member for Torrens for her question. The honourable member has shown a keen interest in both the Premier's Reading Challenge and the Premier's Be Active Challenge because she knows that

these activities through the local schools in her electorate have produced a significant turnaround in many children's daily lives and activities.

I am pleased to inform the house that, due to very overwhelming popular demand, we have extended the reading challenge to include the senior secondary years. This is because many students had reached year 9 and were saying they would like to carry on receiving medals and rewards. We do know that children have responded very well to the opportunity to receive medals and previously we had offered certificates and bronze, silver and gold medals.

Now we have extended the program into further years so that if a student completes five years of the challenge, they become a champion and get a champion medal, after six they can become a legend, and, after seven, they enter the Hall of Fame. This is indeed, as the Premier says, ensuring they are rewarded for being within the Olympics of reading. The awarding of medals has proved incredibly popular and I am very pleased that there is almost a fifty-fifty division between boys and girls receiving these awards.

In the fourth year of the challenge, we now have 95 per cent of schools involved and that is 144,770 students. Of course, this program is ably supported by many volunteer ambassadors who go around the state, some in person, sometimes online. So we have not only ambassadors such as Juliet Haslam visiting schools around the state, as well as our ever popular Mem Fox, but we also have online visits by these volunteers with question and answer periods to schools in distant areas.

In addition, the Be Active Challenge is proving increasingly popular. In its inaugural year 7,500 students completed the challenge of four weeks and 60 minutes physical activity. This has been supported by medals, and 50 of last year's highest achieving schools also received \$1,000 of sports equipment. This year participation has more than doubled, with more than 22,000 students already involved and registered. Again, there are one-off grants for schools, and we are finding that the challenge is getting increasingly popular as the months go on.

I would say that, whilst initially there was criticism from those opposite about the reading challenge, it has proved one of the most popular strategies within our schools and one of the most popular events for families. In fact, it has proved that you can make a difference in children's literacy when you reduce class sizes, increase investment and are more creative about working with children.

JUSTICE SYSTEM

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON (Croydon—Attorney-General, Minister for Justice, Minister for Multicultural Affairs) (15:06): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: The Premier and I today have announced a \$48.1 million package over four years to speed up the state's court system and to deliver swifter justice for all. The South Australian government will be reopening the Sturt Street justice precinct as dedicated criminal courts. We are also increasing funding to have more than double the number of Office of the Director of Public Prosecutions staff since the Rann government took office. The new courts will be presided over by extra judges. There will be an upgrading of existing courts and more resources to forensic science.

This government has been elected, and re-elected, on a pledge to be tough on crime, and it has been. Dozens upon dozens of reforms to the criminal law have been made by the parliament, and that has led to a big jump in prosecutions and more prisoners than ever behind bars. Owing to the government's pledge, more cases are now before our courts, and the huge investment in police, innovative lawmaking and the exposure of crimes (especially against children) is having a real effect. The package announced today is practical and immediate action to fast-track justice in this state.

The cornerstone of the government's strategy is the reopening and modernisation of the Sturt Street justice precinct at a cost of \$18.9 million over the next four years. The centrally located courts feature two court rooms, three cells, two jury rooms, interview rooms and ample space for prosecution and defence lawyers, witnesses and victims, and court administrators. The courthouse has been hired out to other uses for about 15 years. We are giving it a fresh lease on life. After a major refurbishment, the precinct will be a comfortable, practical and well-resourced platform to tackle the state's backlog of criminal cases. Indeed, in the total cost is a \$3.2 million renovation that will see the building fitted out with modern technology, disabled access, security devices and other features by late 2009.

Along with other measures, the precinct is expected to minimise waiting times in the state's higher courts. Over five years it is projected that the two extra courtrooms will hear about 300 trials, quickly and efficiently cutting the backlog and helping to prevent further delays in case listing. The \$18.9 million package also includes:

- \$11.1 million for three extra judges and 12 more court staff. The first new judge will start this year.
- \$2.8 million for five extra full-time prosecutors, plus 2½ support staff.
- \$1.8 million for extra Legal Services Commission lawyers and support staff.

On top of the Sturt Street allocation I have just outlined, the Office of the Director of Public Prosecutions will receive another \$7.5 million.

When I took office as Attorney-General, a former member of the Olsen Liberal government told me that I should look at the funding for the Office of the Director of Public Prosecutions because, in his words, 'that office is running on the smell of an oily rag' under the Liberal government. Year on year we have steadily increased resources to the office. Today I can tell the house that the ODPP staff levels will rocket from 70 in 2002-03 to 148 in 2009-10. That is more than double the level since the Rann government came to office—that is more than double. This includes new funding of \$5.3 million, plus \$2.2 million for the response to the Mullighan inquiry. Extra staff positions have already been funded to deal with the work created by firearms reforms and the arsenal of laws to tackle the criminal bikie gangs. In the next four years 36 extra full-time staff will join the office of the DPP—and about 24 of those will be prosecutors. More prosecutors mean cases can be dealt with more thoroughly and quickly. More importantly, this means less stress on witnesses and victims.

On top of the pledge of \$1.8 million to the Legal Services Commission as part of the Sturt Street package, we have also announced an additional \$8.3 million. Dealing with one part of the criminal justice system can place pressure on other parts, so when the tide comes in it lifts all boats. Along with record funding of the office of the DPP, disadvantaged defendants will have greater access to justice with a 50 per cent boost for funding in the Legal Services Commission since the Rann government came to office. This is in addition to extra positions that have already been funded to deal with cases generated by the firearms legislation and the anti-criminal bikie reforms. Representation for accused people means swifter justice for all.

Some \$3.1 million will be devoted to faster forensic services. This will pay for a pathology registrar, a laboratory technician and two support staff to deal with the backlog of cases. This fast-tracking of cases will help to not only resolve criminal cases faster but also speed up the process to relieve those waiting on coronial findings.

More funds are also being allocated to improve security, information technology and reporting services in our courts, with upgrades to the tune of \$4.2 million. Court reporting equipment will move from analogue to digital, which will reduce courtroom disruption and improve reliability. Information technology and electronic security systems will also be replaced in city and country courts—because this is a government for the regions with two ministers from the regions.

Today's measures will drastically reduce the backlog of cases, delivering swifter justice for victims and their families and putting more offenders behind bars sooner rather than later. Today's announcement comes on top of recent pledges of:

- \$5.3 million to cut the DNA backlog. Eighteen extra scientists, technical and support staff will be appointed to slash the backlog of analysis of DNA evidence.
- \$520,000 to recruit more Aboriginal language interpreters and prevent delays owing to language barriers.
- \$35.9 million to provide a further 209 new spaces in our prisons to manage unprecedented prisoner numbers.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

WATER TRADING

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop) (15:14): Today I rise to talk about water—not stormwater or water in relation to metropolitan Adelaide but, rather, what is happening in the Riverland and what the minister has done. I asked a very serious question of the Minister for Water Security in question time today. The minister had obviously read *The Weekly Times*, as I expected she would, and she

chose to answer her question based on a story in *The Weekly Times* rather than the question that I put to her. I did a little more than just read *The Weekly Times* story; I actually did some home work to find out exactly what happened.

The Weekly Times story suggests there was a surge two days before the 7 February announcement. The story is entitled, 'A surge in water purchases'. If anybody wishes to consult the *Hansard*, they will read the minister's suggestion that there was a spike in water prices. To my understanding, there was no surge or increase water prices before the 7 February announcement, as the minister suggested. She was trying to say that it was because on 5 February she reaffirmed that 32 per cent was as far as the allocation for this water season would go. That may be the case.

The point that I made in the question was that three to four days before her announcement on 7 February—that was one to two days before the announcement about the 32 per cent allocation—there was a notable spike in the amount of water traded. There was no change in price, but a notable spike in the amount of water traded. After the announcement of 7 February, there was a noticeable spike again in both the amount of water traded and the price. A little while later, there was a further spike in the price. We saw the price over that period after 7 February go from between \$180 to \$200 a megalitre upwards to \$380 to \$400 a megalitre; that was the price surge. There was a definite surge in the amount of water traded some three to four days (that is, one to two days before her announcement on the allocation) before her announcement on the carryover policy.

Why would this make a difference? Irrigators in South Australia had already been burnt by promises that there would be no increase in the allocation over 16 per cent.

Mr Kenyon interjecting:

Mr WILLIAMS: Well, this is the way irrigators report it to me, that they were promised. In fact, they said, 'We were urged to make the hard decision in early November.' Before the end of November, allocation was increased to 22 per cent. The impact was that the price of temporary water on the market dropped from over \$1,200 a megalitre down to about \$200 a megalitre. A week later, the Premier visited the Riverland and announced a further increase to 32 per cent. These announcements have huge impacts on the market.

As I said in the Riverland last week when I was up there, if people bought and sold shares in public companies under those sorts of circumstances, we would see people locked up in gaol. But this government has no understanding and does not care about the impact that such announcements have. I stand by the question I asked today. The minister still has to explain why there was a surge in the volume of water traded three to four days before her 7 February announcement. She said that she was consulting, and I agree that maybe you should consult, but, surely, having consulted, you do not actually then tip off people that you are making an announcement next Monday, Wednesday, or wherever.

Surely, there should be some mechanism where you freeze the market, as they do on the stock exchange, pending an announcement, because this is serious money. Individual irrigators are spending hundreds of thousands of dollars just to survive, and the government has been of little help.

