

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 5 June 2008

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

LEGAL PROFESSION BILL

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for State/Local Government Relations, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Volunteers, Minister for Consumer Affairs, Minister Assisting in Early Childhood Development) (10:32): I move:

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

Motion carried.

NEIGHBOURHOOD DISPUTE RESOLUTION BILL

The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher) (10:32): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to provide an alternative dispute resolution mechanism for residential neighbours. Read a first time.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher) (10:32): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

I guarantee that there would not be a member in this house who has not had to deal with a dispute between neighbours, whether it be in relation to trees, dogs, cats, car parking, noise, alleged voyeurism, car access—all sorts of things. In my experience I have had to deal with many of those situations, some of which seem quite petty, yet they involve a lot of time and often the local council also finds itself in a difficult situation when trying to deal with a dispute between neighbours. From the perspective of a local MP, you might win a vote (if you can sort out the matter) but you might lose a vote, as well, from the other neighbour.

This bill creates the position of a neighbourhood ombudsman. Some people have suggested that we could use the existing ombudsman. I would not have a problem with that, but I think it is better to have a specialist position to deal with disputes between neighbours. Unlike the current arrangement where we have mediation services, the neighbourhood ombudsman could and would be able to require the disputing parties to attend a conciliation meeting or conference. At present mediation does not work in many cases because people do not attend. They cannot be compelled to attend, so one neighbour might want to sort out the issue and the other might not want to participate and, as a result, there is a festering sore in the community over a long time.

I point out that the neighbourhood ombudsman would not be a court. The ombudsman could require the complainant and the respondent to attend a meeting and he or she could look at the written material. The complaint itself must be in writing and it must not be frivolous and vexatious—the usual provisions apply. The ombudsman can require such books, papers or other documents to be supplied to him or her, but no-one is required to produce material which could incriminate them in an offence. It provides a simple mechanism for getting the neighbours together—it might involve an issue of trees, fences, dogs, cats, car parking arrangements, access to driveways—all those sorts of things—so the ombudsman can sit them down and hear from both parties in relation to the matter.

The ombudsman can refer the issue to the police, if he or she thinks fit, or to any other agency. The main thrust of the bill is to ensure that as far as possible the matter is conciliated so it does not have to go to court and it does not have to be dealt with by another agency. The bill has confidentiality provisions to protect the people involved. It has a provision that the ombudsman will not entertain anything which is frivolous or vexatious. The complaint must be lodged within six months of the act or omission (the subject of dispute) or, if it is a series of acts or omissions, within six months of the last of those acts or omissions.

There is a provision that the ombudsman must cause a written summary of the particulars of the complaint to be served personally or by post on the respondent named in the complaint, to avoid any suggestion that the respondent has not been contacted. I am not aware that the position of neighbourhood ombudsman exists anywhere else in Australia, although I cannot give an absolute guarantee that that is the case.

I think it is a simple measure, which would save a lot of pain and heartache. It would save members of parliament a lot of pain and suffering, and also councils—and I have spoken to people in councils. In fact, I was talking to a senior elected member of the City of Onkaparinga last night.

He thought it was a very good measure, because these sorts of issues—disputes between neighbours—take up a lot of council time, and allowing them to fester is not good for the neighbours or the wellbeing of the particular neighbourhood.

So, the sensible approach that is reflected in the bill is to bring the two parties together and require them to sit down with the ombudsman to conciliate the issue, and I would predict that in most cases that is likely to occur. Under the current arrangements, where it is optional to attend for mediation, a resolution is not reached because the warring parties do not want to meet.

I commend this bill to the house. I believe it has merit, and I would like to see it taken on board in South Australia. One suggestion last night from the elected member from the City of Onkaparinga was that we could trial it in a couple of council areas. I am not opposed to that. If someone is keen to amend the bill to provide for a trial in one or several local government areas I do not have a problem with that. However, I do not think that is really necessary. There are provisions in the bill for the Attorney-General to provide for regulations to deal with some ancillary matters. I commend the bill to the house, and I trust that members will support it.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. I.F. Evans.

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

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 8 May 2008. Page 3254.)

Mr VENNING (Schubert) (10:40): This is a very significant bill, and I think it is important that we speak about it today, particularly in relation to the revelations that I heard this morning on ABC Radio. Electronic crime today is a serious matter. This morning we heard about a site containing paedophilic material that had thousands of hits in the first hour, and now the police are tracing those callers.

I agree with the member for Davenport, whom I commend for raising this matter, because it is all about convicted sexual offenders who are already on the register. The member believes (and our party supports him) that the registry should also contain their email address, which ought to be supplied to the police, so that their activity can be quickly picked up if they access material on the electronic media.

As I said, I support the member for Davenport on this matter. Electronic crime is rampant today. When I heard this on the radio this morning I said to my wife, 'It's just shocking to see so many hits.' It makes you wonder what our society is coming to. There were many hits in the first hour—thousands of them—and the allied activity that went with that was quite horrific. We are certainly making a lot of work for our police force, and we should do anything we can to make it easier for them.

I think this measure is very commendable. The question that needs to be asked is: why is it not so already? I cite Professor Sumner Miller's proverbial saying: why is this not so? Why leave this motion on the *Notice Paper*? I think that we should vote on it now and be done with it. Surely the government will not disagree with this. I am very pleased that, at least when people are accessing these websites, there is a trace-back, and I say good on the police for being able to find it. We need to stamp out this activity, because it is like a cancer: it is infiltrating all levels of our society. I commend the member for Davenport, and I ask the house to support the measure.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher) (10:43): I support the bill. I would like to take the issue back to a more fundamental point—and that is not taking away anything from this proposal. As a society, clearly, we have not been able to deal with human sexuality as we should have done, and that is reflected in the fact that we have people who prey on children. Quite frankly, I do not understand how people can find children sexually attractive in any way, shape or form. I find it quite bizarre.

It suggests to me that those particular individuals, as reflected in their evil activity, have a serious problem. I do not believe that we as a society are addressing that issue. It is interesting that when there are attempts to introduce sex education programs in schools to make people aware and have a more open and understanding view of human sexuality—and that includes not only the physiological but also the psychological aspects—there are people in the community who oppose it.

If you look at many of these characters, 30 years ago paedophiles were regarded as unfortunate people who could not interact with others and therefore they had to interact with

children. Society has changed its view in the past 30 years and now says, 'Well, it is unacceptable; it is evil activity; it is a crime: we will not tolerate it.' I do not have a problem with that. The attitude has changed dramatically.

Apart from treatment of people who do offend—and that has to be genuine treatment and rehabilitation—there should be a system where, in effect, there is not an amnesty but an open invitation for people who find themselves attracted to children in this deviant way to be given appropriate treatment before they get into a position of offending. If they find that they have tendencies which are likely to lead them to prey on children, they should be able to contact appropriate sections of the government or non-government sector so that they can be given proper treatment—psychological programs—to change their mindset and behaviour.

At the moment, we are dealing with the event after it has happened. I want to see more effort put into preventing the abuse of children in the first place, and that means the wider (and I will not go into all the ins and outs of it now) society having a more healthy attitude towards human sexuality, instead of the double standard emphasis that we have in society at the moment where we send out mixed messages and help to create a climate where people have unhealthy attitudes to others, particularly to children. Putting that bigger picture aside for the moment, I commend this bill. I believe that people who offend against children should be closely monitored and, importantly, treated and assisted to move away from their deviant and unacceptable behaviour.

Mr HANNA (Mitchell) (10:47): The member for Davenport has brought forward a very simple, effective proposal to help combat the scourge of paedophile activity in South Australia. It is very simple: it requires the registration of all internet forms of contact had by the child sex offender. The term 'child sex offender' is already technically a term under the law: it is pretty clear what that means. Clearly, the purpose of the legislation is to require the registration of all internet providers, names, uses of chat rooms, identities and so on in relation to a child sex offender to make it easier for police to track what they are doing. This, by definition, is after they have been convicted of such a crime. It is an aid to law enforcement.

I do not see how anyone in this place could possibly object to such a measure. It could only be assumed that those who wish to adjourn the matter today are opposed to this measure which will help to fight paedophile activity.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mrs Geraghty.

GAMING MACHINES (HOURS OF OPERATION) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 8 May 2008. Page 3262.)

Mr GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel) (10:49): I am pleased to make a contribution in relation to the bill introduced by the member for Davenport. Last time the house dealt with this legislation, I had commenced my remarks in relation to the bill. However, it being only a few minutes to 12 when time expired for dealing with this part of private members business, I was cut short, and so I now continue my comments. I support the legislation introduced by the member for Davenport.

My position in relation to poker machines and gaming (as the industry calls it) is reasonably well known in this place and in the broader community. When the legislation was introduced by the government in 2004 (from memory) to reduce the number of machines by 3,000, I supported every measure. It was a conscience vote. I supported every measure, including amendments moved by the government and private members. I recall that the member for Mitchell moved a considerable number of amendments which I supported. They concerned issues such as the location of automatic teller machines in licensed premises.

It has been my view that, if you have a licensed premises with gaming machines, poker machines, then an automatic teller machine should not be located in those premises. A reasonable amount of research which has been undertaken on that particular issue shows that it reduces the number of people in our community who are at risk of problem gambling. It reduces the likelihood of their continuing to gamble once they have expended the money that they have in front of them at the machine. As I said, my position on poker machines is well known and well covered in the local media in the electorate of Kavel in the Adelaide Hills. That is notwithstanding the fact that my family has some very close friends involved in the hotel industry. Arguably, some significant leaders in the hotel industry are our close family friends and, no doubt, my position in relation to gaming may be different from their position. Nonetheless, they respect my position. Probably they do not agree with it but they respect it; and, certainly, it does not affect our relationship. I enjoy attending the

Christmas lunch hosted by the hotels' association, the AHA; and, as I said, I have a number of close friends within the industry.

Coming to the substance of the bill, the actual time period that poker machines are allowed under their licence to operate needs some further regulation. I see street signs in my electorate outside gaming venues indicating that those establishments actually open at 7 o'clock in the morning—7am to 9pm, from memory, according to one of the advertisements placed out in the street. I do not know about you, Mr Speaker, but I think that allowing establishments to open at 7 o'clock in the morning so that people can gamble is not really good public policy. I just do not think that allowing people to start gambling at 7 o'clock in the morning is something of benefit generally to the community.

I understand that, at the moment, regulations within legislation state that the gaming venues must be closed for three two-hour periods in a 24-hour time frame. In reality, obviously not all gaming venues close at the same time over that six-hour period. Some venues might close from 2am to 4am or from 6am to 8am, and so on; however, other venues are open in the metropolitan area and, obviously, the proximity of one venue to another is relatively close, so that someone with an addiction to gambling can gamble on poker machines 24 hours a day, going from one to another.

It is not terribly difficult, as I said, to find three or four metropolitan hotels with poker machines in relatively close proximity so that people can move around them with relative ease. I think that any measure to assist problem gamblers to break or to reduce their habit is worthy of support.

The member for Davenport's proposal is that all gaming venues, apart from the Casino, close at 3am and not reopen until 9am. That gives a six-hour break right across the whole state, so that, even if a poor soul feels compelled to keep playing the poker machines, they cannot—they have no outlet for that activity, they have no outlet to continue that addiction. I believe that it is a good and sensible measure and, certainly, a measure worthy of support.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr O'Brien.

**CRIMINAL LAW (CLAMPING, IMPOUNDING AND FORFEITURE OF VEHICLES)
(PRESCRIBED OFFENCES) AMENDMENT BILL**

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 6 March 2008. Page 2466.)

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (10:58): I rise today to support the motion to expand the powers relating to clamping of vehicles to include an offence against section 17 of the Summary Offences Act. Too many times in our community we see acts of hoon driving and other types of inappropriate use of vehicles stirring up neighbourhoods, etc., and causing distress in our community.

Only recently an extended road works program in Murray Bridge caused a lot of grief to residents who just did not want to pick up the pieces from people using vehicles inappropriately. A vehicle came skidding down a road while it was being resurfaced with new bitumen. The road was all white rubble at the time while the surface was being prepared. On this afternoon this person decided to throw the car sideways and land it on the pathway, and it almost hit some people but, thankfully, no-one was hurt. However, there was plenty of potential for someone being either severely hurt or killed in this instance.

I think that bringing in this measure to amend the original act is an excellent improvement, especially as it applies to people who use vehicles for criminal offences. We see many hundreds of businesses these days that have been forced to put up bollards in front of their premises. We have seen time and again on the evening news reports of people using vehicles to ram-raid business premises for quick vehicle access and, I guess, a quick getaway.

Mr Goldsworthy interjecting:

Mr PEDERICK: Yes, as the member for Kavel just indicated, they also use their vehicles inappropriately, crashing into police vehicles which may be in pursuit, and this can cause the airbags to go off in the police vehicle and the chase has to end. Too many times we see the tragic tale of innocent people, such as the recent case of the SES volunteer just going to work, being hit by some idiot who, basically, is on the road unlawfully using a vehicle.

Frankly, I think we should make it even tougher; two strikes and you lose your vehicle forever. I am not sure what goes on at present, but I think the law needs to be tougher to really be a disincentive for people who use their vehicles inappropriately and in a criminal manner, often to ram-raid business premises or, for example, to hold up a bank or service station. I support the bill.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mrs Geraghty.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (WATER CONSERVATION TARGET AND SUSTAINABLE WATER RESOURCES) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 6 March 2008. Page 2473.)

Mr O'BRIEN (Napier) (11:03): The member for Mitchell's bill seeks to amend the Public Corporations Act, the South Australian Water Corporation Act and the Waterworks Act in order to ensure, in his view, that the water conservation activities of SA Water become more effective than they are currently. Specifically, the bill seeks to amend the South Australian Water Corporation Act by inserting a per capita water consumption reduction target in the legislation. It is interesting to note that this bill was first moved by the Hon. Mark Parnell, who agreed for the bill to be taken from the *Notice Paper* and referred to the established Select Committee on SA Water. To quote the Hon. Mark Parnell:

When the committee reports it will include...an analysis of the bill and make recommendations on whether it is an appropriate one to bring back to this chamber to be passed. As the mover of the bill, I have no objection to taking this course of action and referring my bill to the Select Committee on SA Water.

Therefore, the question that should be asked is: if the original mover of the bill is willing to wait for the report of the select committee, why is the member for Mitchell not willing to do the same? In addition, given that this bill is proposing some major changes to the way SA Water would operate, the member for Mitchell has provided a second reading of five small paragraphs, with no scientific analysis to support the amendments that he and the bill's original mover, the Hon. Mark Parnell, want. Would it not have been more prudent to provide some preliminary analysis on how the bill's water conservation targets could actually be achieved? The Hon. Mark Parnell provided even less justification for the bill, essentially agreeing to send it straight to the select committee.

The government will oppose the bill for the following reasons: SA Water operates in accordance with a charter determined by the Treasurer and the Minister for Water Security. The charter cannot be read in isolation from the broader government policies and the South Australian Strategic Plan. In the 2006 election, the Rann government made a commitment to amend the legislation establishing SA Water to ensure it implements environmentally-friendly water initiatives and policies. In addition, the government committed to modernising the Waterworks Act and the Sewerage Act to ensure that they support water conservation and recycling.

The government plans to proceed with these reforms in a consultative manner over the forthcoming year. It is vital that all stakeholders have the opportunity to contribute to this process to ensure that the revised legislation delivers sustainable outcomes for South Australia.

In his speech, the honourable member referred to SA Water's contribution to government revenue. I point out that it is not unreasonable for SA Water to provide a return to the taxpayers of the state. The government uses these contributions made by SA Water towards funding services that are for the benefit of all South Australians.