To the other questions I asked of the Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, when he glibly stands up and says that we cannot make it rain, I invite every member of the house to go to the Riverland and talk to irrigators. They all say that the problem is not the shortage of water—there is water available—it is the price they have to pay for it and finding the money to buy it. My question to the government is: can South Australia afford to lose the permanent plantings in the Murraylands and the Riverland—as I pointed out—that produce economic benefit to this state of over \$1 billion a year? Can we afford to lose them? Individual growers are running out of capacity to buy water at over \$1,000 a megalitre to keep them alive.

Time expired.

BADCOE, MAJOR PETER

The Hon. P.L. WHITE (Taylor) (15:20): I rise to send a bouquet to our state Treasurer for his recent action in providing funding to secure for Australia and South Australia Major Peter Badcoe's Victoria Cross Medal. Major Peter Badcoe, who died in 1967 during the Vietnam conflict, was posthumously awarded the Victoria Cross for his valour, leadership and gallantry under fire during that conflict. He is particularly well loved by South Australians, being an Adelaide-born man, and he is particularly revered by the Vietnam Veterans Association of South Australia and

specifically by the Northern Suburbs Sub-Branch of the Vietnam Veterans Association, and I will explain that link in a moment.

Major Peter John Badcoe, who was born Peter Badcock but changed his name by deed poll for fairly obvious reasons, was a man of extraordinary courage. When I read of his contribution to conflicts under fire—the way he stood out of his expected role, showed leadership, rescued mates and turned what I am told by veterans were situations of certain defeat into victory—I see that he was an amazing man.

I mentioned the link with the Northern Suburbs Sub-Branch of the Vietnam Veterans Association. The Vietnam Veterans Association opened its premises in the old DSTO complex (or where that complex used to be) just a couple of months ago. Both the Vietnam Veterans Association and the Ex-Military Rehabilitation Centre were recently opened with great pride by Governor Rear Admiral Kevin Scarce. It was a wonderful, wonderful day, and I had the opportunity to talk with Vietnam veterans of the northern suburbs about their experiences and about the work they do today.

I have visited with them on a few occasions, but I was reminded of what they do in the community for all sorts of people. Every Wednesday there is a lunch at the complex for the veterans and their families, where they have a guest speaker. A 15-seater bus collects some of the disabled veterans. They have pension officers for the veterans who are on the disability pension working on site. The services are also available to war widows from any conflict, not just the Vietnam conflict. They have some counselling on site, and they refer to other services in South Australia, and they get involved with a lot of fundraising activities and also activities for youth—youth of veterans and youth in the community.

They do things like restoration and provision of furniture and fittings for some of the domestic violence shelters in the area; there is a sausage sizzle in Salisbury every Friday to raise money; and they have a long distance walk for charity, which finishes at Montague Farm on Long Tan Day, and that money goes towards the education of children of the vets and the Daw Park Foundation.

Amazing things happen at the Ex-Military Rehabilitation Centre. They provide woodworking, and they have a gem club. They do bread runs for a lot of the various charities in the northern area; they have a recreation area; and they have a men's support group. They perform a lot of functions that people would be unaware of, but it provides a great service in the northern suburbs.

Time expired.

YORKE PENINSULA HEALTH BUS

Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder) (15:24): I wish to speak briefly this afternoon about the Yorke Peninsula Health Bus. I acknowledge that the fact that the health bus exists is because it is an initiative of the government, and I am grateful for that. It has been under a trial arrangement since 6 August last year, and that trial was extended until 30 June, but there is an enormous amount of indecision, it appears, as to what is going to occur in the future.

Yorke Peninsula people are very alarmed about this. It is actually on the front page of the local newspaper this week with some comments from me. It is very alarming because, in the period since the trial first started on 6 August, about a thousand people have used it. A thousand people might not sound like a lot, but for a thousand people who have to travel for hours and hours from their homes on Yorke Peninsula (all the way from Marion Bay to the Copper Coast area) to go to Adelaide for appointments, which is what the purpose of the health bus is, it is important for them that it continue.

At the moment with the seemingly apparent centralisation of specialist health services, more and more people, instead of being able to have their health needs serviced at Yorketown or Maitland or the Wallaroo Public Hospital or the private hospitals, have to go to Adelaide for specialist appointments. A lot of these are older people who do not have the ability to actually transport themselves there. Being on a larger-scale bus is nearly impossible for them, so they have to use the opportunity that the smaller-scale health bus provides, especially as a carer can travel with them at no charge, too.

To now be told that while an evaluation is actually taking place there is no surety of its continuing is of great concern. I am grateful for the fact that Yorke Peninsula was used as a trial for potentially rolling this out across the state. I think the trial has worked pretty well and, while it is

possible that it will be used as a template to roll out to other parts of regional South Australia, to be told that there is a great chance that our program will stop at 30 June and then have to recommence (if indeed it does start again when the service begins in other areas of the state) is frustrating.

I have written to the minister about this. A letter that I wrote to him in April this year contains a couple of really great comments from a constituent who has spoken to my electorate office that I would like to insert in *Hansard*. The letter states:

It was heartening to receive a letter the other day from a lady who has accessed the service frequently during the trial and to hear of how it has helped her enormously in attending specialist appointments. Her comments included high praise for the drivers who she describes as 'so kind and helpful' and 'as an aged pensioner makes our Drs or specialist appointments more bearable.'

If we do not have the health bus available, we will again have to rely on volunteer drivers, who will use their own car or the vehicles of YP Community Transport and Services. This will mean taking a far smaller number of people in multiple vehicles, so, to me, it seems that, in terms of economy and efficiency, continuing the health bus service is the obvious way to go.

Since I have written that letter to the minister, and another one confirming my support for the bus service, we have had a letter back from the minister agreeing to a deputation from YP Community Transport and Services and me to meet with him on 17 June. We were hopeful that an announcement was going to be made last week about the future of the YP health bus, but now we are told that that has to be held back.

A lot of my constituents want to be quite outspoken about their opinion on the indecision and delays in announcing an extension of the service. We are trying to do the right thing; we are trying to build positive relationships with the minister. The minister has allowed us a chance to meet with him next week and, while we are going to put a very strong case, it is frustrating to us that this service, which has had 1,000 people use it in about seven months and which obviously has proven itself to be viable in the longer term, does not have that ready demonstration of support from the government already.

It is a cost-efficient way of doing things. It is certainly far more financially viable, I would presume, than the Patients Assistance Transport Scheme that provides a direct reimbursement for people who use their own cars. It is a lot better than getting taxis to come over and pick up people. The health bus allows people to have appointments focused around the middle of the day between 10 o'clock in the morning until about 2.30 in the afternoon. There is a lounge where they can relax in between appointments or wait for the bus to come to pick them up and take them home. They can watch television there, and have a shower there. It seems as though everything is actually working together. There are doctors on the peninsula making appointments based around the times that the health bus will actually operate, so the doctors' practices are working well. The service is proving itself. People want to use it, and all we need is the dollars to be committed.

I think that the health bus is an example of the future needs of regional South Australia. If we are going to have Port Lincoln, Whyalla, Berri and Mount Gambier as a focus for health services in regional areas, it is important that people who do not live in those areas have the opportunity to travel to Adelaide for their specialist appointments. As the population in regional South Australia ages, the ability for them to drive themselves will diminish, so it is important that the health bus continues, and I offer my full support for it.

Time expired.

ENVIRONMENTAL EDUCATION CENTRE

Ms SIMMONS (Morialta) (15:30): Tomorrow is World Environment Day, and today I want to talk about the Environmental Education Centre based at Rostrevor College in my electorate of Morialta and run by the dynamic and passionate Scott Witters. The aim of the centre is to educate our young people as to how the various sciences and the environment are related, and how this acquired knowledge can be used to solve the environmental problems we face today and into the future. The children are taught that new patterns of behaviour, including both personal lifestyle choices and informal social action that reflect this care, will be needed if we are to manage properly and utilise our natural environment and its associated resources responsibly.

Scott feels strongly about the old adage 'think globally, act locally' and works with the students to develop fully their talents and appreciation of wildlife by having a hands-on experience with native Australian animals. The centre is now in its third year of operation and is host to more than 50 weird and wonderful critters, including an assortment of reptiles, including some impressive

size snakes (of which I still remain terrified) and some unusual and very beautiful lizards and goannas, which he has actually got me to like. He also has mammals, birds, fish, arachnids (spiders), crustaceans and invertebrates which are housed on a permanent basis. Some of the more unique and most popular residents with the children include a red-tailed black cockatoo, sand goanna, squirrel gliders, tarantulas, pythons, Murray cod, a laughing kookaburra and, believe it or not, a freshwater crocodile.

The great thing about the centre is that it can be booked and used by all South Australian schools, and I would encourage all members to take an interest in this unique facility and to encourage their local schools to visit the facility. Many of our schools have good environmental programs and should be congratulated. They are heavily involved with Waterwatch, Airwatch, Frogwatch, worm farming, composting, recycling and propagation, but not every school can provide the sort of experience available at the Environmental Education Centre.

As adults, we are often confused by the political and scientific debate related to the state of our planet's health. However, the Environmental Education Centre works with the children through the resident animals to sort out what actions they can take to contribute to a healthy environment and what their actions might do to contribute to environmental sustainability into the future.

The Environmental Education Centre is also based very close (just a short walk) to Morialta Conservation Park, and Rostrevor has its own 'Our Patch' site where they practise weed management, site preparation, seed collection, planting seedlings, watering and biological surveys. A great deal is learnt about the natural environment through being actively involved in site management and survey work. Students are constantly discovering new flora and fauna and continue to be amazed by the biodiversity found at this site.