The deficiencies of this bill stem from some basic misconceptions about how the government and SA Water are managing the impact of the drought. To assert that both the government and SA Water are not actively pursuing water conservation measures is simply inaccurate. This government and SA Water have implemented numerous initiatives to encourage efficient use of water. This included the introduction of permanent water conservation methods in 2003 and, as the drought developed, implementing increasingly stringent water restrictions.

The success of these initiatives can be demonstrated by the consistent reduction in the water consumption figures for the state. During the first quarter of this year, South Australian households have reduced their water consumption by around 30 per cent compared to the same period during the drought year of 2002. In addition to the successful water restrictions currently in place, the South Australian Natural Resources Management Act 2004 provides an array of strong measures in relation to water management, including prescription of water resources and the development and implementation of catchment water management plans.

There are three main themes to this bill. The first theme is the proposed amendments of the public corporations and the SA Water corporation legislation to insert requirements around water conservation and ecologically sustainable development. The government has already committed to the essence of this proposal. This commitment is highlighted in initiative 4.1 of the SA Water Strategic Plan 2005-2009, which aims to implement the outcomes of Waterproofing Adelaide, including a rolling 20-year plan for securing sustainable water resources.

The second theme of the bill is to insert a specific water conservation target which would aim to achieve a 30 per cent per capita consumption reduction by 1 July 2015 into legislation. SA Water is a supplier of water to consumers rather than a major consumer in its own right. It is therefore illogical to hold SA Water accountable for the excessive use of water in this state. However, SA Water's revised water charter now incorporates a direct reference to water conservation, requiring it to do its utmost in supporting the objectives and targets of the South Australian Strategic Plan.

Ultimately, however, it is up to consumers to reduce their water usage. The government recognises the need to target consumers when seeking to reduce the demands for water. As of July 2006, the government has required the installation of rainwater tanks in all new houses. It also offers rebates to subsidise the connection of rainwater tanks into the plumbing system for existing houses. Importantly, this initiative allows established homes to also contribute to a more efficient use of our limited water resources. The government will soon announce plans for a revised scheme of incentives to further build on these initiatives.

Further to this, water prices will not remain at current levels. Through necessity, price increases will need to occur in order to better reflect the scarcity of our most valuable resource and to enable the funding of a desalination plant. South Australia will move from the current two tier water pricing structure to a three tier one in the year 2008-09. This will mean, on average, an increase of 12.7 per cent in real terms from July next year. The sending of this price message should further encourage business and household water conservation. The government, through its commitment to implementing the Waterproofing Adelaide 2005-2025 strategy, envisages:

reducing annual mains water demand so that by 2025 consumption will be lower than it would otherwise have been by about 35,000 megalitres.

It is estimated that, of this 35,000 megalitre saving, households would contribute around 30,000 megalitres, with commercial, industrial and community purpose users contributing the rest, which is about 5,000 megalitres. If achieved, this reduction in water consumption would represent around 15 per cent of our current per annum usage.

In addition to these water saving measures, on 12 February 2008 the Premier announced the establishment of the Office for Water Security. This office will become the central point for water security planning across government, creating a more efficient and functional way of managing South Australia's water supply. Specifically, the Office for Water Security will provide support to the Minister for Water Security in driving South Australia's commitment under the National Water Initiative and in the development of a comprehensive water security plan that will help waterproof Adelaide and South Australia.

The third theme in the bill relates to the requirement of SA Water to service allotments contained in water districts. Local government is responsible for determining whether or not developments are appropriate. It should not be up to a statutory corporation to determine whether developments are appropriate. Its only concern as a supplier of our state's water should be whether it can provide adequate services to the proposed development. Underlying the government's commitment to water security is that in the last 12 months over \$2.5 billion has been allocated as part of its four-way strategy dealing with this issue. This strategy includes desalination, recycling, managing water use and improved catchment management in order to secure South Australia's water supply. Importantly, \$1.1 billion is being invested in the desalination plant to be built, ultimately supplying an additional 50 billion litres of water—

Mr Pengilly interjecting:

Mr O'BRIEN: I've only got a minute. I would have liked to have dealt with that—another major project that will contribute to securing Adelaide's water supply—

Mr Pengilly interjecting:

Mr O'BRIEN: I would have got on to that. I was—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's time has expired.

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop) (11:13): That is most unfortunate, sir, because I am sure we were hanging out for his final words of wisdom. Might I say from the outset that I think the genesis of this bill was a meeting I had last year with the former upper house member Nick Xenophon in response to, obviously, the drought, low water flows into our reservoirs, low water flows down the River Murray, and the total inaction of the current government to address the issues.

I noted a couple of the things the member for Napier has just said, and his words were '\$2.5 billion has been allocated.' I question whether the money has been actually allocated. Lots of very expensive announcements have been made, but I do not think too much money actually has been allocated. I think as we go through the budget papers this afternoon we will not see \$2.5 billion, even in the out years, for major water projects in South Australia. The reality is that we have had the Treasurer, the Premier and the Minister for Water Security stand in this place, and outside of this place, and say time and again, 'We are building the biggest desalination plant in the southern hemisphere, and it will be in the Upper Spencer Gulf.'

There is a fair bit of untruth in that statement, which has been used many times. First, where does the 'we' come from? It is stock in trade for this government to use the word 'we' when it is other people and other organisations that are doing good things in South Australia. It is the same verse they sing when they talk about the production of wind energy—'we'. This government has not built one wind farm or wind tower or installed one wind generator, but the minister responsible keeps talking about 'we'.

The same applies with regard to water. The word 'we' used by this government means: 'We, the government, are doing nothing, but fortunately, in spite of us, there are some good people out there doing some good things.' That is what the word 'we' means when uttered by the Premier or a minister of this government.

Members interjecting:

Mr WILLIAMS: Particularly on water, but on power and everything else. Unfortunately, it has a monopoly over road building, otherwise we might have some people out there building decent roads as well. I say to the member for Napier—

Mrs GERAGHTY: On a point of order, I was going to raise the issue of relevance to the question before us, but if you are going to move on to the bill, I will listen carefully.

The SPEAKER: Order! I will listen carefully, as I always do—

Mr WILLIAMS: I am pleased to hear that you will listen, Mr Speaker.

The SPEAKER: As I always do.

Mr WILLIAMS: I am disturbed that you weren't listening intently anyhow.

The SPEAKER: Captivated.

Mr WILLIAMS: I understand there is a clause in our standing orders that prevents people making frivolous points of order, but the difference between me rabbiting on and some of your lot rabbiting on is that I tell the truth and talk in facts. That is the difference.

The point is that \$2.5 million has not been allocated; this government is not building a desal plant in the Upper Spencer Gulf. The history is that for three or four years it had \$25 million in the budget to build a desal plant in the Port Lincoln area. That disappeared and turned into a \$48 million pipeline and, when I and my colleagues on this side of the house complained that all that was doing was taking another 1.5 gigalitres of water out of the River Murray and shipping it to the other end of the state, the government said, 'Watch this space.'

We are still watching because it is a pretty empty space and that is why this piece of legislation has been brought before the house and why we keep making the point that SA Water, which is suppose to have a charter to provide water and sewerage services to the good people of this state, has a much more important role for this government, namely, being a cash cow. That is what SA Water is about.

We had a 6 per cent across-the-board increase in water rates 18 months ago, announced by the then minister Michael Wright—the minister who has had virtually every portfolio taken away from him in six years, but who continues to sit on the front bench.

The Hon. R.G. Kerin: No-one else would take WorkCover.

Mr WILLIAMS: No-one else will take WorkCover. He continues to sit on the front bench. WorkCover is the only organisation he has been left with, and we all know what a mess he has made of that, but he continues to sit there. We had this nonsense that we were going to build a desal plant in the Upper Spencer Gulf, but the space is now empty. Now we move to a desal plant at the Port Stanvac site. We are waiting, waiting, waiting, waiting, waiting, waiting! I will guarantee that if the drought breaks—and I certainly hope it does sooner rather than later—I do not think we will ever see a desal plant built at Port Stanvac by this government.

Just like we had the \$850 million announcement about this time last year—I think on the eve of the budget—for a new dam at Mount Bold, by September or October the government had changed its talking and said that it would double the storage in the hills. It got the same information we did. We will not double the capacity of Mount Bold or build a new dam there for \$850 million. At least \$1.3 billion was the estimate we received, and I expect it will be even more than that. The government now has that information and has walked away from that one. So, the \$2.5 billion the member for Napier is talking about is illusory. It is one of those famous mirages. It is not in the desert, but on the front bench. That is where all the mirages are with this government—on the front bench.

So, the \$2.5 billion is not allocated and will not be spent, which is the problem. We are putting up the rates again. We had the 6 per cent Michael Wright announced at the end of 2006; we had 12.5 per cent announced last year; and the Treasurer has been quite firm that that 12.5 per cent is of the order we will see year in, year out for at least the next four years. So water prices are going up and we are getting nothing spent, getting very little done, and getting no more water.

To talk briefly about stormwater, having brought the government kicking and screaming from a position of saying that desal is not the way to go in South Australia, it is too expensive, that it does not want it, and so on, it has done the same with stormwater, except it is a little different. The Minister for Water Security stands up and says, 'We're doing it; we're spending money.' When asked the question only this week, 'What specific money has been spent by this government on stormwater harvesting?', the answer was zip, that no money has been spent.

On Monday afternoon or Tuesday morning I downloaded from the SA Water website, the minister's website, its plan to produce 20 gigalitres of stormwater and rainwater by 2025. It is on its website and I invite the member for Napier to have a look. That is just too slow. It is about the same pace as we are moving to build a desal plant south of Adelaide. I spent a few weeks in Spain and Singapore a couple of months ago looking specifically at these issues.

The Hon. J.W. Weatherill interjecting:

Mr WILLIAMS: It was very nice, the weather was lovely. I was specifically looking at desal. In South Australia we are told that we are doing a huge amount of work, that we want to get it right, that it will take at least six years and that everywhere else takes six years. I specifically asked one of the biggest manufacturers/installers of desalination plants around the world, a Spanish company I visited, how long it would take them to build a desal plant in Adelaide if we gave them the job.

He said that it would take a little while to get the permit but, that aside, 18 months to two years, tops, including ordering all the parts and materials. We should have a desalination plant operating in South Australia by the first quarter of next year. That is what should have been done if the government was serious about water. That is why this piece of legislation is before the house.

I will tell the member for Mitchell that the opposition supports the tenor of his bill, and we will certainly support it at the second reading. If it is successful, we will be moving some amendments. We are more than happy to support the bill, because SA Water is not doing what it should be doing, that is, providing water to South Australians at a realistic cost. Why on earth when we are going to have somebody else design, build and manage the desal plant south of Adelaide have we put on about 40 new people at SA Water to manage the desal project?

Time expired.

Mr HANNA (Mitchell) (11:23): I thank honourable members for their contribution. I acknowledge as described in part by the member for Napier some of the good things that the government has been doing in relation to stormwater management and the oversight of SA Water but, as the member for MacKillop has pointed out, it has done nowhere near enough. For a government that has been in office for six years, we would have expected a lot more tangible solutions by now. Waterproofing Adelaide is an excellent program and a very good blueprint for what needs to be done, but only a fraction of that has been implemented.

I acknowledge that the minister has moved to amend the charter of SA Water in line with what exactly I am proposing in this bill, so I am quite confident that I am on the right track. I appreciate the constructive remarks made by the member for MacKillop, and I acknowledge that there is room for improvement of this bill when we get to consider it in detail, but I am confident that the principle of the bill is on the right track.

Second reading negatived.

FAIR WORK (PROHIBITION AGAINST BARGAINING SERVICES FEE) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 14 February 2008. Page 2085.)

The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher) (11:25): I wish to make a brief contribution. The measure that seeks to prohibit unions charging a bargaining services fee misses the point somewhat. In my view, the issue is not about prohibiting a bargaining services fee: the issue is that, if one gets a benefit, should one contribute towards the cost and effort that has gone into obtaining that benefit? In other words, if you do not belong to a union and you get the benefit that the union has obtained for workers in that particular area, I believe it is quite fair and reasonable that you make some contribution towards the cost of getting that benefit.

I would argue that any fee which is to be charged or levied against a non-union member should be determined by the independent commission, not by the union itself. I think that is a fair way to go about this. I have never supported people who are bludgers or parasites. There has always been a provision that if one did not want to join a union, one could make an equivalent donation to the Children's Hospital, or something similar, and some people have availed themselves of that.

Wherever I have worked, I have always belonged to the relevant union. Unions have not always acted the way they probably should but, in terms of industrial relations, I think any person who does not belong to a union is taking a risky approach to their employment situation. As I have just indicated, some unions and some union officials at times overstep the mark; you get that in all areas of life and all areas of the economy. I am well aware that the Labor Party is obviously strongly linked to the unions, as is the Liberal Party in relation to business, farm groups and professional groups, but the reality is that, if one gets a benefit that can be demonstrated as arising from the actions of the union, in fairness, one should contribute towards the cost of getting that benefit.

The difference from some others is that the fee should be fair and reasonable and determined by the Industrial Relations Commission, or an equivalent independent body, not by the union itself. Therefore, I do not support prohibiting a bargaining services fee in total. I do not think it is fair or reasonable. I do not like people getting a free ride whether they are in a union, not in a union, or anywhere in society. I do not like freeloaders. By seeking to prohibit the bargaining services fee in total, this bill misses what could be a more fair and reasonable approach; that is, having the fee determined by an independent body and not by the union itself.

Ms SIMMONS (Morialta) (11:29): The government opposes this bill at this time, as it would be unnecessary and heavy-handed legislation. The bill is also pre-emptive of the new nationally coordinated industrial relations system, which is in the very early stages of development, involving the new federal Labor government and the states and territories. Fundamentally, this bill addresses a matter that is unlikely to arise in the South Australian industrial jurisdiction as it currently stands. If it were to do so, it would be appropriately addressed in accordance with existing decisions of the South Australian Industrial Relations Commission.

It is generally recognised that a very high proportion of strongly unionised workplaces are now, as a consequence of the former federal Liberal government's WorkChoices legislation, within the federal industrial jurisdiction. This means that the federal prohibition against approval of bargaining fees in agreements, which has been in place since 2003, operates to effectively restrict the potential use bargaining fees in South Australian workplaces.

Debate adjourned.

RAIL NETWORK, SEAFORD RISE

Mr PENGILLY (Finniss) (11:30): I move:

That this house condemns the Rann government for the failure to extend the rail network to Seaford Rise.

This motion would come as no surprise to members in this chamber. It has been discussed at length and raised quite regularly in the two years since I was elected a member of parliament. However, the issue will not go away. The fact is that tens of thousands of people, who live on the other side of Darlington in the southern area, are loud and clear in their desire to have a far better public transport system than that which now exists and which is serving the south. Indeed, they have a great desire to have it extended as far as possible.

There seems to be a well-used cliché 'the forgotten south', which is relevant in this argument. It has been bandied around for quite some time. I think the government has totally forgotten about the south. The south stops at Darlington and that is about as far as it wants to go, despite the fact that there are a number of Labor held electorates down there. We have a Minister for Southern Suburbs and local members have been there for some time.

It is a social justice issue. Quite clearly, the people of the south are not getting treated properly. They should have the capacity to get on a decent, reliable, safe public transport system to come in and out of the city—as do many other people in the metropolitan area—but that is just not happening. There is no fairness in the system. There are no plans. Lo and behold, perhaps we will get a wonderful announcement this afternoon in the Treasurer's budget speech that the government will extend the rail south. Nothing would give me greater pleasure than to soak that up at 3 o'clock this afternoon when the Treasurer delivers his forecast for the next 12 months. I have sincere doubt that will happen. In fact, I am sure it will not happen.