Visiting schools are also able to take advantage of a guided walk through Morialta Conservation Park (which I must recommend to every school in our state) and learn about biodiversity or the interesting history associated with the Kurna people, the first inhabitants of this unique landscape. I understand from Mr Witters that demand for this type of environmental education is increasing each year, as teachers strive to find more stimulating ways to engage students in learning, and I congratulate our teaching staff for recognising the value of this hands-on methodology.

I have now been fortunate enough to visit the Environmental Education Centre on several occasions. I have noticed that it is a constantly evolving entity, reflecting the changing needs of the students, the latest addition being a 20-metre long aviary housing native parrots, owls and cockatoos. I was particularly impressed with the dedication of the special class whom I met last month and who spend most Friday afternoons looking after and with the wildlife. In conclusion, I commend the Rostrevor Environmental Education Centre to the house as an exciting, challenging and stimulating science lab, with a real and precious connection with the environment to the benefit of our South Australian children. I would like to add my congratulations to Scott Whitters, who has also been nominated for a Prime Minister's award for his dedication to environmental teaching, and to the principal, Jeff Crozier, and others, involved in this important centre.

WORLD FOOD EXCHANGE

Mr PENGILLY (Finniss) (15:35): Over the last 24 hours in this place we have seen, I suggest, something quite bizarre in relation to a well-advertised event for South Australia that was meant to take place between 21 and 25 September. That, of course, is the World Food Exchange. I was quite bewildered yesterday with the answer provided by the minister. I do not really think that the minister knew what was going on to the extent that the answer was a one-liner. We came back today and asked her a further question and we still did not get much of an answer.

What concerns me about this is the fact that it is most confusing for the industry. How can industry people—in this particular case food and tourism people—be assured of long-term planning and be assured of staging successful events when they are on again/off again? And why on earth, in the winter edition of *Food* (bearing in mind that winter started on Sunday), a document put out by PIRSA, would the government place a half-page ad on this World Food Exchange? There seems to be a lack of communication between the minister's department and PIRSA, which, I think, is alarming. I do not think it is fair to those who would have already made bookings and plans to attend.

There is no doubt that organisations have done that and have been told that what was to be a week had become a couple of days and has now turned into something like a long lunch on Hutt Street. The fact is that businesses, organisations and those involved in the food industry

cannot, with any certainty, know what will happen with this event, either this year or next year. I simply make the point that if you are going to run and advertise an event, and if you are trying to attract people from around South Australia, more widely from around Australia and, more to the point, from overseas, why on earth do you not do your homework and get your advertising and planning right? And why on earth is the government still advertising it?

Not only is the event still being advertised in this magazine, *Food*, but it is still also on the calendar of events on the computer. If members pull up the website it is still there, and it is still advertised for 22-27 September this year. The article states:

Join us in Adelaide for introductory sessions about the many food and wine resources of South Australia, then visit one or more of South Australia's regions, digging deep into the wines...for food lovers and adventurers. Call us for costs and more information.

Well, the more information you get is: 'Whoopee boys and girls! Yep, it will be terrific, but it's not on. She's gone; out the door!' For June, the magazine states:

The inaugural World Food Exchange aims to showcase South Australia's ecologically sustainable world class agriculture and aquaculture practices to importers, journalists and food practitioners from around the world.

Well, great. Just terrific. Only, again, it ain't happening! It has had the pin pulled on it. I think it is a slap in the face, quite frankly. The website mentions the agricultural and aquacultural practices of food growers. It is a smack in the face to those people who produce world-class products for the marketplace in terms of domestic and international use. It is an absolute smack in the face to those people to have this thing fail like it has. I condemn the minister for what has taken place here. It is an absolute disgrace. You cannot run around and be full of froth and bubble on all these big events in Adelaide during March and then not do the homework on the major events you have got planned for the rest of the year.

It is just not on and it is not satisfactory. The minister has failed on this. The fact that the advertising campaign is still going on is a failure. It is erroneous, it is misleading and it does our profile in the world—

Mr Venning: Unprofessional.

Mr PENGILLY: Yes, 'unprofessional', the member for Schubert says. It makes us an unprofessional state in respect to that information.

Time expired.

SEXUAL DISCRIMINATION

Ms CICCARELLO (Norwood) (15:40): Today I rise to talk about the federal Labor government's historic reforms to end discrimination on the basis of sexuality. In July last year I spoke on the Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission Report, entitled 'Same Sex: Same Entitlements', which identified 58 federal laws in Australia which discriminated against same sex couples and their children in the areas of financial and work related entitlements. I called on the then federal government to do something about this appalling injustice and to stop obfuscating the issue with references to marriage and adoption and the thin end of the wedge.

I wrote to the then federal attorney-general, Philip Ruddock, urging him to implement the recommendation of the HREOC report. Some weeks later, I received a standard response from his office with the assurance that:

The Australian government is giving serious consideration to the recommendations of the report. Any changes to government programs involve an assessment of the policy and fiscal implications. A responsible government cannot make broad changes without considering all the issues and the ramifications.

I interpreted that to mean, 'We haven't done anything about it for 12 years and we certainly don't intend to start now.' After 12 years of government and dozens of reports all calling for the same thing. Twelve years of legislation introduced by other parties as a matter of necessity and ignored by the then government and 12 years of complete apathy and disinterest, they then had the nerve to write back to me and say that they were seriously considering the issue. I, of course, was heartened when the Australian Labor Party made its commitment before the election to remove discrimination against people in same sex relationships. I am now delighted that only six months into its term it has already introduced the first draft of the legislation to end this inequality once and for all.

It is interesting that Labor took only six months to do what the coalition pondered for 12 long years. Therefore, I was appalled to read just last week that the coalition-controlled Senate is even contemplating referring this legislation off to a committee. We do not need any more

committees or any more stalling on this important legislation. This legislation must be progressed through the federal parliament as quickly as possible. Areas where discrimination will be removed include tax, superannuation, social security, health, aged care, veteran entitlements, workers compensation, employment entitlements, and other areas of commonwealth administration.

I am sure that all members applaud the federal government in its commitment to social justice and inclusion. I have read some reports, however, that some people in the same sex community feel aggrieved because they believe that they will be worse off under these new arrangements. This is unfortunate but inevitable in this type of comprehensive reform. There will always be winners and losers. For instance, in assessing the income of the household as a unit, the means test will now have regard to the total earnings of the couple as opposed to the earnings of an individual for the purpose of assessing whether that individual is entitled to some form of social security benefit. I would urge them to remember that the positive aspects of making same sex relationships equal to their heterosexual de facto counterparts—in other words, the bigger picture—far outweigh any potential individual disadvantage.

The reforms currently being progressed by the federal government will make a real, practical difference to the lives of many Australians who have for far too long experienced discrimination purely because they love someone of the same sex.

One last thing I mention is the issue of marriage. I understand and am sympathetic to many in the same sex community who would have liked to see the definition of marriage broadened to include same sex relationships. Again, when I spoke on the Rann government's domestic partners legislation in 2006, I acknowledged that it did not include access for same sex couples to adoption and IVF. I stated then that political realities often dictated that it was better to have the vast majority of reforms progressed rather than have legislation delayed or scrapped, and such is the case here. Let us celebrate the passing of these historic reforms and not let it be marred by disappointment that marriage has not been included at this time. I am quite sure that this issue will live to fight another day.

PREVENTION OF CRUELTY TO ANIMALS (ANIMAL WELFARE) AMENDMENT BILL

In committee (resumed on motion).

(Continued from page 3412.)

Clause 2.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: I move:

Page 3, line 6—Delete 'a day to be fixed by proclamation' and substitute:

1 January 2015

The purpose of this amendment is to ensure that there is adequate discussion, understanding and education. It will give those involved a reasonable and appropriate time to come to terms with what is proposed, and those who are insisting on these changes a chance to go and look around the world and see what is taking place and not take any notice of malcontents and others.

The Hon. J.D. HILL: I have to respond to that comment.

The Hon. G.M. Gunn: I think it is a very good amendment.

The Hon. J.D. HILL: Yes, I understand. The effect of this amendment would be that the legislation, which the opposition said it generally supports, would not come into existence until 2015, which would in fact contradict the legislation. The member for Stuart has already said the opposition is committed to changing the legislation so, presumably, this is a device to stop the legislation having force until some optimistic point in the future when the Liberal Party eventually returns to government.

Mr Venning: And we will.

The Hon. J.D. HILL: The Liberal Party may not exist in the future. There are talks of amalgamations. Of course, you may have some new conservative force. But, whatever conservative force exists in the future, if it gets into office and wishes to change the legislation, good luck to it. That is the thing about democracy, of course. But, we want it to come into force while we are here. So, we oppose the amendment. I will be interested to see whether the opposition seeks to divide on this particular measure, because I would love to see how members on the other side vote.

Amendment negated; clause passed.

Clause 3 passed.

Clause 4.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: I move:

Page 3, line 14—After 'welfare' insert:

; to regulate practices involving animals in a way that may have significant impacts on activities such as farming and rodeos

This is the farmers' clause. I did have some difficulty getting some of these amendments drawn up. There was not a great deal of enthusiasm on the part of the people who were going to do it for me.

We want to make it quite clear that this process does not interfere with those people who are involved in intensive farming practices. The member for Goyder has them in his electorate when you go to Wallaroo or Snowtown. I have got them at Robertstown, Eudunda and Burra. There are these big developments and, if common sense does not apply, then you will not have them—they will be gone. It will have a very detrimental effect on those small communities. If members do not understand this, they could cause problems. Some of these provisions, in relation to the unreasonable requests they want to put on rodeos, are unnecessary and unwise.

The Hon. J.D. HILL: The government does not support the amendment. The amendment seeks to put argument which reflects the positions adopted by the member for Stuart. I think the record will adequately demonstrate his position without changing the name of the legislation.