There is a total lack of respect. Onkaparinga council and Mayor Lorraine Rosenberg (who used to be in this place) have been advocating strongly and speaking out loudly on behalf of the large constituency in the south.

Mr Hanna: She is a very good mayor.

Mr PENGILLY: She is a very good mayor, as the member for Mitchell says. Felicity-ann Lewis is another good mayor. These people are strong and powerful advocates for their community. They are saying loud and clear what they desire for their area and their population. They are getting things thrust upon them. Local government is being required to be more accountable. I do not have a problem with that, and I am sure they do not have a problem with it, either. The fact is that while they are accountable this government is not accountable for what it is not doing for the people of the south.

The growth down there is enormous. In the past 12 months the Minister for Urban Development and Planning has announced the extension of the urban growth boundary. The Onkaparinga council is shaking its head and wondering how it will cope with the influx of more people and less money to deal with it. The population at large would like the ability to hop on a train or light rail service (or whatever) to come into the central metropolitan area, whether it be to come into the city centre or to sports fields or to visit family.

Many people in the south do not have high incomes. Public transport is a must for them and at present they are restricted. In my view, the Rann government has absolutely failed to deliver any meaningful, good service to people in the southern suburbs, extending through to Sellicks Beach. It has failed to deliver the goods. It regularly pooh-poohs it and it has not come up with a plan for the future down there, despite the best efforts of people in the area, whether it be through progress associations, councils, pensioner associations or as individuals.

Individuals contact me by email and telephone me. They are saying they are not happy; 'Who is going to do something about looking after the people down south?' This government does not care. Everything is being done in the north of the city. Enormous amounts of money are being spent in the northern suburbs. We have had an announcement about \$100 million for a roof over Football Park. Well, I am a football fan and it would be nice to sit there with a roof over my head but it would be even nicer to be able to catch a tram from the south to go to Football Park. So \$100 million is being spent at Football Park, but we cannot get anything done to extend the public transport system over the Onkaparinga River into the southern suburbs.

I think it is an absolute disgrace, and I am sure most members in this place would agree with me. Even some government members may agree with me—but I will not hold my breath waiting for that. The time is rapidly approaching when we want to hear from the Rann government. More to the point, we would like to hear those members who represent the south tell us what the plan is for a good public transport system to serve those thousands of people—because it is just not happening.

Mitsubishi closed and hundreds of jobs were lost. Now that it has been shut for a few weeks, we need to know how many of those people have found jobs. They live in that area. They do not want to go north but, if they have to, if they have to travel from their homes and those northern environs, they need a public transport system. We do not need to see more and more traffic on the roads. These people should be able to catch a decent, clean train, where one can see out of the windows, instead of the disgraceful things that we have at the moment, which are unbelievably antiquated. I think our trains are an embarrassment to South Australia. I travel along Morphett Road and I am regularly stopped at the Oaklands crossing when trains go past, and I shake my head.

The train system in Perth is absolutely magnificent. The stations are clean and the trains are modern—they are electrified, they run on time and they are quiet—however, in Adelaide we have these ancient, clapped out, dirty, scruffy looking trains. No wonder the drivers and the staff who work for the department of transport are leaking like sieves. How would you feel about getting out of bed in the morning and going to work to drive one of those things? One has to shake one's head in disbelief.

Why on earth has the government not done something to provide an efficient, up-to-date, modern rail service that has been extended south to Seaford, at least—and perhaps we can even look at other options to support public transport to and from the south coast and the Fleurieu Peninsula. But first and foremost—

Mrs Geraghty interjecting:

Mr PENGILLY: There is a cracked record on the other side, I think, going 'Wha, wha, wha.' If the member wants to get up and have a go and say something positive, that is fine—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr PENGILLY: —but the reality is that I am speaking up for people in her so-called electorate down south who are not getting a fair go. They do not have a decent public transport system anywhere near far enough down south. What is the government going to do about this issue?

As I said earlier, this is a social justice issue and, quite frankly, this government is failing the people south of Darlington. As I also said earlier, perhaps the Treasurer (Hon. Mr Foley) will come in here this afternoon and make a grand announcement on a southern rail system; I do not know. I guess government members already know whether that will or will not happen. I suggest, member for Fisher, that by the looks on their faces on the other side: 'No, there ain't nothing happening.'

I took the opportunity to speak on this matter because it is important. I rest my case by saying that it is time the government showed some leadership and a desire to assist the people of the south. Public transport is the way of the future—it has to be the way of the future. Because of the increase in oil prices we will see a reduction in the number of vehicles on the road, particularly large vehicles, and people are looking for the option of good, reliable, safe public transport. The people of the south should be at the forefront of having a brand new system with the electrification and extension of rail to those areas.

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Kaurua—Minister for Health, Minister for the Southern Suburbs, Minister Assisting the Premier in the Arts) (11:41): I move to amend the motion as follows:

Delete all words after 'That this house' and insert 'notes the report 'Extension of the Noarlunga Rail Line to Seaford' and its recommendations, in particular, that the Seaford rail extension be retained as a potential public service transport project and that a rail corridor to Aldinga be identified'.

Mr HANNA: Madam Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The minister's amendment fundamentally changes the tenor of the proposal, and it should be the subject of a separate motion.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The amendment is in order. It deals with the same subject matter.

The Hon. J.D. HILL: I am surprised that the member for Mitchell would try to interfere with the nature of the debate in this way. If he wants to advocate for the Liberal Party in this place, that is fine with me. Many people in politics and in the local community have spoken about the proposed rail extension. It is not surprising that the member for Finniss has now joined that list. He joins a fine list of Liberals who have spoken on this topic.

The former member for Kingston, Kym Richardson, raised this issue on his first attempt to stand for that seat at the election before last. He made a lot of noise about it. He wrote to me after

he was elected and asked to be involved in some sort of process. I wrote back and said, 'Well, tell me how much money the federal government wants to put on the table.' Not once did I hear back from the federal member for Kingston. He raised the issue very prominently in the community and he campaigned around it, but there was not one single dollar or one single commitment. At the last federal election there were no promises from Kym Richardson on the issue of the railway. I note in the paper today that he is now standing as the Liberal candidate for Mawson, so it will be interesting to see how he raises the issue yet again. But there were no promises.

I note in the contribution today by the member for Finniss that there was no commitment by members of the Liberal Party to this railway extension; there was no promise by them. There was not even a vague suggestion that if they were in government they would build this. It is all about: 'Why hasn't the government done something?'

If they are serious, if they are fair-dinkum, if they are convinced that this is the right way to go and the right way to spend money, they should put it on the table that, if they are elected at the next election they will build it, in what time frame, how much they will invest and where is the pathway. If they do not do that, people will see through them and realise that they are insincere and are just playing politics. As opposed to other members who have raised this issue, I have done something about this proposition. I live in Seaford; I live in the southern suburbs. Unlike those others who from time to time speak about this issue, I know the—

Mr Pederick interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. HILL: I would not talk too loudly on the other side. I have lived in my electorate for the entire time I have been a member. I am a proud resident of Seaford—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. HILL: Yes, that's true. I am a proud member of the Seaford community and I am very committed to having the extension of the railway to Seaford. That is why I was pleased to be able to advocate for the review that was done by the government into the extension of the Seaford line. We did not commit to building it. We said that we would have a proper investigation. The purpose of the investigation was to evaluate the extension of the railway line to Seaford through examining the proposal's economic and engineering feasibility and its impact on the objectives in South Australia's Strategic Plan.

The South Australian government is aware of the value of an improved metropolitan public transport system in terms of ecological sustainability, social justice, health, the economy, urban planning and community building. The government has set the strategic context for improving public transport by making the growth of public transport patronage one of the 98 targets in our State Strategic Plan. South Australia is the only Australian state to have such a plan and, of course, it is being monitored regularly by the government.

The proposal incorporates a grade separated double track alignment except for a section of the single track rail line over the Onkaparinga Valley. Two stations are proposed, one at Seaford Meadows and one at the proposed Seaford rail terminus. Two rail bridges are proposed, the main one being over the Onkaparinga Valley and River Road and the other over old Honeypot Road. Three road bridges are proposed at Goldsmith Drive, Seaford Road and Lynton Avenue. The rail alignment crosses the Onkaparinga Valley estuary across a 1.2 kilometre single track viaduct and bridge.

The main conclusion from the feasibility study into a passenger rail line to Seaford is that it is technically feasible but does not yet justify the major initial expenditure. The current cost is estimated to be \$175 million, with a single track viaduct and bridge over the Onkaparinga Valley, and \$215 million if the viaduct and bridge accommodate a double track. Additional rail cars would need to be acquired at a cost of more than \$50 million to operate the extended rail services to Seaford.

The report shows that extending rail services to Seaford provides a preliminary benefit cost ratio (BCR) between 0.5 and 1.0. There is a significant improvement in the economic result if rail services are extended to Seaford after the separate project of concrete resleepering of the Noarlunga to Adelaide rail line. This would provide faster train services and increase the benefit cost ratio from 0.7 to 1.0. This is a significant first step that needs to happen before the line is extended. The second next important addition is the electrification of the line.

I will go through some of the recommendations. The Seaford rail extension should be retained as a potential public service transport project. The proposed rail extension would have significant benefits across the community—improving accessibility, local environment benefits and

job opportunity benefits. It would encourage TOD developments; a shift in journeys of up to 2.3 per cent from private transport, benefits to car drivers who remain on the road network and a whole range of other issues. One of the recommendations is that the 1980s alignment, the most direct route from Noarlunga to Seaford, be the adopted route for a future rail extension to Seaford.

Studies were carried out in the 1980s by the Office of Transport Policy and Planning to consider alignments for road and rail from Noarlunga to Seaford. A display was exhibited at the Noarlunga library and the then Noarlunga council chambers in 1990 to enable public comment on a number of short-listed options. The recommendations from that review resulted in land being reserved for a public transport corridor through the area now known as Seaford Meadows.

The City of Onkaparinga invited Professor Peter Newman of Murdoch University to inspect the state of transport in the outer south ahead of a public forum that was held in July last year. Following the forum, Professor Newman and representatives of the City of Onkaparinga met with officers from DTEI to request re-assessment of a more westerly alignment which reduces the length of the viaduct and bridge over the Onkaparinga Valley. This was agreed and the alignments were compared for the report.

The westerly alignment traverses privately owned land north of the Onkaparinga River. The 1980s alignment is the most direct route from north to south, and the report found that it performs better than the one promoted by the City of Onkaparinga. The westerly alignment underperforms in key areas: it is more costly; it requires more land from the Onkaparinga River park; and it requires the acquisition and demolition of 30 to 40 private properties. This is the proposition that the Onkaparinga council was promoting. The City of Onkaparinga commissioned Professor Newman to review the report 'Extension of the Noarlunga Rail Line to Seaford', notwithstanding its adverse findings on the westerly alignment.

The third point is that the costs and benefits of providing a station at Seaford Meadows or the relocation of the Seaford terminus to Seaford Heights be reviewed. The study found the Seaford and Meadows stations are too close, so that is being reviewed. The report recommends that the feasibility and priority for funding the project be reviewed:

- after concrete resleepering of the Noarlunga to Adelaide rail line is complete—and we are doing that now;
- if high frequency and high speed rail services and other public transport priorities are approved; and
- once the population increases in the southern areas of Adelaide.

If I had more time, I would go into that last point, but that is an important point. The community in the south needs to understand that they cannot have all the development infrastructure they want if they are opposed to having population growth. Those two things go together, and that is a conundrum particularly for people in the Port Willunga and Aldinga area. I will not go through the details of that, but there are plans to increase population growth in the south.

The next point is that the rail corridor over the Onkaparinga Valley be secured in the name of the Minister for Transport—and I understand that is happening—and also that a rail corridor to Aldinga be identified so the railway can be extended. The government is committed to doing that. That is a positive development which indicates our commitment to this overall project. It would mean that it would go further than would have been the case otherwise.

The extension of the railway line to Seaford is a worthy project and one which I will continue to support. Over one-third of Adelaide's population lives in the southern suburbs, with significant differences between its outer and inner areas. Most people in the outer south travel to work in private vehicles. Given the cost of oil and climate change issues, of course, public transport needs to be improved, and we are a government that is committed to doing that. We are committed to:

- upgrading the Noarlunga rail line to providing faster and more reliable rail services;
- defining the rail corridor from Noarlunga to Aldinga to allow structure plans for the development of land to be integrated with future rail services; and
- continually reviewing the supply of bus services in the outer south. There were some recent improvements in that area some months ago.

These initiatives will improve the economic, social and environmental value of the proposal. It will be reconsidered in the context of the need for other significant long-term investments in health,

education, water and other infrastructure and services. This government is committed to extending the railway to Seaford and beyond, and we are going through the processes that are the essential precursors to that—securing the land and also upgrading the railway line to Noarlunga.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher) (11:52): The whole subject of improving the public transport system and, in particular, introducing an electrified standard gauge system to Adelaide has been a cause of mine in this place for many years—so long that I cannot even recall when I first raised it in here. Putting the politics of this issue aside (and we understand why that arises), Adelaide is the only mainland capital now that does not have a modern electric rail system. I believe the option is to move to a standardised light rail system, and it would integrate, as I said yesterday in this place, with the Glenelg tram. You can have light rail trains.

I think that one of the deficiencies in the report to which the minister just referred is that the government did not adequately—and even in any substantial way—consider the option of light rail trains to Seaford and beyond, and I think that it needs to do that. The reason it is important is that if you go for light rail you do not have to spend so much money on bridges, which you must provide if you go for heavy rail. You can use pylons across the Onkaparinga estuary; it is far cheaper. You could even use for the short section across the Onkaparinga a single track arrangement to save money, because you will not be running trains every two minutes (I cannot see that ever happening). You can therefore cut the cost drastically by having a single track across the Onkaparinga estuary on pylons.

I believe this is where the state government should be banging on Mr Rudd's door, because the federal government has an incredible surplus in excess of \$20 billion. We know that it is cautious at the moment, and it should be, because the last thing we want is to stimulate inflation. However, if the federal government committed some of that money towards extending the rail system in the metropolitan area of Adelaide (light rail, standardised, electrified), it would not cause any problems in the short term in regard to inflation, because it takes years to do these sorts of projects. The resleepering of the Noarlunga line will not be completed for about three years.

If the federal government commits to this extension (and I have always argued to extend light rail out to Norwood and other parts of Adelaide), it will not be inflationary in the short term, because you will not be doing anything much in the short term other than planning and making sure you have the land and so on. You can do these projects in stages, just as is happening with the resleepering of the Belair line and then the Noarlunga line. People put up the argument that this will cost hundreds of millions of dollars. Yes, it will, ultimately and collectively, but you do not spend all that money at once. You do one line at a time and one section at a time, but you have a plan which you seek to implement.

The reality with respect to good public transport is that if you provide a modern, electric light rail system you will attract housing and you will attract population near those rail lines. That is a well-established fact in transport planning. Good transport systems attract residential development and they attract increased population. The lack of a modern rail system to Seaford Rise falls at the fault of governments over many years. As I understand it, the federal government many years ago offered Adelaide some electric rail modernisation package, and at the time that offer was declined. I think that Mr Virgo was the minister for transport at the time. People can challenge the assertion but, as I understand it, the government of the day said, 'No; we'll stick with buses', and if that assertion is correct, it is most unfortunate.