Amendment negated; clause passed.

Clause 5 passed.

Clause 6.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: I move:

Page 4, lines 19 and 20—Delete paragraphs (d) and (e).

The purpose of this amendment is to delete two particular events (which can be considered events at rodeos) so that they can hold these events without having to go through the process which will now be put in place. These events—steer riding and roping or tying—are very important in relation to rodeo events around the world. If these events are excluded and people cannot participate in them, then they may be excluded from participating internationally in Canada and the United States. It is a nonsense, put here at the behest of well-meaning, misguided and out-of-touch people.

The Hon. J.D. HILL: This is at the heart of the member for Stuart's objections to this legislation. The bill amends the existing legislation to include two activities—steer riding and roping or tying—in order to allow regulation of those activities and the legislation sets this out. I understand other areas, such as saddle bronc riding, bareback bronc riding and bull riding, have been subject to regulation for some time. I understand that, as a result of those regulations, those events and activities still occur; so it does not stop those acts occurring. It merely allows regulation of those areas in order to ensure they are done in a way that is not harmful or injurious to animals.

I accept the point the member makes that this adds extra burden on those who run rodeos to demonstrate that they can comply with the legislation, but I think it is a reasonable addition. The government is not opposed to rodeos and it is not trying to stop rodeos occurring. It is just trying to ensure they happen in a way which looks after animal welfare. The extension in these two areas is consistent with the areas of regulation that already exist.

Amendment negated; clause passed.

Clauses 7 to 11 passed.

Clause 12.

The Hon. J.D. HILL: I move:

Page 8, lines 24 and 25—Delete 'the training prescribed in the regulations as relevant to their conditions of employment' and substitute:

training as prescribed by the regulations.

The Deputy Leader of the Opposition indicated the opposition's support for this amendment—for which I am grateful. I understand the alteration was a necessary consequence of the government in the other place accepting an amendment from the opposition. This clarifies what was intended. I understand that it is agreeable to all parties.

Amendment carried.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: I move:

Page 10, line 18 [clause 12, insert section 30(2)(a)]—After 'Act' insert:

and, if the powers are to be exercised in respect of premises or a vehicle being used for the purposes of a rodeo, with the agreement of the designated rodeo veterinary surgeon for the rodeo.

There has to be a veterinary surgeon present. It appears to me that logic and common sense will apply if a veterinary surgeon is involved. Therefore, this is a fair, reasonable and sensible amendment, which most reasonable people would accept, and perhaps the extremists would agree with it. At the last rodeo that I went to, when you had these crazy people who wanted to photograph you, I was with Dr Lloyd from Quorn, a well-known and respected doctor throughout the community. He thinks these things are crazy. You do not have to take my word. I suggest you go and ask him. He is a highly competent and highly respected person throughout the community. He is a highly qualified doctor, as the minister would know.

It was interesting that when the doctor went to vote at the last state election, someone handed him a Democrat how-to-vote card, and he said, 'The anti-rodeo people'. These are reasonable things, but with this blatant attempt by the bureaucrats to get their way and not accept any of these changes, all they are doing is making a bed of thorns for them to lay on. That is all I will say.

The Hon. J.D. HILL: Once again, the government does not accept the amendment. The amendment would give the local vet, who is appointed by the rodeo manager to supervise the rodeo, the right of refusing access by an independent inspector. I think that would put the vet in an extraordinary conflicted situation and subject to incredible pressure from the manager or owner of the rodeo, because future work might be denied if they were to accept that an inspector should come on the property. That is an unfair set of arrangements no matter how honourable, credible, or well trained the veterinary expert.

The other point, of course, is that a vet is not a trained inspector. A vet is trained in providing services to injured animals, so using a different skill set is required. While in some ways I understand the point that the member is making, I think that, for the reasons I have just given, the government will have to reject it.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: I think that most reasonable people would accept that the vet is more qualified than some inspector. The vet is dealing with these sorts of animals probably on daily or weekly basis. I put it to the minister that they have a better understanding of animal behaviour and the latest methods in animal handling and husbandry than some inspector, who has been given a crash course and a rule book to read, and who is really out of their depth.

All I say to the minister is: we beg to differ. I will not force the issue any more. We have put our case very clearly. We have clearly put to the committee the difficulties with this legislation. Obviously, those who are behind it on this occasion will get their own way. But, I repeat: the wheels continue to turn. Some of us will be going to the rodeos and watching, and some of these people in the department will get busy when dozens of questions are put on the *Notice Paper*. That is what will happen.

The Hon. J.D. HILL: Let me try again to respond to—

The Hon. G.M. Gunn: Ask the member for Morphett; he will confirm it.

The Hon. J.D. HILL: More than others in this place, the member for Morphett would understand what an awkward position a vet would be put in if he or she was at the rodeo doing their job and then put in a position of having to assess whether or not it is appropriate for an inspector to come in and do his or her job in the heat of the rodeo. I think that would put the vet in a very difficult position because, not only would they have to keep an eye on their normal responsibilities, which is the welfare of the animals, they would have to keep in their head whether or not an offence was committed. What if the vet, in the circumstances, made an error? You could see a whole range of legal actions involving the vet.

While I appreciate that vets are skilled people and may well understand animal welfare better than others, this role the member is attempting to put a vet in is not a veterinary role, it is a judging role—and I think that is an unfair imposition on a vet in the circumstances they would find themselves in.

The other point I would make is that, if the vet is the expert, as you say, employed by the rodeo but as an independent person, if an inspector came along and made a finding or made a decision in relation to a particular action, the vet would be a very good witness for the rodeo in any ensuing action. If the vet was put in the position of judging whether an inspection should occur, I would think that it would, to some degree, undermine the capacity of that vet to be a witness in a subsequent court action.

While I appreciate the point the member is making that you do not want to see inspectors come in without due purpose, cause and reason and all of the rest of it, it would be putting the vet who is in a position to do a particular job in an unfair position to ask them to do this additional job. I think it is best that we allow the inspector to be an inspector. It would be like having a vet stopping a police officer from coming in if a police officer thought there was something going on that was illegal—because police officers can apply the laws of this act as well as any inspector. Clearly, you cannot restrain a police officer in their duties, and nor should you, and exactly the same principle should apply here.

Dr McFETRIDGE: As a vet, I have to buy in on this one. I am very sympathetic to the member for Stuart's amendment. Dr Kelly and I—and, in fact, all vets—are not only trained in veterinary medicine and surgery, we are also trained in the rules and regulations that go along with animal production and meat hygiene. You are taught to inspect premises if for no other reason than that the animal production systems going on are conducting the business in such a way that the animals will be produced to the maximum benefit of the organisation or, in this case, that the animals are not only being treated well and their welfare is being looked after but also that the facilities the rodeo organisers are using are suitable so that animal welfare will not be detrimentally affected.

I would be very surprised if vets who are familiar with large animal work (and most vets who are involved in rodeo work are involved with large animal work) could not offer an expert opinion on the quality of the premises, the way in which the facilities were constructed and used, the way in which the animals were being put through the various chutes. I have seen some pretty ordinary sets of rodeo equipment around the place, both in Australia and overseas, and I have seen some excellent facilities. You can make that judgment as a vet. I am very sincere about the comments I have made here today, particularly about animal welfare and how it is a narrowing of the scope of what could be seen as the aims of this bill.

In this case, while I appreciate the minister's comments about the fact that the vet is employed by the organisers of the rodeo and that it does compromise the vet as a witness, I have to make the point that I think the vet could offer the inspector an opinion that the inspector should note. I would be very, very disappointed if that inspector did not give serious consideration to the vet's opinion before they made any decision, because I think the vet would win.

Amendment negated.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: I move:

Page 11, after line 11—Insert:

(6) In this section—

Designated rodeo veterinary surgeon for a rodeo means the veterinary surgeon designated in the application for the permit to conduct the rodeo as the veterinary surgeon who will provide veterinary treatment at the rodeo or, if that veterinary surgeon does not do so, the veterinary surgeon who acts at the rodeo in the place of that veterinary surgeon.

Again, this amendment deals with the treatment of animals and veterinary surgeons. I think the amendment adds to the bill.

The Hon. J.D. HILL: This amendment is consequential on the previous amendment. We opposed the first amendment in clause 2, and we oppose this amendment for the same reason.

Amendment negated.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: I move:

Page 15, after line 36 [clause 12, inserted section 31E]—

After its present contents (now to be designated as subsection (1)) insert:

- (2) An inspector, or a person assisting an inspector, who—
- (a) addresses offensive language to any other person; or
 - (b) without lawful authority, hinders or obstructs or uses or threatens to use force in relation to any other person, is guilty of an offence.

Maximum penalty: \$5,000

This particular amendment has been included in many acts of parliament. The minister can argue as much as he likes, but there is no reason this amendment should not be in the bill. It is included in acts of parliament the minister himself has administered. It is good enough to include in an act all these sorts of powers that could be applied against volunteers. What happens if one of these inspectors who is too full of their own importance suddenly becomes disruptive? Surely those people have a right to object in a democracy where free speech applies. The amendment refers to 'offensive language' and 'without lawful authority, hinders or obstructs or uses or threatens to use force in relation to any person, is guilty of an offence'.

What is wrong with it? There is nothing wrong with it; it is fair, reasonable and sensible and therefore it ought to be in this act as it ought to be in all acts of parliament. People are having their rights eroded by bureaucracy. Why should this not apply? This amendment is in very many acts of parliament; the only reason that the bureaucrats do not want it is petulant, in my view—miserable and petulant. They can like it or lump it as far as I am concerned, and it will continue—

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: I love it when you talk dirty, Gunny.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: No, I am just telling a fact. The minister knows as well as I do that this particular clause is in many acts of parliament but because of Sir Humphreys 1, 2 or 3 or whatever category you like to call them—I do not care—

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: Do you want me to go?