We are in a new era now. There is no point in trying to score political points off people with 'Who did this? Who did not do that?' The issue is that it needs to be done, and it is up to the state government to do it from its own resources or, I think, heavily lobbying Kevin Rudd. People talk about commitment to the environment and reducing greenhouse gases, but we know that electricity and its production in South Australia contribute to global warming, but it is much more efficient than having thousands of people commute each day from the south in motor cars or even in buses. I would continue, but it has become almost like a record.

The government needs to get on with this. What it is doing in terms of resleepering is good, and I commend the government for it, but it really needs to get hold of this issue. I lobbied before the last election both the federal Labor and Liberal parties to make a commitment to do this for the south. I said that whoever does it would get tremendous political support in the south. They chose not to do anything, but the challenge is there now for the government to act and to bring the Rudd government on board. That government has the money, and it would be a good investment on behalf of the taxpayers of Australia to contribute to Adelaide having a modern, electrified light rail system.

Mr HANNA (Mitchell) (11:59): I rise to make comment on the proposal for extension of the rail network to Seaford Rise. Indeed, it would be ideal if we began talking about extension further than that as well. I note that the member for Finniss (the member whose electorate covers the Victor Harbor area) has moved the motion, and an amendment put forward by the Minister for the Southern Suburbs is a milder version which refers to the report and recommendations on the extension of the Noarlunga rail line to Seaford.

The extension of the rail line further south is something that is, in fact, very important to me. It does not make a lot of sense from the point of view of the electorate of Mitchell as such—even under the new boundaries that will finish down at Sherriffs Road—but it will have an indirect benefit, I suppose, in that, if more commuters from the deep south take the train, there will be less congestion on South Road and the Expressway—and my residents would certainly appreciate that.

However, it is really from the point of view of considering the public transport needs of Adelaide as it grows that I support the member for Finniss in his efforts here today. This topic is something that I have explored considerably. I have read the report to which the minister has referred and I have had some detailed discussions with the Mayor of the City of Onkaparinga and the Chief Executive, Jeff Tate, about the issue.

The minister raises a fallacious point when he says that there needs to be more population before a definite commitment to continuing the rail can be made. The reality is that, if a commitment is definitely made to have a rail line continuing to Seaford Rise (particularly if it is even further than that), then it will be a tremendous spur to population growth.

In any case, it is a little bit rich for the minister to put that forward because population growth, in a sense, is being foisted upon the south. When the state government, just within the last year, redrew the urban growth boundaries for Adelaide, it allocated huge areas of land at the southern end of the Adelaide metropolitan region and said that these were designated as future suburban development.

If the government is going to do that—encourage population growth down south, subject to all the planning requirements which need to be addressed first—then it really needs to have the infrastructure to go with it. We do not want to see a repeat of Sheidow Park and Trott Park—suburbs with which I am very familiar—which were set up in the 1970s and 1980s without a great deal of government commitment to the infrastructure that they needed to function well as a community. They became dormitory suburbs, where people would use their cars to go in and out—to shop, to work and so on—and where literally hundreds of young people grew up and had very little to do in terms of recreational opportunities or even access to transport to get them where they wanted to go.

Things have improved over time, but there is still an element of that dormitory suburb character in those two suburbs. We do not want to see the same thing repeated further south, where suburbs grow up without adequate infrastructure. So, start the planning now. The minister in his speech said that there was a commitment to the rail line being extended. That, at this stage, is a little vague, but I thoroughly welcome that commitment. I am looking for both parties to commit most definitely before the next election to the extension of the rail line at least to Seaford Rise, and ultimately I think we need to do more work to have an efficient rail line down to Victor Harbor as well.

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (12:04): I support the member for Finniss's original motion, 'that this house condemns the Rann government for its failure to extend the rail network to Seaford Rise', because the amended motion put forward by the minister for the south states:

That this house notes the report 'Extension of the Noarlunga Rail Link to Seaford' and its recommendations, in particular, that the Seaford Rail Extension be retained as a potential public service transport project and that a rail corridor to Aldinga be identified.

What bureaucratic nonsense! We are going to note a report—another report. This bureaucratic nonsense has been going on for 25 years and yet we have no action. We hear about all the action with public transport and we hear about the issue of climate change, but we know how serious the Labor governments of this country are about climate change, because they are all as one as far as means testing the installation of solar panels on houses is concerned.

That really goes to show how serious the Labor Party in this country is about offsetting the effects of climate change. They get elected federally on some false premise—'We're going to be the government for climate change'—and the first thing they do is start chucking initiatives out of the window. Frankly, I cannot see a couple earning a combined income of less than \$100,000 being able to fit solar panels.

The government's attitude to public transport smacks of the same arrogance. The reason that the Premier had to announce the massive use of solar panels at Wayville was because the Solar Shop and others would have had massive orders sold off and he would have got them for half price, I believe. The government has basically destroyed an industry in one fell swoop. However, I digress from the main tenor of the motion.

An honourable member: But only a little.

Mr PEDERICK: Only a little.

An honourable member: In the same state.

Mr PEDERICK: And in the same state. There is a lot of talk about whether we have growth in the southern suburbs. Certainly, there is a lot of potential for growth down there. There is plenty of building going on in the Willunga area and further south towards Seaford Rise. There is also major growth in the north of the city. We have a little place called Freeling, where my grandparents came from years ago, that used to be prime farming land, and when I see an area such as Freeling being opened up for, basically, urban housing, it just about makes me shudder. It is no different from the fact that we probably have the best farmland in this state—we are probably standing on some of it, actually. It would be no less productive than those golden soils of Goyder on the Yorke Peninsula.

Be that as it may, I think we need to be more proactive, and that is something this government certainly has not been in terms of enhancing transport options for people in the outer country areas. When I say 'the outer country areas' I mean the outer suburban/country areas, I guess you could say—places such as Langhorne Creek, Strathalbyn, Clayton and Goolwa. If I am successful (and I hope I am) in the 2010 election, I will represent Goolwa, and there would be plenty of people down there who travel to Adelaide; and also people travelling from Victor Harbor in the member for Finnis's area. There should be a park 'n' ride facility built in conjunction with a rail extension to Seaford Rise, and it would cut down on many hundreds of vehicles having to clog up suburban streets, especially with the price of fuel and with people wanting to cut back on carbon emissions. It is an absolutely sensible idea that we should have a rail extension to Seaford. I note the member for Mitchell also talked about an extension to Victor Harbor, and I believe in the longer term that should happen also to give the people concerned better access to the city.

The Minister for the Southern Suburbs' amended motion just notes a report. It is a little like the budget announcement last year about the resleepering of the railway line down to Noarlunga. It is basically a maintenance upgrade. Yes, I note that we will need it for electrification, and we may hear about that this afternoon, because there would have to be standardisation work done on the concrete sleepers. Essentially, you have to lift the sleeper and move it in a few inches, and if you do not have the concrete sleepers you basically cannot do it. I note that this was the main premise of a budget reply speech last year by the member for Bright, who went on for five or six minutes about resleepering rail. What a classic! I was waiting for the next little gem to come out but there was nothing there. It was all about putting in concrete sleepers.

I think we need to get proactive, and I have a fair idea that we will hear some grand plans for transport this afternoon, but will it make it any easier for people in the south—the people of Langhorne Creek and Strathalbyn who should be involved in the Metroticket system? Murray Bridge is a classic case in point, where we will be putting up state facilities. We will be putting up a new forensic mental health facility and also the new women's and men's prisons. They are state facilities.

Mr Koutsantonis: You're welcome!

Mr PEDERICK: I did not welcome them on the announcement, with no consultation. The government needs to commit to its own earlier commitments to the Rural City of Murray Bridge and make sure that it has in place the appropriate public transport systems which it promoted in earlier talks with the council but which it is madly backing away from. With Labor, it is all about reports. They want to put their prisons in a country electorate. The seat of Hammond is prepared to take it on and the Rural City of Murray Bridge is prepared to take it on, but they are not going to do it without the appropriate government support.

The government is backing away seriously; it is backing away from the appropriate road infrastructure for the entrance to the prison and backing away from the appropriate public transport connection, because they just do not want to fund it. They want to stick it out there when they could have built it in the Premier's electorate: I believe that is where they had land set aside for the new

prison. But, no, they would not put it there. It would not affect the Premier very much, because he does not live anywhere near his own electorate.

They have already had to extend the plans for the prison and, by the time they have built it, it will be full. They started with 760 inmates and I believe the male prison is up to 1,000 inmates now. They need to get on with the job and make sure they follow up their earlier commitment to the Rural City of Murray Bridge on public transport access and make it a Metroticket area, because Murray Bridge comes up in urban planning as a growth area. But I digress somewhat. I commend the member for Finniss's motion—

Mr O'Brien interjecting:

Mr PEDERICK: Now we are getting on to the route for the rail line. I love it! The member for Napier has just given me another contentious issue involving rail lines, and this would need major funding. This would be related to the Seaford Rise line, but the fact is this would have to come through the Hills to Murray Bridge in order to improve access. People, quite frankly, would not be prepared to travel for two hours on a train from Murray Bridge into the city, so it needs some foresight by the Labor governments (both federal and state) to set up a new route straight up the freeway, with some tunnelling, and we would then have decent public transport access via rail. I acknowledge that would be a major project, but it could be done.

Time expired.

Mr PISONI (Unley) (12:14): I think I much prefer the member for Finniss's motion to the minister's amendment. The member for Finniss's motion reads:

That this house condemns the Rann government for the failure to extend the rail network to Seaford Rise.

That is the motion I prefer. The minister's amendment to that motion is another do nothing approach, the hallmark of this government over the past six years. We see a media announcement, a song and dance, a bit of froth and bubble, but no action. Accepting a report will give the government another opportunity for a media announcement but no commitment to action. We have seen the way this government operates: it responds to a bit of pressure from the media. It will make a response, usually in a hurry, but let us hope it at least pays attention to the concerns of those living at Seaford Rise.

I support the motion, particularly in light of the high price of petrol—yesterday it was \$1.66.9 a litre at many service stations, despite the fact that Kevin Rudd promised to reduce petrol prices when in opposition, but since coming to government he told the people of Australia less than a month ago that he has done everything he possibly can to help working Australians. Forget about Kevin 07: let us remember Rudd the dud.

In my electorate of Unley one should try to catch a bus into town from about bus stop 4. I will talk about my experience at bus stop 2 back in April on a rainy April morning. I was talking to some constituents about the difficulties they were having catching a bus and one constituent arrived at that bus stop at 7.50 a.m., a bus went past about 20 minutes later (they are supposed to be every 15 minutes), but it did not stop because it was full. Instead of having a destination point it said 'Sorry, no pick up' because it was full. It is full of people travelling in from the southern suburbs much further down from my electorate—people living south of the Noarlunga rail line. This is an indication of how tired our transport system is and how there is no plan to deal with the increase we are seeing in the use of public transport because of the high price of petrol.

I would like to see transport hubs developed where people can come in on a train and leave their cars parked in an area. I would like to see more reliable services. People expect a bus to turn up every 15 minutes as advertised, and when it does turn up that it is capable of picking up people rather than driving straight past. This is a major issue right through my electorate: Goodwood Road, Unley Road and George Street, which continues into Duthy Street. Those low number bus stops in my area are suffering from the lack of foresight this government has had in public transport policy.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: On a point of order, there seems to be a spelling mistake in the motion: the member for Finniss has called it 'Seaford Rise'. I thought it was Seaforth Rise.

Members interjecting:

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: Are you sure, because the Leader of the Opposition called it Seaforth Rise on the radio?

Amendment carried; motion as amended carried.

KANGAROO ISLAND TRANSPORT

Mr PENGILLY (Finniss) (12:20): I move:

That this house notes the failure of the Rann government in not achieving a fair and equitable cost to travel on the sea route between the mainland and Kangaroo Island, and the subsequent impact on residents, pensioners, farmers, small businesses and travellers.

I wish to qualify, before commencing my debate, the fact that on the parliamentary register my wife is noted as being a very small shareholder in Sealink through being a family beneficiary. Nothing quite stirs the emotion of Kangaroo Islanders like the cost of travel between the mainland and the island and as a life-long islander I share those sentiments and express my concern at the increasing costs to that service.

It is interesting to note that currently the Kangaroo Island Development Board, with some government assistance by way of a grant, is doing a study called the water gap project. Services come and services go, and over decades services have run originally between Port Adelaide and Kingscote/Penneshaw, and then Kingscote to Port Adelaide with the *Troubridge* and the *Island Seaway*. We have had services run between Glenelg and Kingscote, between Wirrina and Kingscote, the most recent of which has fallen over, again for a variety of reasons, and we have the service that operates currently by the Sealink company between Cape Jervis and Penneshaw with two ferries, one based at Penneshaw and another at Cape Jervis, and they cross over.

Quite apart from the cost, the fact remains that the island has the best service that it has ever had in relation to regularity and frequency of trips during peak times. A government agreement requires that all freight has to be moved within a certain period of time. The service operates almost every day of the year, with the exception of Christmas Day. There are perhaps one or two days a year, during a midwinter storm, that it does not operate, and that is basically because it cannot get into Cape Jervis.

The issue is one of equity. I have raised this in a past life, as have my predecessors, and as has my current successor, all to no avail. The issue is one of subsidisation. You may or may not be aware that the service operating between Melbourne and Tasmania is subsidised and it is an extension of the national highway. What we seek for the island ferry service is also an extension of the national highway to bring some fairness and equity to the people of the island, and their businesses.

The punt services operating across the Murray River are free of charge. They are all subsidised. You can hop on a punt to go across and there is no charge. It is absorbed in the greater cost of transport in the state. Unfortunately, because of federation and the distribution of House of Representatives and Senate seats, Tasmania receives an extremely substantial subsidy. The people of Kangaroo Island do not enjoy that. For a long time, all they have been asking for is some equity. I will read into *Hansard* some travel cost figures and times shortly.

I raised this matter with the former federal government. For many years the Hon. Alexander Downer (the federal member representing Kangaroo Island and the member for Mayo) took this up with the Rann government and got nowhere. I have taken this up with the Rann government and got nowhere. They blame the feds, the feds blame the state and, actually, while all the argy-bargy goes on, people are still paying the same amount.

The other aspect of this is that the island is highly promoted by the government, and rightly so—and I support that—as being a unique and very special tourist destination around the world. That is great but, equally, the cost of getting visitors—the tourist population—to and from the island is large. Only last week, I think, a woman from Tasmania who wanted to go over to the island got to Cape Jervis and was horrified by the cost. She had her facts wrong when she rang in, and we corrected them, but the cost does frighten a lot of people away.

I will read into *Hansard* some of the travel costs. The cost for a return trip for an adult from Cape Jervis to Penneshaw is \$86 on SeaLink. The cost of a passenger motor vehicle (a five metre vehicle) is \$168 return. The important thing is that the distance travelled between Cape Jervis and Penneshaw is 16 kilometres and takes approximately 45 to 50 minutes. For a car, the ferry between Melbourne and Tasmania costs \$234 return. The cost of a day ticket—that is, sitting up on the ferry—is \$240 return. A variety of cabin prices are available, but I will use one in the mid range. A twin cabin inside is \$248 one way and, obviously, double that for a return trip. That cost is for the off-peak season. During the peak season, the cost of the day ticket is \$176, and the twin cabin is \$303, or \$606 return. The distance travelled is 429 kilometres and takes a total of about 10 hours.

The Wallaroo to Lucky Bay ferry, which is approximately 55 kilometres and takes about one hour and 45 minutes, is \$60 return for a passenger. For a car up to 5.5 metres, it is \$240 return, and I think the member for Stuart uses that quite regularly. Yet again, we have the ferry that runs from Sorrento to Queenscliff at the bottom of Port Phillip Bay, and the cost of a vehicle and driver on that ferry is \$106 return. The cost of a vehicle and driver during the peak season is \$118 return, which is quite a difference. The distance travelled between Sorrento and Queenscliff is 12 kilometres and it takes approximately 40 minutes.

The other interesting thing is that, apart from Tasmania with two of those ferry services, you can actually drive. Whether they drive or take the ferry is, of course, an option for those who choose to travel. I do not mind travelling on ferries on good days, but I would prefer not to travel on them on bad days. The people of Tasmania and Kangaroo Island have nowhere to go; they can either fly or go on the ferry. They have no other option. Tasmania is heavily subsidised by the federal government of the day, and that will continue. There is no question that that will continue. It is regarded as an extension of the national highway.

It is interesting to note that the ferry that used to operate between Kingscote and Port Adelaide was also an extension of the national highway; however, when services changed, that went and the subsidy disappeared. We have moved on from those days. Tourism to Kangaroo Island is growing rapidly and international visitation is increasing markedly—which is good—and the costs are going up accordingly. The costs of doing business on the island are extremely high. I make no bones about pointing out that, if one chooses to live on an island and bring up one's family there, one should expect the costs to be greater than living on the mainland of Australia.

No-one has any argument with that—and no-one should have any argument with it. We should also bear in mind that there is no public transport available on Kangaroo Island. Indeed, there is no public transport available between Kangaroo Island and the mainland, or from Kingscote to Penneshaw and Penneshaw to Adelaide and onwards. Nothing is available. Pensioners get very little by way of reduced fares. Kangaroo Island residents do get a cheaper fare. They get an 'island resident' fare. If members want to travel to Kangaroo Island they will pay full tote odds. It is holding the island back and it is not doing the island any good whatsoever.

On behalf of my constituents—and one could say I have some self-interest because I put freight on the ferries, as well—I urge and plead with the house to support having that section of water between the island and the mainland declared an extension of the national highway. It is in the long-term interests of South Australia to do so. It is in the best interests of the economy of South Australia, whether it be primary industry, fishing and tourism, or the day-to-day travel arrangements of islanders and those from the metropolitan area who want to go to Kangaroo Island, to have it declared an extension of the national highway, and for the people of South Australia to assist the residents of Kangaroo Island, and those who want to come back and forth, to do it in a cheaper, more equitable way.

I know no-one would like the fares reduced more than the SeaLink company. It is paying over \$700,000 a year wharfage to the department of transport, and that is spread all around the state. It is not a freeloader. In addition, the SeaLink company pays a licence fee to the Kangaroo Island council, which is probably now about \$160,000 to \$180,000. It pays a licence fee to the Kangaroo Island council, which goes back into infrastructure on the island to cater for visitation. No-one is freeloading on this issue.

It is time equitability was put into this debate and the government recognised the importance of Kangaroo Island and what it produces by way of agriculture. I think its agricultural production was about \$60 million to \$70 million in the past year, and tourism sits alongside that. They do not compete with each other but, rather, help and complement each other. This is a debate that is well past.

Some \$100 million worth of economic activity is produced on Kangaroo Island. A subsidy to the island on the component of the sea travel service is well and truly due—and it should be done immediately. We should stop having argy-bargy between the feds and the state on this issue. No-one would congratulate the Rann government more than I if it was to make it an extension of the national highway in order to give full respect to those people who reside on Kangaroo Island and make a large contribution (by size of population) to the economy of South Australia, given that only 4 500 people live on the island.

It is high rainfall country, for which there will be an increasing demand due to climate change. We will rely more on the high rainfall districts of South Australia (including the South-East, Lower South-East, Fleurieu Peninsula, Lower Eyre Peninsula and Kangaroo Island) for agricultural

production. In order to do that, we will have to get it back and forth to the mainland at a reasonable cost in order to continue to contribute to the economy, if we are going to stay in business.

The cost of getting grain from the island to the mainland is about \$68 a tonne, and getting fertiliser back is unbelievably expensive. And it is lineball. It is okay while commodity prices are reasonably high: if grain prices are up at around \$300 a tonne, a person can just about make ends meet. However, if we get a fizzer or if grain prices return to \$140, \$150 or \$160 a tonne, you are out the door; you just will not have any production.

People on the island are turning to smaller and more efficient ways of primary production. But the linchpin of it all is to declare an extension of the national highway and to promote the island's economy and pick up the reasonable costs of production and moving between the island and the mainland. I urge the house to support my motion, which is not unreasonable or unfair. It is a motion about commonsense and it is in the best interests of South Australia and my electorate—the place where I have lived all my life.

Mr O'BRIEN (Napier) (12:36): I commend the member for Finniss for an excellent exposition of the issues facing his constituents. It was extremely well researched, and I thought the comparison of ferry fare prices around Australia really bore out the central thrust of his argument.

The member may well be aware that, in 1995, the then state Liberal government introduced a 10-year annually declining freight subsidy scheme, which obviously expired in 2005. The intent of that scheme was to allow businesses and the community on Kangaroo Island to make adjustments over a 10-year period so that, by 2005, with adjustments to the cost structures and the like, they would hopefully be in a position where the impost of freight charges would not negatively impact on their bottom line. From what the member for Finniss has said, that scheme was not successful.

In the interim, the Labor government wanted to see how the new Kangaroo Island ferry service between Wirrina Cove and Kingscote worked out. We are only talking about a three-year period between the end of the decade-long subsidy scheme and today. However, as the member for Finniss has pointed out, the Kangaroo Island ferry has not proved to be economically viable and has not injected that degree of competitiveness into the equation that the government was hoping would arise.

The member for Finniss made mention of the work of the Kangaroo Island Development Board, and that is where the government takes issue with the member's motion. The Rann government, through the Department of Trade and Economic Development, has put \$90,000 into the Kangaroo Island Development Board's business plan exercise, which is working up a business case on the water gap cost issue. I would have thought that probably it is a little presumptive to be moving this motion when we have yet to get the business case.

I would hope that the proposition that the member for Finniss is championing—the extension of the national highway—could be injected into that business plan and that the member for Finniss would be the champion for that. Rather than note the failure of the Rann government on this issue, I think the member for Finniss ought to have held fire and allowed the Rann Labor government the opportunity to consider the business case that has been worked up by the Kangaroo Island Development Board on this issue of the water gap so that we could devise an appropriate response.

In making the point of developing an appropriate response, I think the member for Finniss would probably not want us to go back to the subsidy scheme that the former Liberal government had in place. It ultimately did not deliver the desired benefits. So, I think the government and the house will be awaiting with great interest the development of the business case. I am sure that the Department of Trade and Economic Development will go through that with a fine toothcomb and, if embedded and central to the proposition within the business case is an extension of the national highway, I hope the member for Finniss is foremost in the lobbying exercise at the national level, because it will ultimately be a decision that the federal government will have to make. For those reasons, we oppose the motion.

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (12:41): I rise to support the motion of the member for Finniss that the house notes the failure of the Rann government in making transport to Kangaroo Island a fair and equitable process. The island is a lovely place to visit. I must admit that I have visited the island a couple of times recently. One visit related to a meeting about water. The subject of water never seems to go away no matter where you are in this state or country at the moment. Previous to that, I was assisting the CFS in mopping up a week after the fires.

It was interesting that the member for Finniss mentioned the price of freight of grain from Kangaroo Island. I was very impressed as a farmer in my past life to note the crops through which the fire had burnt—and I was hoping that the farmers had adequate insurance. With its rainfall and soil types, obviously it is a place where they can grow abundant crops. I saw some of the best canola crops that I had ever seen. I would not be surprised at all if their yields were approaching 2.5 tonne per hectare.

There have been issues for years about access to Kangaroo Island. I remember as a child travelling on the Troubridge from Port Adelaide overnight. What a wild and lengthy ride. We also had the Fokker Friendship planes operating in those days. I think they were 44-seater planes. Things have changed since then with the present modern ferries—and I note that one company has just ceased operating—and new people operating those flights.

It is not just access for tourists or residents, it is also the cost to the community. I believe they still freight their waste from Kangaroo Island to a waste depot south of Adelaide. This is a huge cost to the council. I guess that they have been forced into that position because of the costs imposed with waste management and the very scientific and environmental way in which waste is handled. In fact, waste has been made a business, I believe. That is just a huge cost on its own.

In relation to the tourism sector, I believe that, if a national highway was opened up over the sea route to Kangaroo Island, the government would get its money back tenfold because it would make the island that much more accessible not only to international tourists but also local tourists. I know that it is something which sticks in your mind when you think about going to Kangaroo Island. You think about all the water you have to cross and whether to go via Cape Jervis, fly or what.

At the end of the day, whether or not people wish to make that trip gets down to cost. I certainly support the fact that we need to make it easier for people to gain access to the island. Finances are tight. It is a very nice place to visit. However, it also needs assistance, as the member for Finniss said, in the freighting of produce. The island has a very broad agriculture base, as well as a forestry industry cranking up. As I said, the waste is transported from there to the mainland. With those few words, I support this very commendable motion from the member for Finniss.

Mr VENNING (Schubert) (12:45): I rise briefly to support the member for Finniss. A motion such as this is most important to a member of parliament, especially the member for Finniss who actually lives on the island. I commend him for raising this matter. Kangaroo Island is a very important part of South Australia. It is second only to the Barossa—I could not resist that—in relation to a major Australian tourism destination. Kangaroo Island offers unique opportunities for everyone. I could say that, in some areas, Kangaroo Island is better than the Barossa. I cannot say that, can I? I will just say that if you took the Barossa and Kangaroo Island out of South Australia, what tourism destinations would be left? Not many. Anyway, it is important that we support this motion today, because we noted just a few weeks ago the closure of Kangaroo Island Ferries, which ran between Wirrina and Kingscote.

I was very concerned about that, because it was an option people were using. When that one is taken away it leaves the remaining ferry without opposition, and that is the very point the honourable member is raising. We must try to keep the cost as low as possible so that people can afford to use it. Without the other ferry operating, it means that the remaining ferry has the monopoly. Some people would argue that the ferry ought to be free because it can be argued that it is an extension of the South Australian road network. It is. If it were not free the government ought to subsidise it heavily, particularly for those people who live on the island and who rely on it for freight and to get to and from the mainland, because sometimes when the planes cannot fly people have to use the ferry.

I also mention the cost to freight for farmers. I have been to Kangaroo Island but not lately. I am due to go again, and by invitation of the honourable member I might go sooner.

Mr Pengilly: You might not be given a passport!

Mr VENNING: No; I will have to behave myself. I have many grazier friends who have bought farms on the island, and even some grain growers. To export product from the island to the mainland just kills the profit motive. Kangaroo Island is a fantastic place for raising fat lambs, but the cost of getting them over to the mainland is huge. I believe that the government must say 'Well, there is no alternative for these people, other than building a bridge.' It is a bit long for a bridge. I fully support this motion, particularly where the honourable member refers to the impact on residents (and he is one), pensioners (there ought to be a very heavy subsidy for them), farmers, small business and travellers, which, as I said, is tourism.

The government ought to at least address this. The honourable member would not have raised this if there was not a problem. There is a problem. It is to the point of being a prohibitive cost. The honourable member has raised it here because he is the member. It is just like when I hammered Gomersal Road. Eventually we got Gomersal Road, didn't we? Now I am amazed, and the government is amazed, that since Gomersal Road was opened how much more traffic travels on it than the government thought—in fact, the volume of traffic is eight times more than the government's predictions. It is the same with this. If the government makes this vital link affordable, I am sure the patronage will go up markedly, because it is very expensive, particularly if people have to take their car over there.

I commend the honourable member for raising this matter. I commend him for raising matters important to his electorate, and I hope the government will support it.

Mr PENGILLY (Finniss) (12:49): I thank members for their contribution to this motion. It is a critical issue for the people of Kangaroo Island. I did pick up what the member for Napier said. As I said in my speech, I acknowledge the fact that the water gap project is being undertaken. If he would like to come to my residence on Kangaroo Island, I will show the member for Napier a stack of reports about so high, all gathering dust, which have been done over the last 40 or 50 years—at least the last 30 that I know of—and which have been done by deceit. I actually have one in my office. They have all led nowhere—report after report and no action.

While I respect the comments of the member for Napier and I have enormous respect for the amount of work that the Kangaroo Island Development Board under the CEO, Pierre Gregor, and assisted by the Mayor of Kangaroo Island, Jayne Bates, and others are doing, the fact is that I do not think that we are going to get any action unless we push and prod and the member for Finniss stands in this place and makes a pain of himself on this subject with regular abandon. That is the upshot of where we are going on this.

They will do an enormous amount of work, it will tie people up for days, months, hours, on both sides of the mainland and the island. They will have meeting after meeting and produce copious amounts of paperwork and reports. In the end—I am sorry, but I am afraid one gets somewhat cynical after seeing all of these other reports—the report will be done and I have no doubt that the report that comes out from the Kangaroo Island Development Board on the water gap will prove conclusively that that extension of the national highway is absolutely critical for Kangaroo Island and, for the life of me, I just want to see it happen.

I know residents of the island are fed up to the back teeth with waiting. The member for Napier in his remarks talked about the sliding freight subsidiary. Yes, he is quite correct and that did expire a couple of years ago, and when that expired they were exposed to the full market forces. That is how things are and that was the deal done many years ago, but I believe quite conclusively that it is time to move on, it is time to put all this stuff behind us and it is time to look to the future. That is what it is about; it is about the future of the island and what part it can play in the economy of South Australia. I think we need to get on with it. I think for the government of the day—and on either side of the house, I might add—it is time to bite the bullet and get on it.

There would be huge bipartisan support for making this an extension of the national highway; there is no question about that. It is time to put politics aside, it is time to bring this on, it is time to do it and make that section of water between the island and the mainland an extension of the national highway. It will only grow the economy on both sides. It will grow it down through the south and the Fleurieu with tourism, it will open up markets for people, and it will open up markets for primary producers, with the dairy industry on the Fleurieu, by way of being able to get hay and grain over there at an equitable cost. It will make it cheaper for the producers on the Fleurieu to get their product. Most of it comes in from the Mallee and the north of Adelaide and Victoria and the West Coast and everywhere else.

I urge this house to support my motion and make the sea crossing between Kangaroo Island and the mainland of Australia an extension of the national highway.

The house divided on the motion:

AYES (14)

Chapman, V.A.
Gunn, G.M.
Pederick, A.S.
Pisoni, D.G.

Evans, I.F.
Kerin, R.G.
Penfold, E.M.
Redmond, I.M.

Goldsworthy, M.R.
McFetridge, D.
Pengilly, M. (teller)
Such, R.B.

Venning, I.H.

Williams, M.R.

NOES (28)

Atkinson, M.J.

Bedford, F.E.

Bignell, L.W.

Breuer, L.R.

Caica, P.

Ciccarello, V.

Conlon, P.F.

Fox, C.C.

Geraghty, R.K.

Hill, J.D.

Kenyon, T.R.

Key, S.W.

Koutsantonis, T.

Lomax-Smith, J.D.

Maywald, K.A.

McEwen, R.J.

O'Brien, M.F. (teller)

Piccolo, T.

Portolesi, G.

Rankine, J.M.

Rann, M.D.

Rau, J.R.

Simmons, L.A.

Stevens, L.

Thompson, M.G.