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: You can help me, because you would agree with me that some of this is nonsense.

The Hon. P.F. Conlon interjecting:

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: Good on you. I thought that someone had some common sense on that side, and I give the minister full credit, but those who are pulling the strings can wear the consequences, because let me say to you—and this is a good clause to say it—if these people come along, we will find out how many hours and minutes they were there, how many kilometres they had done in their motor car, what instructions they were given, whether they were given instructions—it is unlimited, because these people are going there to hinder, harass and interfere with good living South Australian citizens. Two people can play the game, and obviously if no-one accepts these sorts of very reasonable amendments, then two can play the game, and I am going to play the game, I will tell you.

The Hon. J.D. HILL: Despite the threats in that speech, I indicate to the house that the government does not support this amendment. I do agree with the member, though, that it is in many pieces of legislation and, on this occasion, the other place did not carry it, which is interesting. We are certainly not carrying it in this house, as the member would know. Inspectors, as ministerial appointments, must abide by the Public Sector Management Act 1995 and the code of conduct for public sector employees. This ensures appropriate and lawful behaviour and provides penalties for inappropriate action.

It is appropriate that public servants are managed by one act, and that is the Public Sector Act. Furthermore, the Ombudsman has the authority to investigate allegations concerning the behaviour of any inspector, and the funding deed in the memorandum of understanding spells out the requirements that the government expects of its inspectors and of the RSPCA in its role as their employer. This arrangement has served the people very well for many years and will continue to do so. The other point I would make, of course, despite the implied threat in the member's comments, is that this house is capable of answering and dealing with any alleged breaches of the law, and the member is entitled, as is any member, to raise those issues at any time in here in any way he chooses.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: The minister knows that I am a retiring character, and it takes a lot to get me on my feet on these sorts of occasions. Therefore, it will take a lot to get me into these matters, but at the end of the day what Sir Humphrey and the minister appear not to understand is

that the average citizen is at a tremendous disadvantage when confronted by the government, its agencies or its inspectors. The average person does not know their rights. They can quite often be intimidated by these people whether or not these people do it intentionally, but they are not aware. They do not have access to legal representation.

Look what happened to that poor person at Clare who ended up in the Magistrates Court. If ever there was a shameful act which brought discredit on all those associated with it, that was it. A volunteer was dragged before the court, and he had done absolutely nothing wrong himself, but he was dragged before the court at the behest of some of the people and he was out of pocket. Then the RSPCA dropped the case, but they gave him no compensation for his out-of-pocket expenses, and that is absolutely appalling.

Here you are; the rodeos' volunteers are raising money not to provide it for lawyers. Heaven help me! I have made the point. We will vote on it, and people can say that I have made threats; no: I have just stated facts. I come from a small, isolated rural community and I understand the difficulties these people have, and I understand that they are entitled to stick up for themselves. In this world when bureaucrats get their own way on unreasonable matters, it always catches up with them. It will come back to bite them, and this is what is going to happen at the end of the day.

Mr VENNING: I just want to support the member for Stuart very strongly and say how much the party appreciates his position on this, particularly this clause. I will be using this in my electorate for publicly supporting rodeos, and I thank the member for Stuart for doing the work and being a keen supporter of rodeos, not just here but on the world scene.

The attention to detail from the member for Stuart is well known and, as I said yesterday in this house, that is the reason that he is here after all these years in a marginal seat. Let it be a lesson to all members that good representation goes against electoral trends. The member for Stuart can retire in two years' time—and we are very sad about that—with some comfort that he has looked after the little people. This is one prime example of that. We certainly support the member for Stuart.

The committee divided on the amendment:

AYES (12)

Evans, I.F.	Goldsworthy, M.R.	Griffiths, S.P.
Gunn, G.M. (teller)	Kerin, R.G.	McFetridge, D.
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.	Geraghty, R.K.
Hanna, K.	Hill, J.D. (teller)	Kenyon, T.R.
Key, S.W.	Lomax-Smith, J.D.	Maywald, K.A.
McEwen, R.J.	O'Brien, M.F.	Piccolo, T.
Rankine, J.M.	Rann, M.D.	Rau, J.R.
Simmons, L.A.	Snelling, J.J.	Stevens, L.
Weatherill, J.W.	White, P.L.	Wright, M.J.

PAIRS (6)

Hamilton-Smith, M.L.J.	Koutsantonis, T.
Pederick, A.S.	Fox, C.C.
Chapman, V.A.	Portolesi, G.

Majority of 15 for the noes.

Amendment thus negated; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 13 and 14 passed.

Clause 15.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: My objection is that the penalty is excessive and unnecessary and will particularly affect volunteers. By putting this amendment forward, I have made my position clear; that is, it is an unnecessary and quite vindictive approach to these people. I have tried to highlight the vindictiveness of this proposal by way of suggesting an amendment that it be reduced.

I will not be moving my amendments Nos 7 and 8, but I will certainly be moving my amendment to clause 18.

Clause passed.

Clauses 16 and 17 passed.

Clause 18.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: I move:

Page 17, after line 38—Insert:

41—Prosecutions.

- (1) A prosecution for an offence against this act may only be commenced by—
 - (a) an inspector; or
 - (b) a prescribed person or a person of a prescribed class.
- (2) In proceedings for an offence against this act, an allegation in an information or complaint that a person named in the information or complaint was or was not, at a specified time—
 - (a) an inspector; or
 - (b) a prescribed person or a person of a prescribed class,
is, in the absence of proof to the contrary, proof of the matter alleged.

This is an important amendment. It will prevent the sort of nonsense and untruthfulness that is occurring. These animal liberationists and other extremists are bringing frivolous and quite outrageous prosecutions against good, decent people. We know that some of these people have the most peculiar backgrounds and their own involvement with animals is nothing of which to be proud.

Mr Hanna interjecting:

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: For the benefit of the member for Mitchell, my understanding is that one of these particular proponents has been barred from all the veterinary practices in Gawler. They do not want to see sight nor soul of that crazy woman. That is the woman who was put in the horse trough. I am not surprised she was put in there because I know exactly what she did. As I said on another occasion and I repeat: if I had been there, I would have clapped, too, because she certainly looked to me as though she was allergic to water. They go on with the most crazy behaviour and cause a great deal of difficulty for the people running rodeos.

This Mr Hanheuser, or whatever his name is (the character who stood against the member for Davenport), is the same person who polluted stock feed at Portland for the live export sheep going to the Middle East. These are the sorts of people you are dealing with. They have no sense of what is fair and reasonable. They have no ability to understand that thousands of people are enjoying themselves at these events that are properly run by volunteers who need our encouragement, assistance and support. They do not need unnecessary harassment and interference. This amendment relates to prosecutions that are fair, reasonable and appropriate.

The Hon. J.D. HILL: I understand the point the member for Stuart is making. The advice I have is that this is a standard right that any member of the public has in South Australia in relation to most legislation, that is, any individual can pursue a member of the public who has breached the law when it is a summary offence. For example, if I saw the honourable member crossing the road, jaywalking, theoretically I could pursue him in that regard, or if I saw him throwing rubbish away or doing any of those things, I could pursue him. However, very rarely does one do that.

It is an important principle because it means that if one of these inspectors, whom the honourable member has criticised so sharply, were in breach of this legislation (for example, if he was doing something improper such as keeping an animal in a car, not watering it or doing one of those things), a member of the public could pursue that inspector. It is so the Crown is potentially subject to the same penalties as any citizen. It is an important protection of the rights of the community to allow it to have a go at government, if you like.

Clearly, it is a power that potentially could be misused, and it is up to the courts to ensure that that does not happen. But to deny third party rights would mean that only inspectors could have those rights; and, if that were the case, there could well be abuse. As I say, my advice is that this ability is generally unfettered in South Australian legislation.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: What the minister fails to indicate to the committee is that an inspector has the protection of the government, and any individual who would attempt on one of these matters to take someone to court must either have very sufficient financial means or have a legal background, otherwise it is beyond their capacity. I will give the committee an example. A constituent of mine has been accused of using a mobile telephone when that person does not own one, he is deaf, he does not know how to operate one and he has two witnesses.

The Hon. J.D. Hill: He will get off.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: But to get a lawyer will cost him between, he is told, \$800 and \$2,000. The bureaucrat is protected, the ordinary citizen is at the beck and call of—

The Hon. J.D. Hill interjecting:

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: The minister ought to be grateful. He is making pretty good progress, but if he gets me wound up I could take him through the process for sometime. Why should these crazy people be allowed to go about the country tormenting, harassing and hindering the volunteers running these things? I thought this government supported volunteers. The government has a Minister for Volunteers, heaven help us. Where is she today? Volunteers run all these things, and you have community members who provide all the other facilities but you want to let these crazies take on some poor person who does not have the financial means to defend themselves.

The government runs the risk of those people getting prosecuted, even if the prosecution is quite frivolous. These people make things up. They run around with their video cameras and they doctor the videos. We know that. They have no sense of fairness or reason. This amendment seeks to protect those people. The experience at Marabel, in the electorate of the member for Schubert, ought to be a lesson for anyone, not just for members here who have the benefit of knowing what the law is, who have the means and the ability to defend themselves personally. I think it is pretty mean of us, particularly when these people are running these events for the good of their little communities.