Weatherill, J.W.

White, P.L.

Wright, M.J.

Majority of 14 for the noes.

Motion thus negatived.

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

STATUTES AMENDMENT (BUDGET 2008) BILL

His Excellency the Governor's Deputy, by message, recommended to the house the appropriation of such amounts of money as might be required for the purposes mentioned in the bill.

CROWN LAND MANAGEMENT BILL

His Excellency the Governor's Deputy, by message, recommended to the house the appropriation of such amounts of money as might be required for the purposes mentioned in the bill.

BUS SERVICES

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett): Presented a petition signed by 372 residents of South Australia requesting the house to urge the government to return all F designated buses to the original zoned area and to give more consideration to the needs of the northern area by providing consultation and faster services where possible.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

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

BROADBAND ROLLOUT

18 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (9 May 2007).

1. Has the broadband rollout in South Australia been completed and if not, what percentage is yet to be completed and which locations still do not have coverage?

2. What has been the total cost of South Australia's broadband rollout?

The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton—Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education, Minister for Science and Information Economy, Minister for Youth, Minister for Gambling): The 2003-04 State Budget provided an allocation of \$8.37 million over four years for the development of a broadband program, Broadband SA, including the development of a State Broadband Strategy, the establishment of a cross-agency consultative group to consider state broadband issues, a broadband capability 'mapping' and the Broadband Development Fund (BDF), a four-year, \$7 million fund for investment in infrastructure to increase access and affordability of broadband services throughout South Australia.

Broadband demand aggregation projects, which identify the level and location of demand for broadband services, have now been completed in all the non-metropolitan regions of South Australia.

Broadband projects, supported by the BDF, have enabled the deployment of broadband in the Yorke Peninsula, Port Lincoln, Whyalla, Port Augusta, Kangaroo Island, the Coorong District,

the Barossa and Light Region and the City of Salisbury. These projects have involved a variety of telecommunications providers, namely Amcom Telecommunications, Internode/Agile, Silk Telecoms and Telstra.

An extremely successful process, drawing on the support and collaboration of all levels of government and the private telecommunications industry has been adopted. Recent changes to the Federal Government's programs for the support of broadband rollout, however, have caused uncertainty for recently deployed broadband projects and those still in the planning phase. The transition from the previous Broadband Connect subsidy scheme to the new Australian Broadband Guarantee affected the anticipated funding that would have been provided to projects in Yorke Peninsula, the Barossa and Light Region and the Coorong District. It has also delayed the implementation phases for projects in Eyre Region, Fleurieu, Adelaide Hills, Central Local Government Region, Murray and Mallee LGA and the South East LGA.

In a press release on 12 April 2007 announcing further modifications to the Australian Broadband Guarantee, the Federal Minister for Communications, Information Technology and the Arts, Senator Helen Coonan stated that the Federal Government 'particularly wanted to ensure that a number of important projects in South Australia were properly accommodated under the program.'

Such recognition highlights the successful process that was in place as the result of South Australian Government policy for the delivery of broadband services in this state.

Other South Australian Government projects have been delivering specific broadband services into regional centres around South Australia. This activity has been completed in Port Lincoln, Whyalla and Port Augusta and is about to begin in Mount Gambier. Further projects for Port Pirie, Murray Bridge, Berri and other Riverland towns are also scheduled.

Specialised broadband services for the research and education sector have been delivered through the South Australian Broadband Research and Education Network, called SABRENet. This project has constructed and will operate an optical-fibre telecommunications network linking major research sites in metropolitan Adelaide.

Separately, broadband coverage in South Australia has been progressed through other activity such as the deployment of broadband in selected telephone exchange areas by Telstra, sometimes triggered by the competitive pressure of community-based projects funded through the BDF. Other providers are maintaining a competitive market by installing their own broadband service equipment in Telstra exchanges, particularly within the metropolitan area.

Any analysis of the extent of broadband coverage in the state is dependent on considerations of the technology concerned. The entire state is covered by satellite broadband services but many people do not wish to use satellite services because of issues regarding cost and performance.

The total cost of South Australia's broadband rollout consists of funds from several sources. The South Australian Government, the Federal Government, telecommunications companies and local community organisations have all contributed to that cost.

The South Australian Government component to regional community-based projects has occurred through the BDF which was launched in December 2003. To date BDF funding approvals, totalling \$4.004 million, have been made for the broadband infrastructure projects in Yorke Peninsula, Eyre Region, Port Lincoln, Whyalla, Port Augusta, Kangaroo Island, the Coorong District, City of Salisbury, Barossa & Light and Mount Gambier. A further \$0.289 million from the BDF has been provided to community-based regional organisations to assist their project planning processes.

South Australian Government agencies have contributed \$1.178 million for the Port Lincoln, Whyalla and Port Augusta project and have committed \$1.670 million for the projects in Mount Gambier, Port Pirie, Murray Bridge, Berri and Riverland towns.

For the SABRENet backbone construction, \$233,000 was contributed by the South Australian Government.

BUSINESS AND PARLIAMENT TRUST

25 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (7 June 2007). With respect to the Business and Parliament Trust:

- (a) how much funding has been allocated to establish and operate the trust;

- (b) who is appointed to the trust and what are their roles; and
- (c) what programs are operated by the trust?

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): The Department of Trade and Economic Development has advised the following:

(a) No funding was allocated to the Business and Parliamentary Trust in 2005-2006. \$25,000 was allocated to the Business and Parliamentary Trust in 2006-2007.

(b) A board of management has been established to govern the Trust. This is chaired by two co-chairs: one representing the business community and the other the parliamentary community.

Mr Mike Terlet, AO is co-chair along with the Speaker of the House, Mr Jack Snelling. Dr Bob Such was initially appointed as a co-chair. He retired from this position on the Board when he was replaced as the Speaker by Mr Jack Snelling.

The following people are appointed to the Trust as board members:

Mr Peter Vaughan, CEO Business SA

Ms Cheryl Bart, Economic Development Board Member

Ms Christine Locher, Managing Director, Locher

Ms Melissa Cadzow, Managing Director, CadzowTech

Mr Tony Mitchell, CFO, Gro Pep

The Hon Michelle Lensink, MLC

The Hon Vickie Chapman MP

The Hon Carmel Zollo MLC

(c) The Business and Parliament Trust runs two programs:

- a program for business leaders to attend parliament house for a day to meet with politicians from both sides of politics.
- a program whereby parliamentarians spend a day in a business learning about the drivers for business.

The program for parliamentarians to spend a day in a business has not yet taken place but is scheduled to occur later this year.

BLANCHETOWN TO MORGAN ROAD

33 The Hon. G.M. GUNN (Stuart) (24 June 2007).

1. What plans are there to seal the Blanchetown to Morgan road?
2. What is the purpose of the antennae attached to the sign at the Blanchetown weigh station?

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

The Department for Transport, Energy and Infrastructure (DTEI) has no plans to seal the Blanchetown to Morgan Road at this time.

DTEI ensures that regular patrol grading is undertaken when necessary and has an annual re-sheeting program in place to maintain the road to a satisfactory standard.

There is an alternative access between Morgan and Blanchetown, via a sealed council road, on the eastern side of the river, which runs parallel to the unsealed Blanchetown – Morgan Road. DTEI provides and maintains a free 24 hours ferry service at Morgan to support this alternative access.

The antennae is to allow the remote control (or wireless connection) of the variable message sign for the Blanchetown checking station. The antennae receives the signal that allows the variable message sign to indicate whether the Blanchetown checking station is operational and whether heavy trucks and commercial buses are required to enter.

BROADBAND STRATEGY

117 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (31 July 2007). What are the details of the \$2.6 million allocated to the department's broadband strategy?

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

The South Australian Government has announced as part of the 2007-08 State budget, funding of \$2.6 million for broadband networks in Berri, Murray Bridge and Port Pirie.

The allocation will also fund an upgrade to the State's central data network to join South Australia's regional centres together in a world-class network. The network will provide 'metropolitan level' connectivity and, on average, double the current bandwidth available.

The funds will allow the reach of government services to be extended and provide a more robust communications backbone in these areas.

Minister Jay Weatherill also expressed his pleasure that as Minister for Families and Communities and Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation, the project will provide Aboriginal health clinics in seven regional centres with video conferencing and other technologies.

TRAMLINE EXTENSION

119 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (31 July 2007). What is the final cost of upgrading the ETSA power supply to the light rail project and what was the original estimated cost?

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

The estimated cost of the power supply in the \$31 million budget for the tramline extension from Victoria Square to City West was \$1.5 million. The final cost (excluding GST) is \$1,306,905.

RAIL TRACK REPLACEMENT

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

1. How much funding will be allocated in forward years to the replacement of rail track points and crossings?

2. Is the replacement of railway track points and crossings at Goodwood, Woodville, Adelaide rail yard and railcar depot and the Glenelg tramway on time?

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

1. Prior to the intended asset transfer of TransAdelaide's assets to DTEI, TransAdelaide's forward estimates for replacement of rail track points and crossings was as follows:

2007-08 \$500,000

2008-09 \$513,000

2009-10 \$526,000

2. Goodwood—The materials for this project are currently being manufactured for delivery in September 2007. Installation has been deferred to coincide with major concrete resleeper proposed for the Noarlunga line to avoid multiple closures and minimise inconvenience to the travelling public.

Woodville—This work has been completed.

Adelaide Rail Yard and Railcar Depot—The relocation of the Railcar Depot to facilitate the construction of the new hospital has now made replacing this trackwork unnecessary. Routine inspections will ensure that the trackwork is monitored until the relocation.

Glenelg Tramway—All mainline points and crossings on the tramway except the crossover at Leah Street have been replaced.

3. There are two FTEs in the Case Management Secretariat—Director, Case Management Framework (\$120,123) and a Project Officer, Case Management Framework (\$55,569).

OVERTAKING LANES

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

1. What is the expected forward expenditure requirements for the State's overtaking lanes and what are the reasons for not including these forward expenditure requirements in the Budget?
2. How many overtaking lanes have been planned and where are they to be constructed?

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

1. 2007-08 is the final year of the current approved Overtaking Lane Program. Any extension of the program will be subject to normal budgetary processes.
2. \$7.4m has been allocated to the Overtaking Lane Program in 2007-08. Four lanes will be constructed in 2007-08. They are:
 - Victor Harbor Road (Mt Compass to Mt Compass—Goolwa Road)
 - Riddoch Highway northbound lane (north of Nangwarry)
 - Riddoch Highway southbound lane (south of Nangwarry)
 - Noarlunga Cape Jervis southbound lane (near Lady Bay)

LEVEL CROSSINGS

155 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (31 July 2007). How many level crossings will receive safety upgrades at a total cost of \$3 million in 2007-08 and what are the details?

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

The Department for Transport, Energy and Infrastructure (DTEI) has proposed 29 railway level crossing sites for safety improvement works in 2007-08.

Below is a list of the 29 sites:

Port Road, Woodville
Hawker Street, Bowden
Goodwood Road, Goodwood
Hayman Road, Two Wells
Dutton Road, Mt Barker
Dunorlan Road, Ascot Park
Howard Street, Gawler
Wenzel Road, Balhannah
Pym Street, Dudley Park
Sixth Avenue, Glenelg East
Thevenard Road/Bergman Drive, Ceduna
Woodville Road, Woodville
Jetty Road, Brighton
Alawoona Avenue, Clovelly Park
LeBrun Street, Port Lincoln
Fenchurch Street, Goolwa
Shepherd Avenue, Port Lincoln
Institute Road, Cummins
Alexandrina Road, Mount Barker

Bethany Road, Tanunda

APY LANDS, AIRSTRIPS

305 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (20 November 2007). When will urgent maintenance and upgrade works to airstrips on the APY Lands be undertaken and when will the upgrading of the Oodnadatta airstrip to improve its all weather access capability occur, and what will be the cost of these respective projects?

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

I am advised that the urgent maintenance to airstrips in the APY Lands that was identified in mid November 2007 was completed by the end of November 2007. Urgent minor maintenance to airstrips in the APY Lands is normally undertaken and completed by AP Services soon after it is reported.

The State and Australian Governments have approved \$220,000 for airstrip major works projects in the APY Lands this financial year. This funding is provided through the Australian Government's Remote Aerodrome Safety Program to which the State provides matching funds.

The upgrading of the Oodnadatta aerodrome along with a number of other aerodrome upgrade projects in the unincorporated areas of the State and on Aboriginal Lands have been identified as potential projects for funding from the Remote Aerodrome Safety Program in the period from 2008-09 to 2010-11. The cost of upgrading Oodnadatta airstrip has been indicatively estimated at \$1.2 million.

TRANSPORT, ENERGY AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEPARTMENT

313 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (20 November 2007). Which land, buildings and facilities have been declared surplus to the department's requirements and when will they be disposed of?

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

A number of residential and commercial properties, road and rail land have been declared surplus since 1 July 2006 by the Department for Transport, Energy and Infrastructure. A number of properties have already been disposed of and others are awaiting disposal. I provide a list detailing which land, buildings and facilities have been declared surplus and the relevant disposal details.

HOUSING TRUST WAITING LIST

332 Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (27 November 2007). Why has a single, unemployed mother with three young children and who has been on the South Australian Housing Trust waiting list for 17 years, been unsuccessful in obtaining a trust home and when is this likely to occur?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Minister for Families and Communities, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation, Minister for Housing, Minister for Ageing, Minister for Disability, Minister Assisting the Premier in Cabinet Business and Public Sector Management): In general terms, applicants for public housing are placed in the first instance in Category 3 of the waiting list. In high demand areas, Category 3 applicants do have a significant waiting time, as most vacant properties are allocated to Category 1 and 2 applicants.

If the applicant gives any indication that they have special circumstances that may warrant a higher category, they are provided with information regarding the Housing Needs Assessment process, i.e., how to apply and what criteria must be met to qualify for higher priority housing.

A range of other housing assistance is available through Housing SA, in addition to assistance with public housing. Eligible applicants can apply for financial assistance to secure private rental accommodation and some are able to purchase a property through the Affordable Homes Program. Low-cost long term accommodation is also available through the Office of community Housing.

Applicants wishing to find out about housing options and available services are encouraged to telephone Housing SA's Telephone Customer Service Centre on 13 12 99 to arrange an appointment to discuss their situation with a housing advisor.

CASE MANAGEMENT SECRETARIAT**379 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett)** (18 February 2008).

1. What private sector projects are currently before the Case Management Secretariat and what are the individual project amounts?
2. Who are the case managers assigned to each project?
3. How many public service employees are there in the Case Management Secretariat and, what are their positions and remuneration?

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

1. and 2. The table below outlines the current case managed projects, the case manager assigned to that project and the project amount:

Project	Case Manager	Value (\$million)
Aquaculture Development of Salt Interception Schemes	Ian Nightingale	24
Aquaculture Feed Manufacturing Plant	Ramesh Perera	10
Aquaculture Tuna Propagation	Heather Montgomerie	100
Biofuel Development	Nicolle Sincock	12
Bluegum Plantation	Martyn England	70
Bolivar Winter Water	Rob Demarco	70
Foundry Expansion	Margot Gall	40
Buckland Park Country Township	Roger Hartley	2,000
Wave Energy	Bruce Roy	440
Chicken Meat Grow Out Facilities	Simon Gierke	210
Utilities Port Augusta Training Program	Sean Holden	26
Park Terrace, Salisbury	Adam Reid	100
Feed Mill and Expansion	Rob Demarco	385
Zircon Deposit	Steve Ward	400
Langhorne Creek Water Security	Rob Demarco	800
McLaren Vale Water Substitution	Rob Demarco	3
Penola Pulp Mill	Roger Hartley	1,700
Pt Lincoln Marina & Housing	Adam Reid	40
Recovery of Port Wakefield Facilities	Rob Demarco	15
Tenby 10, Pt Pirie Lead	Mark Diamond Health	56
Abattoir Expansion Bordertown	Jack Langberg	15
Two Wells Glasshouse	Margot Gall	30
Wakefield Industry Development & Infrastructure	Martyn England	90
Wakefield Waters	Adam Reid	1,500
Wallaroo Marina Project	Simon Millcock	20
TOTAL		8,156

Case Managers work across State Government Agencies and with Federal and Local agencies as required to facilitate the project to achieve the defined outcomes in accordance with the agreed Case Management Plan, whilst fulfilling their day to day responsibilities within their own Agency

3. There are two FTEs in the Case Management Secretariat – Director, Case Management Framework (\$120,123) and a Project Officer, Case Management Framework (\$55,569).