They are under enough economic strain and difficulty out there now without having to put up with the sort of nonsense that some of these people carry on about. They race around the place. They have had to change the rules about who can video at these rodeos. The people running them claim copyright—at Wilmington and places—because of the scurrilous way these people went about taking and then altering the videos, trying to make out people were committing offences that had not taken place. It is a pretty reasonable and fair amendment to protect volunteers, and I am surprised that the minister will not support it.

Mr VENNING: I support the member for Stuart on this issue. We had an incident at Marabel involving a volunteer who happened to be the public officer for the rodeo. He comes from a very respected family in that community. In fact, he is a Rowett—a very well-respected name in that community. I thought it was absolutely gross that charges were laid against him as the public officer for the Marabel Rodeo. He is expected to pay his own legal fees and pay the fine, if it is ever levied against him.

I find this offensive. Who is going to be a volunteer at a rodeo if you can be personally liable like this? You are going to kill this; you are going to kill it dead. This poor person who would never have broken the law in his life rang me and said, 'Ivan, I'm liable for this according to them.' They made some pretty strong accusations against the rodeo and, as the public officer, he had to wear it. I find that offensive and, quite candidly, just blatantly wrong, and not fair.

The committee divided on the amendment:

AYES (12)

Evans, I.F.
Gunn, G.M. (teller)
Penfold, E.M.
Redmond, I.M.

Goldsworthy, M.R.
Kerin, R.G.
Pengilly, M.
Venning, I.H.

Griffiths, S.P.
McFetridge, D.
Pisoni, D.G.
Williams, M.R.

NOES (27)

Atkinson, M.J.
Breuer, L.R.
Conlon, P.F.
Hanna, K.
Key, S.W.

Bedford, F.E.
Caica, P.
Foley, K.O.
Hill, J.D. (teller)
Lomax-Smith, J.D.

Bignell, L.W.
Cicarello, V.
Geraghty, R.K.
Kenyon, T.R.
Maywald, K.A.

McEwen, R.J.
Rankine, J.M.
Simmons, L.A.
Weatherill, J.W.

O'Brien, M.F.
Rann, M.D.
Snelling, J.J.
White, P.L.

Piccolo, T.
Rau, J.R.
Stevens, L.
Wright, M.J.

PAIRS (6)

Hamilton-Smith, M.L.J.
Chapman, V.A.
Pederick, A.S.

Koutsantonis, T.
Fox, C.C.
Portolesi, G.

Majority of 15 for the noes.

Amendment thus negatived; clause passed.

Clause 19 passed.

Clause 20.

The Hon. J.D. HILL: I move:

Page 18, line 23—Clause 20, insert section 43A—Delete 'the action' and substitute:

any action.

I am advised that the amendment to this section is to ensure that, if a person reports to an inspector an alleged contravention of this act, the inspector must, at the request of the person, inform the person if practicable of the action proposed to be taken under the act in respect of the allegation.

The wording of this amendment presupposes that an action will be taken. This current amendment clarifies that, if requested and if practicable, an inspector needs to inform a person of any action proposed to be undertaken. It may be that no action is proposed to be taken in response to a complaint such as if a complaint is vexatious or malicious. This means that if an action is proposed to be taken, then, if requested and practicable, an inspector must inform the complainant. I understand this is supported by the opposition, and I thank them for that.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 21 and title passed.

Bill reported with amendment.

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Kaurua—Minister for Health, Minister for the Southern Suburbs, Minister Assisting the Premier in the Arts) (16:38): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

I thank the house for its support of this legislation. It has been an interesting debate, which I have enjoyed. I take this opportunity to thank my advisers today—Janice Goodwins; Peter Croft and Bob Innes; and also Dr Deb Kelly from the Department for Environment and Heritage; and Shirley Fisher, parliamentary counsel. I thank them for their assistance. I commend the legislation to the house and thank the opposition for its in-principle support of the measures contained in this legislation as outlined by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition yesterday during the preliminary stages of the debate.

Mr HANNA (Mitchell) (16:39): I am glad to note the passage of this legislation to improve the enforcement of animal welfare provisions in South Australia. The opposition, led by the Hon. Graham Gunn, (the member for Stuart), has sought to play out a rear guard action in relation to the practice of rodeos, but the majority view, I have to say, at least in the city of Adelaide, is that they need to go, because there is too much harm to animals in the process.

The concern that I had with the legislation was that it was a missed opportunity to take a completely different tack in relation to enforcement. I strongly suspect we would be better off if the police, that is, SAPOL, was responsible for enforcement of animal welfare provisions. It is true that it is a specialist area to look after the welfare of animals—perhaps to enter into farms, piggeries, chook yards and the like—but the reality is that there are many specialist areas which fall under the responsibilities of SAPOL, with special circumstances, special sensitivities and so on.

The reason, I believe, that the government has continued to persist with the RSPCA model for enforcement is that it is simply a lesser drain on the Treasury purse. Obviously, if SAPOL had

those extra responsibilities, there would be additional funding required for SAPOL, and we certainly would not want to distract our good officers of the law from other matters pertaining to assaults on human beings and the like. But, I think essentially that policy decision is driven by economic reasons.

It is very interesting that constituents have contacted me about the funding of the RSPCA. One woman relayed to me an appeal for funds by the RSPCA saying that, 'Although we enforce the laws and we can get a \$1,000 fine if someone has mistreated this poor little dog,' seen pictured, 'we do not get a cent from that \$1,000.' While that is strictly true, on the other hand, there is an equivalent source of money from the government particularly for the enforcement functions of the RSPCA. So, the government, in a sense, provides the money for enforcement but allows the RSPCA to pretend that it does not, so that it can get in donation money on the basis that it is not getting the money from the fines which result from enforcement. So the RSPCA, you could say, has it both ways in that regard.

Nonetheless, the government has decided to stick with enforcement of animal welfare provisions by the RSPCA, and I am glad to see that the government has moved to increase penalties in certain respects. So, the bill goes in the right direction, and I realise that it is a controversial area. It seems to me that every time in this parliament—or at any level of government—the topic of cats, dogs, horses and farmyard animals is raised, there is heated debate, because they are creatures that we can readily relate to.

With those few comments, I note my support for the government legislation, and I am pleased to see that it will pass the lower house today.

Bill read a third time and passed.

ENVIRONMENT PROTECTION (BOARD OF AUTHORITY) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 2 April 2008. Page 2494.)

Mr GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel) (16:45): I indicate that I am the lead speaker for the opposition on this bill. I do not anticipate holding up the house unnecessarily on this part of the legislative process. I certainly do not intend to speak at length. Some of our upper house colleagues have experienced that over the past two or three weeks when two members spoke for a total of 12 hours in their contributions on another important piece of legislation which the parliament has had to deal with.

The proposal in this legislation is to separate the roles of the chief executive and the presiding member of the board of the Environment Protection Authority. I am aware that there is a bit of history in relation to this issue. Some five years ago, when the restructure of the Environment Protection Agency and the Environment Protection Authority took place, it was the government's decision to allow the chief executive and the presiding member of the board to be one and the same person. I understand that at the time there was strong opposition to that initiative from the state Liberal Party.

We all have 20/20 vision in hindsight. In her second reading explanation, the Minister for Environment and Conservation admitted that the arrangement is not ideal. Indeed, it is not ideal. The way in which our constitution is structured in this state and right across the nation is that what we call the separation of powers is paramount to the way in which the government operates.

The Hon. J.D. Hill interjecting:

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: The minister protests at my making that statement. I will draw an analogy and make a comparison. The minister might protest about it, but the way in which our constitution is structured is that parliaments around the country make laws but another administration—the judiciary, the criminal justice system, and the like—manages and administers the law.

The way in which the government structured this situation five or six years ago is that a particular person is sitting as chairman of the board, making policy and decisions on the direction the authority should go, and that same person is sitting in another position administering and managing that policy. There is a similarity with a member of parliament making the law and then administering the law. It would be absolutely outrageous for that situation to be proposed in this country. In some countries there is a blurring of the separation of the powers. Allegedly, corruption creeps into the political/judicial system.

One of the fundamental principles of our constitution is that we do not have a blurring of those lines. One can compare that situation with the way in which the government structured these roles about five years ago. The minister has admitted that the situation is not ideal. When a minister says that something is not ideal one knows it is extremely bad; it is a bad situation. If the minister admits it is not ideal, it supports and vindicates the position that the Liberal opposition took five years ago in opposing this measure.

I want to comment on the immediate past chief executive, Dr Paul Vogel. By and large, my experience suggests that he was a good chief executive. I make those comments as a result of personal dealings with him in relation to issues that came to the fore in the electorate of Kavel. I can recall a couple of examples. One of the councils had a problem with the licensing of a waste water treatment plant. I can recall that legal action was to be taken in relation to its not meeting a particular time line for some works to be completed. I spoke to Dr Vogel about that issue and he resolved it. He did a very good job, and I was most grateful for his work in relation to that issue. Lengthy and expensive legal proceedings were averted by Dr Vogel's actions.

Another matter for which I took representation from the community to the current Minister for Health, the then minister for environment and conservation, dealt with a private primary school in my electorate that was having issues with some land that it had purchased which was a contaminated site. The remedial work required to mitigate that contamination was going to be extraordinarily expensive. However, I met with the minister, and we went back to the EPA, and another option was put forward concerning measures for the remediation of this site. It was still expensive, but nowhere near as expensive as the initial proposal.

The school was particularly pleased with that outcome. Now, there are some new tennis and netball courts, a new playing area has been established at the school, and they are very pleased with the outcome of my representation and with the minister's assistance and that of the EPA. They are positive outcomes, but we also hear some particularly negative outcomes when the community and landholders and the like engage with the EPA.