METROPOLITAN ADELAIDE INDUSTRIAL LAND STRATEGY

386 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (18 February 2008). What is the total value of land that will be sold and acquired, respectively, under the Metropolitan Adelaide Industrial Land Strategy?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Port Adelaide—Deputy Premier, Treasurer, Minister for Industry and Trade, Minister for Federal/State Relations): The Minister for Urban Development and Planning has provided the following information:

The Metropolitan Adelaide Industrial Land Strategy was established to monitor the supply and utilisation of industrial land. The key objectives of the Industrial Land Strategy are:

Objective 1: Provide a rolling 400-600 hectare supply of development-ready industrial land in Metropolitan Adelaide.

Objective 2: Identify a rolling 15-year industrial land bank

Objective 3: Monitor industrial land supply, demand and utilisation

Objective 4: Review the Strategy, Assessment Framework and regulatory controls.

The information sought on the total value of land to be sold and acquired does not fall within the ambit of the Industrial Land Strategy. This information is not collected within Planning SA. The land identified in the Industrial Land Strategy is in various locations, varies significantly in quality and value and would be utilised over an extended period and then be subject to various forces of demand. It is doubtful whether such data, even if assembled, would have any practical application.

In 2006 and 2007 some data on 5 yearly land sales and values per square metre in different localities was collected and used for comparative purposes to gauge the Metropolitan Adelaide's competitiveness, particularly with industrial land in Melbourne. Industrial land in Metropolitan Adelaide continues to remain more than competitive with that in Melbourne. This information has been made available to both the public and private sectors in this State.

MARINE MAINTENANCE

420 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (8 April 2008). For each operating and marine maintenance project that will be completed in 2007-08, how much has been allocated to each project and what is the timeframe for its completion?

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

Operating marine projects anticipated to be completed in 2007-008:

Project	Cost	Completion Date
General fixed costs such as utilities, insurances, property management, staff salaries, Port Bonython shipping management fees, oil waste station fixed costs and various other fees and charges	\$2.2 million	ongoing

Marine maintenance projects anticipated to be completed in 2007-008:

Project	Cost	Completion Date
Routine maintenance of aids to navigation	\$400 000	ongoing
Hydrographic survey of Port Bonython channel and inspection of navigation beacons	\$56 000	May 2008
Quick release mooring hooks refurbishment at Port Bonython	\$120 000	September 2007
July 2007 storm damage excess to several jetties and Penneshaw breakwater	\$100 000	April 2008
Beachport boatyard, maintenance work on straddle carrier	\$70 000	May 2008
General routine jetty maintenance	\$120 000	ongoing
Supply of 150 box piles for reserve stock	\$350 000	December 2007
North Haven dredging works	\$380 000	October 2007
Tide gauges maintenance program	\$40 000	ongoing
Venus Bay abutment works	\$80 000	June 2008
Largs Bay jetty refurbishment	\$470 000	April 2008
Wardang Island jetty demolition	\$380 000	September 2007
Coffin Bay jetty re-decking	\$60 000	June 2008

ROAD SEALING

423 The Hon. G.M. GUNN (Stuart) (16 April 2008). How much will be spent on sealing the Wilpena to Blinman road and the Lyndhurst to Marree road, respectively, in 2008-09?

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

\$3.900 million will be spent on sealing the Wilpena to Blinman Road in 2008-09.

\$2.020 million will be spent on sealing the Lyndhurst to Marree Road in 2008-09.

COMPETITIVENESS COUNCIL

In reply to **Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite—Leader of the Opposition)** (27 June 2007). (Estimates Committee A).

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): The Minister Assisting the Minister for Industry and Trade has provided the following information:

There are no costs associated with the establishment of the Competitiveness Council. The Economic Development Board members of the Competitiveness Council do not receive any remuneration for their work on the Council. A Competitiveness Council secretariat has been established within the Office of the Economic Development Board to support the Council and this comprises four FTEs. The positions were reallocated from within the Department of Trade and Economic Development and no new positions have been created to support the Council.

HISTORY TRUST AND SA MUSEUM REVENUE

In reply to **Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett)** (27 June 2007). (Estimates Committee A).

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): I have been advised of the following:

This is predominately a timing and accounting process issue. With regard to the History Trust, at the time the income was estimated it reflected lower-than- expected visitor numbers at the National Motor Museum. Subsequent to the budget being provided, attendance figures improved markedly. The History Trust have now revised their estimated revenue to \$1.003 million, an increase from 2006-07.

During 2006-07, the South Australian Museum made a change in its commercial activities whereby both the shop and café operations were transferred, effective 1 November 2006, from the Museum Board to the Museum Foundation. Arising from this is an estimated \$550,000 revenue that will no longer appear within the Arts SA administered accounts. However the Museum's projected ongoing success in achieving Australian Research Council grants, plus the impost of charges to temporary exhibitions is expected to appreciably meet this shortfall. As a result the forward external revenue projections show a 4 per cent decline for 2007-08. However, it should be noted this decline is essentially an accounting/reporting matter in that the revenue forgone through Arts SA is effectively still accrued for the benefit of the Museum through the Foundation.

With regard to boosting visitor numbers, the Honourable Member would be aware that both the History Trust and Museum are included in South Australia's Strategic Plan target 4.3 to increase visitor numbers at cultural institutions by 20 per cent by 2014. I am happy to report that the Museum achieved record attendance every month but May for the last 6 months of the financial year in 2006-07.

Both organisations are involved in a number of initiatives as part of South Australia's Strategic Plan such as continuous improvements to the amenities of galleries and public spaces like renovating the Migration Museum at the History Trust and creating a new Biodiversity Gallery at the Museum; providing high profile special exhibitions; developing partnerships and collaborations such as History Trust's recent work with the State Electoral Office; and targeting initiatives at young audiences.

PUBLIC SERVICE EMPLOYEE NUMBERS

In reply to **Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite—Leader of the Opposition)** (27 July 2007). (Estimates Committee A).

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): The Treasurer has provided the following information regarding FTE Caps:

FTE caps have been established for all general government sector agencies. The aggregate FTE cap for 30 June 2007 is 74,560.

From 1 July 2007 the Department of Treasury and Finance (DTF) commenced monitoring staff numbers against the caps. This is done through the extraction of data from agency payroll systems. Agencies are required to explain any significant variations between staffing levels and the FTE cap.

The caps are consistent with the level of salaries and wages budgets. Any changes to the salaries and wages budget, for example, through new initiatives, will result in a corresponding adjustment to the FTE cap. Changes in FTEs between years reflect the timing of all past and present budget and savings initiatives.

EYRE PENINSULA WATER SUPPLY

In reply to **Mrs PENFOLD (Flinders)** (25 September 2007).

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): SA Water has provided the following information:

The groundwater used to supply most of Eyre Peninsula has naturally occurring levels of Calcium Carbonate that leads to the water being particularly 'hard', and can be associated with scaling of pipes and fittings.

SA Water undertakes regular monitoring of water quality on Eyre Peninsula. The results of these analyses show that total hardness (measured as calcium carbonate) has dropped in the water supply to Streaky Bay, Ceduna and Wudinna over the last 10 years.

SA Water's investigations indicate that elevated water temperature in customer private pipe system is the main cause of scaling. The problems generally occur if polyethylene pipe is used to transport water over long distances by private landowners. When polyethylene pipe is used on the ground surface or in shallow trenches (i.e. less than 200mm below the surface) water in non flowing or low flowing situations can absorb large amounts of heat, giving rise to increased scaling and precipitation problems and in extreme circumstances, can block the pipe. Polyethylene storage tanks, particularly if they are a dark colour can also have similar problems.

SA Water has informed the public about this issue through communication with councils, schools and the community across Eyre Peninsula. SA Water recommends that private polyethylene piping be buried greater than 200mm below the surface to reduce the likelihood of water heating.

SA Water is currently working with the community to develop a longer term water plan across the Eyre Peninsula.

SEWAGE OVERFLOWS

In reply to **Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (7 June 2007).

The Hon. K.A. MAYWALD (Chaffey—Minister for the River Murray, Minister for Water Security, Minister for Regional Development, Minister for Small Business, Minister Assisting the Minister for Industry and Trade): I am advised the overflow from the Garden Avenue sewer main on 3 June 2007 was caused by a blockage in the main next to a manhole on Glynburn Road, not by a lack of capacity in the main.

The blockage was caused by a quantity of tree roots which lodged in the main pipe where it enters a manhole on Glynburn Road. The blockage was cleared and the pipe was inspected internally with closed circuit television equipment. This pipe has previously been repaired and relined and is in good condition with no indication of tree root intrusion at this location. It appears that the bundle of roots responsible for the blockage had come down the Garden Avenue main from further upstream in the sewer catchment.

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:

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

Government's Response to the Natural Resources Committee—Deep Creek Report—
addendum

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

Local Council By-Laws—

City of Norwood, Payneham and St Peters—

No. 1 Permits and Penalties

No. 2 Moveable Signs

No. 3 Roads

No. 4 Local Government Land

No. 5 Dogs

ECONOMIC AND FINANCE COMMITTEE

The Hon. P.L. WHITE (Taylor) (14:05): I bring up the 66th report of the committee, entitled Emergency Services Levy 2008-09.

Report received and ordered to be published.

QUESTION TIME

LEIGH CREEK HOSPITAL

The Hon. G.M. GUNN (Stuart) (14:06): I direct my question to the Minister for Health. Given that South Australian country residents have been given the opportunity to shape our destiny by engaging with the planning process for future health services, and as the Leigh Creek Health Service Board recommended to the minister that there be no change to the services provided at the Leigh Creek Hospital, will he agree to accept the board's recommendation or will he reserve the right to override it?

The minister would be aware that the Leigh Creek Hospital provides a service to the local mining community but, equally, it provides a service to the vast areas of the outback. Due to the isolated nature of the area, the importance of the hospital cannot be over-emphasised. It is good parish pump politics.

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Kaurna—Minister for Health, Minister for the Southern Suburbs, Minister Assisting the Premier in the Arts) (14:07): I thank the member for Stuart for his question and, as he said, it is good parish pump politics, and he is a remarkably good parish pump practitioner. I hope that the basketballer who follows him will be equally as good at scoring goals, but somehow or other I doubt it very much.

On 6 June last year, the Treasurer brought down the budget. On that same occasion, at a briefing to people from the health sector, I said that within the next six to 12 months I would produce a country health plan, and I intend to honour that commitment. When I do produce the plan, it will have a number of features which will see an increase in the amount of acute care that is provided in the country. We will also see an increase in the amount of primary health care in country South Australia.

As I have said before, the health outcomes for people in country South Australia are not as good as those for the state overall. I think there are a whole range of issues in relation to primary health care that need urgent attention in the country and, of course, there are a whole range of services that could be provided in the country, for which people now have to come to the city.

In addition to that, we need to maintain a very extensive range of emergency services throughout country South Australia. Those three goals: improving country primary care, improving country and acute care and improving while maintaining emergency services, will be the parameters in which the country Health Care Plan will operate. As I say, I will give a more detailed explanation in the near future.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr BIGNELL (Mawson) (14:09): Can the Premier inform the house what the state government is doing in support of the theme for World Environment Day 2008, which is climate change and has the slogan, 'Kick the Habit! Towards a Low Carbon Economy'?

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) (14:09): In his message for World Environment Day, the United Nations Secretary-General Ban Ki-Moon admits that our world is 'in the grip of a dangerous carbon habit.' But to break the addiction, we all have to play our part as individuals, organisations, businesses or

governments. It is a message that we have already taken to heart in South Australia. The carbon-constrained world of the 21st century provides us with as many opportunities as it does challenges.

What it does not offer us is a choice. We have no alternative but to act now and to act decisively. With our economy in buoyant shape, our challenge is to ensure that we grow in a sustainable way. Achieving a balance will be difficult, but it is crucial. I have no doubt that our choice is not between the economy and the environment. Indeed, I believe that not only can the two exist side by side but also in many cases can fuel each other's growth. Neither government nor business can achieve that balance on its own. The urgency of kicking the world's carbon habit means that we must be united in our planning, we must be strategic in our thinking and we must be proactive in our approach.

Since being elected into office the South Australian government has progressively been working with all levels of government and business to have climate change put on the agenda. We achieved some success in 2005 when we were successful in putting the issue of climate change on the Council of Australian Governments (COAG) agenda. I was given the proviso of making sure that I did not discuss national emissions trading schemes or Kyoto. How absolutely absurd! We were able to get a working party out of that. It was an important step, which was followed by South Australia arguing for mandatory greenhouse gas emission reporting—which, of course, was the first step towards establishing an emissions scheme.

The states and territories decided to work together on their own discussion paper on emissions trading and, through the Council for the Australian Federation, under brilliant chairmanship we commissioned Professor Ross Garnaut in 2007 to undertake his work on climate change and the design of a national emissions trading scheme—in the face of climate change deniers headed by John Howard.

I remember, when I released that discussion paper with John Thwaites and Morris Iemma on Bondi Beach, how I was besmirched in the federal parliament by the former prime minister. We were accused of wrecking the Australian economy. What a difference a few months makes. A few more polls came out and suddenly he was not only George Bush's friend but also Al Gore's. Anyway, those days are behind us. I think it is terrific that the first act of a Labor government in Canberra was to go to Bali to sign the Kyoto agreement.

South Australia is today recognised as a national leader and, in some cases, a global leader in climate change policy and renewable energy development. We have Australia's first Climate Change and Greenhouse Emissions Reduction Act, which sets targets of cutting the state's emissions by at least 60 per cent of 1990 levels by the end of 2050—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: He says 'voluntary'. I remember what happened in this parliament when members opposite said that my proposal for legislation was simply inadequate and was not tough enough. Then there was a phone call from Canberra. Then there was a phone call from the business community. The next day what Rann was doing was too tough. It was going to destroy the economy. This is their policy substance—

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: Walking both sides of the street, as usual.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Walking both sides of the street and emitting diesel fumes at the same time. It also sets a target—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Members opposite sneered when we announced our target in the legislation of having 20 per cent of our energy coming from renewable sources by 2014. I will invite them next year in this parliament to celebrate the day when we achieve that target five years ahead of schedule. That generation target will be met by next year—putting South Australia in a world leading position.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: He says that he had a briefing note about it. Maybe that briefing note might have told him that when we came to office not one wind turbine was operating in this state. Now we have 47 per cent of the nation's wind energy and 40 per cent of the nation's grid connected solar power and 80 per cent of the exploration and development work on hot rocks geothermal activity. I am quite happy to give a lecture—a symposium—on this. In fact, I can reveal to the house that I have said to this energy minister, who has stood shoulder to shoulder with me as we lead the world on sustainable energy, that I want him to look at lunar energy next. In fact, I

am quite prepared to put that in his ministerial title, because I believe that lunar energy—tidal energy to the non-believers—should be our next policy embrace.