I remember when the board members of the EPA came to Parliament House and heard a number of issues raised by members of parliament. It was a big shock. It came as a big surprise and a big shock. Members of parliament made remarks and comments to the board about how the authority was working, delivering services and dealing with the public and the issues that were well and truly to the fore in the community. I think they were really quite surprised, and they went back and had a good look at how they operate.

By and large, from the people in my electorate who talk to me about their dealings with the EPA, I think the attitude of the EPA has changed to a degree. It looks at matters (development and the like) in a more proactive, positive and can-do manner. It is prepared to work with industry and developers to meet some of the requirements.

As I said, it has been my experience that, by and large, the EPA has changed its attitude. Early in my parliamentary career, probably in the first year in 2002-03, I had a meeting with an EPA officer about a particular matter on site, and there was no suggestion from that person about how we could overcome the problem. I made a suggestion and the response was, 'Oh, that would completely change things; that would completely change our outlook.' No assistance was given by that person in relation to the issue that we were dealing with at the time. Recently, the feedback that I have received from the community is that the EPA's attitude has changed, and that is obviously positive.

I would like to raise one other point about the replacement of the chief executive following Dr Vogel's resignation. It is my understanding that Dr Vogel gave notice in August last year that he was going to resign, and he left the position in November. The position has been back-filled, basically, since that time, and I understand that a replacement has not been appointed. November to June is seven or eight months. For that position to be back-filled by another senior government public service officer is just stretching things too thinly.

I understand that Mr Alan Holmes has been the acting chief executive. He has a whole raft of other responsibilities to take care of. To expect that person to manage his existing responsibilities and also keep a close eye on what is happening in the EPA is spreading resources far too thinly. I would have thought that there would be somebody somewhere in Australia—20 million-plus people; big public services right around. We have wall-to-wall Labor. We know what Labor is about—big governments—so there are plenty of bureaucrats. I would have thought that it would not have been terribly difficult to find a replacement for Dr Vogel. But, no, not even eight

months down the track. Maybe the government might have to look at the retired ranks of Liberal members. We have seen the government—

Mr Bignell interjecting:

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: I don't know how Gunny would go heading up the EPA; it would be interesting. The government has engaged the services of Hon. Dean Brown, a very successful past Liberal premier, in relation to water-related matters. The Hon. David Wotton took up a role offered in relation to natural resource management. I understand that Mal Brough, a past federal Aboriginal affairs minister, was recently asked to go into the APY lands to assist—

Mr Bignell interjecting:

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: No; the senior members of the Aboriginal community requested that his services be engaged. It is pretty obvious that the government is struggling to find, from its own resources, people of any quality to fill these positions, and there are reasons for that, but I am not necessarily going to explore those this afternoon. The point I want to make is that, if there are important jobs to be done, the government looks to past Liberal members and ministers to help it to solve its problems, because the government does not have anyone within its own ranks to meet those demands.

As I said at the outset, the proposal is to separate the roles of the chief executive and the presiding member of the board. Under the new arrangements, the bill will remove the chief executive as a board member and as presiding member, but that person will continue to sit in on board meetings but as a non-voting member, and they will be able to provide policy advice to the board. I think that is the correct structure, not the same person holding those two positions. As has already been indicated in the other place, the opposition is prepared to support the legislation.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (17:03): As a former environment minister, I want to make some comments on this bill. This bill comes before the house at the government's discretion because the government is admitting to the house that the decision it took four or five years ago to combine the positions of chief executive of the EPA with the chair of the board was wrong. The opposition at the time argued the case that what the government was doing would put that person in a position of conflict. The reason that person is in a position of conflict is that, as chairman of the board and as chief executive, they perform two roles.

The chairman of the board is the chairman of the group that is the policy setter; the chief executive is the policy administrator. At the end of the day, it is the policy administrator's role to administer the policy, not set the policy. So, there is a clear conflict. The Liberal Party has for many years taken the view that those roles should be split, and we have been fairly consistent in the view that, when these positions come up, they should be split.

The government, of course, said, 'Don't worry; there is no conflict. This won't cause a problem; this will work.' As my learned colleague the member for Kavel says, Paul Vogel, who I think did a good job as head of the EPA, gave notice 10 months ago that he was leaving, and the government has not filled the position. I suggest to the house that one of the reasons the government cannot fill the position is that the applicants are saying to the government, 'Hello! You've got a conflict in your act.' So, the government is bringing in this bill now, tail between its legs, to correct a conflict of its own making. The opposition will support this bill, because it has been our longstanding policy on this issue.

The second issue I want to raise is the issue of not having a chief executive. The government has not had a chief executive for 10 months. I appointed Allan Holmes as head of DEH, and he is the second-longest serving executive in government, as we speak. Jim Wright is the only person who served longer than Allan Holmes. The other former minister for the environment in the house (the member for Kaurana) acknowledges that and nods. It is fair to say that Mr Holmes does a good job in DEH, but we know that the government's view is that the role of chief executive of DEH should not be combined with the chief executive role of the Environment Protection Authority, because there are conflicts.

When the Environment Protection Authority puts out a policy for consultation, the Department for Environment and Heritage signs a submission to the EPA about what the Department for Environment and Heritage thinks about the EPA's policy. Mr Holmes has been put in the unfortunate position of having to sign memos to himself—of making submissions to himself—and, of course, that naturally puts him in a position of conflict. When he sits as chief executive of the EPA, does he argue his case on behalf of his agency, or does he argue the case on behalf of the EPA? There is a clear conflict. Why the government put Mr Holmes in that position is beyond

me when there are lots of other chief executives they could have picked without that inherent conflict. However, the reality is that there is a conflict, and it should be fixed.

I think it is appalling that the government has taken 10 months to fill the senior position in what is the most powerful watchdog in this state, namely, the EPA. In saying that, can I make it absolutely crystal clear that I have no criticism of Allan Holmes or his performance. I am purely criticising the position the government has placed him in.

The government was well aware of this conflict. It was this government that came to the house and said that it would make the independent EPA even more independent by not letting it use staff of DEH because there was a conflict. Other staff of DEH were answerable to the management of DEH or the management of the EPA, and it was this government that came in and said, 'There's this massive conflict here.'

Then as soon as Paul Vogel leaves, what does the government do? It recreates the conflict at the most senior level. So the minister for the environment, I think, is absolutely out of her depth and out of touch in my view in the way she is managing that agency. It is an absolute nonsense to suggest that the public servants cannot be in DEH and service the EPA and then, at the very same time, argue that the chief executive of DEH can service the EPA.

There is no consistency in that argument. The government has looked around the Public Service and said, 'Who knows something about environment? I know: the head of DEH' who actually (from memory) might have been on the board once before in the very early days. I might be wrong there.

The Hon. J.D. Hill interjecting:

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: All the way through? So they plonk him into that position. There we go.

The other issue I raise is why we are changing the sections relating to administrative units. I am not convinced about these changes, and I do not understand why they are being made. Under section 14, 'Powers of authority', the government gets the opportunity to use the administrative unit of the Public Service if the chief executive of the EPA is declared under the Public Sector Management Act to have the powers and functions of the chief executive of the admin unit.

So that is the chief executive of the current act. It restricts it to the chief executive of the EPA. This new legislation broadens it. The bill provides that the authority can make use of the services of an administrative unit's employees and its facilities if the minister agrees—that is any administrative unit. So the EPA board can go to any administrative unit and ask to use its employees.

It was only four years ago that that was a conflict. The board can do that. Clause 6 of this bill, which relates to section 14A of the act, essentially provides that, if the authority does make use of the administrative unit employees, and the minister of that administrative unit agrees, then that person (the CE of that agency) becomes the chief executive of the EPA. I quote: 'The person for the time being holding or acting in the position of chief executive of that administrative unit will be taken to be the chief executive' of the EPA.

So on my reading of clause 6 (new section 14A of the act) potentially, any chief executive in the Public Service whose administrative unit is used to service the board of the EPA can be declared the chief executive of the EPA. I do not understand why we are doing that. Maybe the minister can explain that to me.

The last issue I wish to touch on is the issue of the downgrading of the round table conference. The last clause of the bill (clause 9) makes a very simple amendment. It provides essentially that the chief executive will no longer have to chair the round table conference. This is a big burden for the chief executive. They actually have to go out and meet the public and sit through a day of consultation with the public about environmental protection matters.

What they are doing here is duck-shoving that responsibility to someone else within the agency. My experience is that it does not hurt the chief executive to have to sit through a full day of public consultation with all the various groups (the Farmers' Federation, KESAB and all the other groups), because it is a very good sounding-board, and it protects the minister, because the chief executive gets to hear the problems first-hand.

Depending on whom you believe, EPA stands for 'every problem available' if you have a negative view of the EPA, or 'every possible assistance' if you have a positive view of the EPA. My

experience of the EPA is that it is generally full of good officers administering the laws that the parliament gives them. If the parliament or the politicians are not happy with the law, then draft a private member's bill or draft a bill and change the law and mount your argument.

I have sat in this place for 15 years and listened to people come in and criticise the department for the environment and the EPA on a pretty consistent basis. Some bring in their private members' legislation and others just seek to criticise without seeking to improve. My view is very simple: if you are not happy with the role of the agency and what it does or if you are not happy with the law, then change the law.

My experience of the EPA officers is that, like all policemen, they are caught between the devil and the deep blue sea. They have to administer the law and, ultimately, policing authorities are rarely popular. My experience of the EPA is that, on balance, it does a reasonably good job across the whole state. I think there are some issues structurally with the workforce in the EPA. There are so many people acting, it could be the State Opera at the moment: everyone in there seems to be in an acting position, and as a result no-one will make a decision. That frustrates business but, again, I do not think that is the agency's fault. Ultimately it is a government matter to administer the workforce and get them into permanent positions and give them the authority to make the decisions that need to be made.

They are my comments on the bill. I think we have gone full circle. I think we are trying to correct a problem of the government's making, and I will be particularly interested in why the minister has chosen to introduce clause 6 which affects the administrative unit and in who ends up being chief executive of the agency. If the minister can answer that for me, we may not need to go into committee.

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Kaurua—Minister for Health, Minister for the Southern Suburbs, Minister Assisting the Premier in the Arts) (17:15): We may have to go into committee because I am not sure whether I can answer that question. I will address some of the general issues. I do thank the opposition for its support of the legislation—I understand that is the case. I took on board some of the issues made by members opposite. There is a certain amount of gloating on the part of the opposition because, as a couple of members said, this is the position the opposition was putting on the last occasion this was raised.

With the effluxion of time, it has been possible for government to judge the way the system was working. I think there were merits in the system that we introduced some time ago, but there was a view that the arrangements that were in place did put the CE, who was also the chair, in an invidious position at times because of the potential conflicts. The reason for making the arrangements that we and I made as the then minister was to create a CE and chair of the EPA who could actually act. I think one of the frustrations under the former arrangements led to the arrangements we put in place. However, time goes on and people have different views about how these matters should be arranged.

The issue is that we need to get the legislation through before we appoint a new CE, so they know what arrangements are in place. I do acknowledge the outstanding work done by Dr Paul Vogel. The member for Davenport acknowledged that as well and I think other members may have. He did do the job in a very fair and honest way. Mr Allan Holmes is acting in the position. I think that he has been on the board the entire time we have been in government and he may have been on the board in the former government's time as well. The reason for asking him to do it was that he was very knowledgeable about the organisation. I am confident that, once this legislation has gone through, the appointment can be made.

In relation to the matter about the administrative arrangements, as I understand it, now that the CE and the chair will be different people, it is appropriate that the administrative arrangements for the CE are common with the arrangements for all other CEs in the state; that is, they are appointed generally and then they are appointed to a particular organisation. That is the way, for example, the health CE is appointed. I think they are appointed by contract to the Premier, from memory. I think the arrangements were put in place so that all CEs are now responsible for the whole of government policy, not just the bit which is in their division. It is an attempt to modernise the Public Service generally so that all the chief executives are responsible for the broader objectives that are set out in the State Strategic Plan, for example. This brings this in line with those arrangements.

A board will be responsible for the broader policy and strategies and so on, so that will maintain the independence. As I understand it, the officers who work within the EPA are public servants and subject to the Public Service act generally, so it brings this particular officer in line

with the arrangements that apply to all the other officers. I do not think I can add much more. I hope that explains the situation. Once again, I thank members for their contributions and I place on the record my thanks to the public servants and parliamentary counsel for their assistance with this bill.

Bill read a second time.

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Kaurua—Minister for Health, Minister for the Southern Suburbs, Minister Assisting the Premier in the Arts) (17:21): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (17:21): The minister can take this on notice and send it to me in due course rather than hold up the house because, at the end of the day, the bill will get through and the opposition generally supports the bill. With due respect to the officers giving the advice, I think that new clause 6 (which deletes and then introduces a new section 14A in the act) allows DEH to provide the administrative support to the Environment Protection Authority, if the minister so wishes.

As the minister handling the bill knows, that is the exact provision that was changed under his reign as the environment minister so that that could not happen. While it is not directly written in the act that it shall be DEH, it can be any administrative unit if the minister agrees. It does open it up for a government, without the parliament's approval, to go against a decision made under a previous act to separate the EPA staff from DEH staff.

I think that, while it does not directly create conflict, certainly it creates the opportunity for a future minister to reintroduce the way this was administered five years ago with the sharing of administrative units between the EPA and the DEH. The minister can send me a note and just clarify that, or, if I still have concerns when I get the note, I can ring the officers and get a more formal briefing.

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Kaurua—Minister for Health, Minister for the Southern Suburbs, Minister Assisting the Premier in the Arts) (17:25): Rather than get this information in an indirect way, I will get a note to the honourable member and arrange a briefing.

Bill read a third time and passed.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (ETHICAL INVESTMENT—STATE SUPERANNUATION) BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

TORRENS TITLE

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON (Croydon—Attorney-General, Minister for Justice, Minister for Multicultural Affairs) (17:25): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: I rise to draw the attention of members to the approaching 150th anniversary of the system of landownership known as Torrens Title. It was on 1 July 1858 that our first Real Property Act came into force, beginning the system of land titles registration that still flourishes today. A symposium in honour of this anniversary is to be held at the University of Adelaide Law School on Friday 20 June. The Torrens Title system was championed by the redoubtable Sir Robert Torrens, a member in this place and briefly the premier.

Mrs Geraghty interjecting:

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: The member for Torrens is quite right; and a great Irishman he was. It was championed with the support of various helpers, including the legal scholar, Dr Ulrich Hübbe, one of our German settlers, as well as Mr Anthony Forster, the then editor of South Australia's first newspaper, *The Register*, and many others. As well as advocating the system in the colony's principal newspaper, Forster was also a member of another place where he had the carriage of the bill, while Torrens himself steered it through this place having stood for election on a platform, including land titles reform. Herr Hübbe, for his part, distributed to the members of this place a book he had written pleading for the introduction of a more rational system of land titles that certainly helped the cause of reform.

Indeed, Torrens acknowledged the help he had received from a variety of early South Australians, including both British and German settlers, in the adoption of the new system, making this an example of what can be achieved by people of different origins working together. The Torrens system superseded the cumbersome and uncertain old system in which land transfers

depended on the tracing of documentary chains of title back through history. That system was, of course, remunerative for lawyers but burdensome and unsatisfactory for the buyers and sellers of land.

Much work was needed under the old system to establish what encumbrances affected the land and whether the seller was in a position to pass good title. If a mistake were made the buyer might well lose his money. The old system had been, of course, inherited from English law, but it soon became clear that it was wholly unsuited to South Australia. Whereas in England only a few could aspire to own land, migration to South Australia was fuelled by the reasonable expectation of landownership. This meant that the process of land transfer was of vital interest to a great part of the population.

New settlers could not accept that, in some cases, the cost of the legal work needed to buy land was as much as the cost of the land itself, and that even after they had paid it they could not be entirely certain of owning clear title to the land. In the 1850s, hundreds of miners were returning to South Australia from the Victorian goldfields, some newly rich. They, too, wanted to buy land. German settlers were also familiar with more rational systems of land titles in the lands of their birth and found it difficult to understand how a new colony could have made land titles so complicated so soon.

By the 1850s, of the 40,000 properties in the province, the original deeds for more than half had been lost and for some 5,000, the state of the title was unsatisfactory. It is not surprising, then, that public agitation for reform increased and that this historic measure became law within a year of the first elected parliament in this state.

As members will be aware, under the Torrens system, the former researches into the chain of title are needless. Title to land depends on registration. The prospective buyer can rely on the register, the accuracy of which is guaranteed by the state and backed by an assurance fund. This makes land transactions far quicker, simpler and cheaper than under the old system and protects against the risk that the seller might not be able to pass good title.

It is a tribute to the public servants who have administered the act since 1858 that the assurance fund has always had far more money than it has needed to deal with the very few mistakes that have been made in administration. Indeed, no further contributions to the assurance fund have been required from users of the system since the end of 1988.

First adopted in South Australia in 1858, the Torrens system of land title was soon taken up by other jurisdictions. In 1862, only four years after its adoption in South Australia, this system had proved to be such a success that it was taken up by two much richer and larger colonies; New South Wales and Victoria, in the face of campaigns by some lawyers to preserve the old system in the interests of keeping legal fees high.

By its 17th anniversary in 1875, the Torrens system applied throughout all the Australian colonies and in New Zealand. It has continued to spread and it is now in use in seven of the ten Canadian provinces—the Torrens registry in British Columbia opened for business as early as 5 April 1861—and in Malaysia, Singapore, the Philippines, Papua New Guinea, as well as in some countries in Africa and the Caribbean. There are also reports of its existence, more difficult to confirm, in countries as diverse as Madagascar, Tunisia and Iran. Torrens title has been described by Associate Professor Greg Taylor of Monash University as 'South Australia's most successful intellectual export'.

Mr Venning interjecting:

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: The member for Schubert says that his great-grandfather campaigned for Torrens title. His name?

Mr Venning: William Jasper Venning.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: Although 150 years old, Torrens Title remains a thoroughly modern invention. As I have mentioned, it was intended to promote and does promote the wide ownership of land by all sectors of society and thus contributes to a more egalitarian society. Yes, one day we may even break down the Venning estates and hand them back to the peasants.

More than any other system of landholding, it lends itself to computerisation. Australia is now working towards a national electronic conveyancing system that builds on the Torrens system and will yet further improve the speed and convenience of land transactions. It may well be that, as electronic commerce advances, we will in future see more jurisdictions adopting Torrens title as a simple and reliable system for land transactions.

The Torrens system's recent extension to cover almost the whole of Ontario and its adoption in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick at the start of the 21st century is largely attributable to its suitability for computer-based operation. This is a remarkable thing indeed for an invention that is 150 years old and a tribute to the soundness of the principles upon which it is based.

I commend this great South Australian achievement to honourable members, an example of what, with foresight and determination, can be accomplished in this place and by South Australian society.

At 17:35 the house adjourned until Thursday 5 June 2008 at 10:30.