As Minister for Sustainability and Climate Change, I announced this year (and I am sure this will lead the news tonight) that the state government was putting its money where its mouth was by achieving carbon neutrality for its operations by 2020—the first government in the world to be carbon neutral and, by 2014, the first government in the world that I have heard of (although I know that Bhutan has a strategic plan that has a gross national happiness index) where 50 per cent of the state government's power requirements for schools, hospitals, government buildings, police stations and fire stations, the parliament and members' electorate offices will come from accredited green power.

I was delighted to announce this week that the first geothermal power will be produced out of the area near Innamincka by January next year. There are also our wind farm developments. We started by education, and that was the critical key to this. People called it symbolism, but symbolism is so important in basically bringing people with you. Tim Flannery, two days before I was sworn in as Premier, came to me and said, 'Can we put solar panels and solar power at the Museum, the Art Gallery, the State Library and Parliament House?' I am told that a couple of days ago the panels were installed on the Adelaide Airport, and the next move is the biggest solar array on any rooftop in Australia, five times bigger than the Victorian markets—10,000 square metres of solar panels are to be installed at the new Goyder Pavilion at the Royal Showgrounds.

I am delighted that we have signed the first voluntary agreement (which was sneered at by members opposite) with the wine industry. I know that the barons of the Barossa on the other side of this house (whom I admire enormously) believe that we did the right thing at the London Wine Show—and, I must say, it was nice drinking Grange Hermitage at 10 in the morning. There is the agreement with the Local Government Association of South Australia and the Property Council. These sector agreements are a key element of the state's climate change legislation, through which we can tackle carbon emissions.

Then there is our Million Trees Program. First of all it was a million trees. Then Herbert Girardet, one of our thinkers in residence, said that we could help to reduce the carbon footprint of Adelaide with a series of interlinked urban forests with three million trees, and now a further 2.5 million trees will be planted for the new River Murray Forest. Of course, South Australia is used to being a leader. I know there are some advisers from the 1970s in the gallery who advised the Dunstan government during the glory years, people who were exalted by the likes of Des Corcoran (my fashion and decor adviser), when we showed—

Ms CHAPMAN: Sir, I rise on a point of order. The Premier is well aware, after 30 years, of standing orders not to refer to people in the gallery.

The SPEAKER: There is no point of order.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Some 30 years ago, Glen Broomhill introduced legislation, for which he was condemned, which brought in container deposit legislation, after Oregon—I admit, the Oregonians were doing—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: —no, not Origamis; Oregonians—were leading in this area to bring in container deposit legislation. We are very pleased that, as part of our response, we have decided to make it 10¢ rather than 5¢. We are still the only state to have had the guts to do so. Of course, as part of our response to adaptation, the state government is committed to protecting our biodiversity on land and water by establishing five biodiversity corridors across the state, as well as 19 marine parks by 2010. Then we will move on to plastic bags. Somaliland has banned plastic bags; also Ireland, France, Bhutan, Bangladesh, and soon South Australia.

The challenges ahead are great and some tough decisions will need to be made. All addictions are tough to break and our addiction to carbon is no exception. This addiction poses a terrible threat to future generations, so we must work together—business, government and the community—to plan our withdrawal, because we have to do it in a most committed way in a series of partnerships. South Australia is leading the way. And breaking news, if you do not believe me, ask David Suzuki, my friend Mikhail Gorbachev, Al Gore, Robert Kennedy Junior, Blair, or David Miliband and, in a chorus singing in unison, they will hail what this parliament and this government have achieved.

STARFISH HILL WIND FARM

Mr PENGILLY (Finniss) (14:21): My question is to the Minister for Infrastructure. Will the minister advise the house of the amount of power as a percentage of installed capacity that the Starfish Hill wind farm is currently providing to the grid and how many of the turbines are inoperable? The Liberal opposition has received advice that there are chronic design faults in the turbine gearboxes and that a number of the turbines are currently offline and have been for an extended period.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Elder—Minister for Transport, Minister for Infrastructure, Minister for Energy) (14:22): This is the difference: a government that has encouraged the wind industry to the extent that we are world leaders and an opposition which, when it was in government, did not have a single turbine—

Mr PENGILLY: Mr Speaker, I rise on a point of order. My point of order is relevance.

The SPEAKER: Order! I do not uphold the point of order. The minister has barely begun his answer. I will listen to it.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: The point I make is that, at any opportunity they can find, they attack the renewable energy industry. I am quite happy to talk to—I think it is Tarong Energy that operates—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Wasn't it us?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: The member for MacKillop obviously still does not believe the facts that have been put to him by the Premier. The truth is that, when we came to government in 2002, there was one wind turbine: it was in Coober Pedy and it did not work. That was the previous government's achievement in renewable energy.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: How many were approved? None that I can recall, because I can tell members that one of the first things I did in government was get the bureaucrats into my office on the Starfish Hill wind farm and tell them to resolve the deadlock on providing all the necessary approvals for it to go ahead. After the industry had been stuffed around for months by the former energy minister, it took 20 minutes to resolve the difference. If you want to talk about wind energy, we will do it at some length.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: The answers may well be longwinded. I am quite happy to find out how many, and I will not take for granted any of the honourable member's allegations. I do not know why you want to attack the people operating wind farms. I do not know why you want to do that, but we are more than happy to be known in public as strong supporters and happy to find out. I will tell members how many are operating as opposed to when you were in government, and that is an infinite number more because, when you were in government, our energy was drawn from—

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I am sorry, the power tool has something to say by way of an interjection. I mean, that voice is as uninformative as it is unattractive! What I can say is that any reasonable observer would know that South Australia is not only the most successful state in Australia in creating renewable energy but also a world leader. If members opposite want to quibble about someone who has gearbox problems in wind farms to attack the industry, go right ahead, but we will continue to support it.

CONSUMER AFFAIRS MINISTERIAL COUNCIL

Ms SIMMONS (Morialta) (14:25): Will the Minister for Consumer Affairs advise the outcomes of her recent attendance at the Ministerial Council on Consumer Affairs?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for State/Local Government Relations, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Volunteers, Minister for Consumer Affairs,

Minister Assisting in Early Childhood Development (14:25): Ministers at the most recent Council on Consumer Affairs meeting agreed to a range of issues, including the development of a national consumer policy framework, national product safety and wine-labelling reforms. Ministers welcomed the opportunity to work collaboratively with the federal government to develop a groundbreaking approach to consumer policy which will enhance market confidence and fairness. These reforms will address inconsistencies in legislation across the nation while at the same time encompassing legislative and regulative best practice.

The aim is better outcomes for consumers and lower costs for businesses. One of the other key outcomes from the meeting was the agreement to reform the way in which we deal with product safety. Again, the aim is consistency and rapid response. Over the past couple of years, we have seen increasing numbers of toxic and faulty goods—particularly from China—coming into Australia. Different states at different times have implemented bans on different products, whether that be children's toys, cooking items or toothpaste, for example. Every year we have the round of show goodies banned in one state only to pop up a few weeks later in another—costly testing and costly administration.

A study by Access Economics (commissioned by the ministerial council) has revealed more than 173,000 product-related accidents in Australia every year. The findings also reveal that more than 13,000 of these are caused by faulty products, with resulting injuries costing the nation an estimated \$250 million. Over 40 per cent result in the need for medical treatment. Many of those injured are employed, and the report estimated that, as a result, over half a million work days are lost. The ministerial council agreed to a proposal that will enhance the commonwealth's role in product safety while ensuring that local issues are dealt with swiftly. Interim bans implemented in one state will be automatically advised around the nation, and the ACCC will immediately begin assessment for permanent bans.

The ACCC will undertake a greater role that will be significantly enhanced, and it will share enforcement responsibilities with state and territory consumer affairs agencies. Finally, I am pleased to inform the house that all other states and territories have agreed to follow South Australia's lead in adopting a unified wine labelling system. While Australia signed up to the worldwide trade group agreement last year, South Australia was the first and only of the Australian states and territories to implement it. It is estimated that this will save the South Australian wine industry in excess of \$12 million a year, with potentially a \$25 million saving for the industry across Australia. The decisions made at the ministerial council provide a new way forward in consumer and business protection and state and commonwealth cooperation in this area.

TEACHERS

Mr GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel) (14:29): Will the Minister for Education and Children's Services advise how she will provide teachers for the Nairne Primary School given her recognition that the school is experiencing significant student growth? I received a letter from the minister recently stating that a feasibility study for future capital works will be undertaken at Nairne Primary School in order to accommodate student growth. Yesterday it was revealed in a study completed by the University of Adelaide that the state needs 2,500 additional teachers over the next four years to stem a major skills shortage.

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH (Adelaide—Minister for Education and Children's Services, Minister for Tourism, Minister for the City of Adelaide) (14:30): I thank the member for his question. I think that he is condensing two ideas into one question. Nairne Primary School, I am sure, will be easy to staff because, in reality, it is an attractive, well-run public school, which is particularly attractive to teachers, both with experience and recently qualified in their career.

Having said that, I think that the issues around recruitment of teachers are not as terrifying as the article purported them to be. For instance, to put this matter into perspective, we have 36,000 registered teachers in South Australia, and little more than 20,000 of them are actually teaching. Some of those, of course, are women who have intentions of returning to the workforce at some time into the future.

Also to put it into context, this year alone we appointed 3,000 qualified teachers to vacancies within schools and started the academic year with 3,000 newly appointed teachers, and I think we only had 10 vacancies, from memory, which, in itself, is an extraordinary achievement. The way to recruit teachers is to recognise that one has to understand the demographics of the workforce, to recognise the qualification rate of those coming out of university and to find ways of matching that with available jobs.

To explain that: managing a workforce of over 20,000, as DECS has, takes a significant amount of input on a variety of levels. It is about recruiting young teachers before they finish their courses; it is about placing them in appropriate locations and recognising forward need. We do not actually have a shortage of teachers. In all reality, with 36,000 teachers, we do not have a shortage of teachers. What we have is a mismatch between available locations that they wish to work in and a mismatch in training, because we recognise that we do have a shortage in some specialist areas, and those specialist areas are—

An honourable member: Languages.

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH: —languages, mathematics, physics and chemistry. In fact, it is pretty concerning around the world that there is a shortage of maths and physics teachers and, in fact, I am shocked by the statistics that come out of Great Britain that show the very low percentage of teachers of physics who have physics degrees, and I think that there is a worldwide crisis. But I have no fear about the South Australian workforce because I understand that the number of available teachers is in balance with the jobs on offer. The most critical point, though, is to plan for the training of teachers, to recognise that employment requires a balance of recruitment and retention, retraining, upskilling and, in fact, to recognise the value of teachers.

I know that the previous federal government made an art form out of denigrating, demeaning and attacking teachers, and that is something that we would never condone, because we recognise their enormous value to our community and our children. Teachers should never be attacked, as they have been by the previous government, as a way of blaming them for every ill in society. But the studies we have embarked upon with the University of Adelaide have, in fact, reflected my concern that there is not an overall shortage of teachers. It is a specialist-by-specialist problem that we need to address into the future.

The reason we are actually being very analytical about looking at the workforce is that we want to have a reflection of the available jobs within the university training programs, because it would be misleading to have a massive recruitment of students to acquire a HECS bill and a degree if there were not available jobs in the future. The shortages do not seem to be true of junior primary and primary teachers, but we do know that the shortages into the future will be in specialist training courses. That is why we are working with the university sector to gear forward enrolments to match the forward job opportunities. I think that is a very responsible thing to do.

In the short term, I explain to the member for Kavel that, in fact, there is no shortage of primary and junior primary teachers, and Nairne Primary School has no fears because not only do we have a government that believes in public education and is prepared to invest in it, but we know that there are very good teachers to work in that community.

AMBULANCE SERVICES

Mrs PENFOLD (Flinders) (14:35): My question is to the Minister for Health. Can the minister advise how many of the additional 72 staff announced for the SA Ambulance Service to cope with the anticipated extra call-outs will be allocated to regional areas? In his media release dated 30 May it was announced that the money would fund a massive 96,000 extra call-outs of paramedics over the next four years. Ambulance services in most regional areas are manned by volunteer officers, who are being increasingly stretched as their numbers dwindle, and hospital numbers are going to be reduced.

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Kaurana—Minister for Health, Minister for the Southern Suburbs, Minister Assisting the Premier in the Arts) (14:35): I thank the member for Flinders for her question because it allows me to highlight the fact that the government announced just last week that in this budget there will be \$26 million extra for ambulance services in our state. Those extra funds will do a range of things. They will allow us to employ an extra 70 or so staff, some of whom will be paramedics. It also allows us to purchase additional ambulances, so that there are more ambulances on the road—this is not replacement vehicles but more ambulances—and also additional vehicles which will be used to change the nature of the way ambulance services are delivered in this state.

At the moment, of course, when someone calls an ambulance, an ambulance is sent out with a couple of officers in a very expensive vehicle and, often, the person is not necessarily carried to a hospital because they can be looked after. So a more modern ambulance service, which is what we are heading to, will be able to have a two tier approach, with a clinical service at the phone centre so triaging can occur, and vehicles other than an ambulance can be sent out with paramedics in them to provide assistance in the home and perhaps transfer to somewhere other than a hospital.

So it is a different system of doing business. The British health service works in this way. This will provide us with the extra capacity we need because, as we know, in South Australia as our population ages the demand for acute services is increasing at an enormous rate, and that applies to the ambulance services also. So these additional funds, the \$26 million, will help us expand the services that are required right across South Australia. As to the proportion of those funds that will go in particular directions, I cannot give the member a specific answer but I am happy to seek advice for her.

PATIENT ASSISTED TRANSPORT SCHEME

Mrs PENFOLD (Flinders) (14:37): My question is again to the Minister for Health. Will the government revise and raise the PATS (Patient Assisted Transport Scheme) reimbursement so that it reflects increases in costs associated with country people accessing medical attention?

A constituent who requires monthly specialist eye treatment is considering dropping the treatment and subsequently losing his sight because of the cost. He chooses to fly, because it is the cheapest option for him as it avoids the necessity of an overnight stay in Adelaide (it is unwise to drive for some hours after treatment), and he spends as little time away from work as possible so that his income is not further disadvantaged. He believes the reimbursement from PATS, which he appreciates, does not adequately deal with the current situation regarding costs and travel options. He points out that a visit to his eye specialist costs him \$300 to \$350, without including the doctor's charges, while a metropolitan resident can access the same treatment for as little as \$10.

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Kaurana—Minister for Health, Minister for the Southern Suburbs, Minister Assisting the Premier in the Arts) (14:39): I thank the member for the question. It is an important question. I can inform the house about a range of things that we are doing. I answered this in part in relation to the question that the member for Stuart asked me. The first thing we are doing is introducing a country health plan which will provide more services close to where people live. That seems to me to be the fundamentally most important thing we can do.

Something like 45 per cent of the money we spend on acute services for country people is spent in city hospitals, so there is a capacity, we believe, to transfer some of that resource back into country settings. Clearly, you cannot do that in every hospital but we have identified a range of hospitals where we can do that. The Port Lincoln hospital in the member's electorate is one of those sites where we want to expand services—

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. HILL: The Deputy Leader of the Opposition may wish to ask questions about this. That is fine. She may have a view that we should not expand services in the country. That is also fine.

She is entitled to campaign on that belief in the country and the city, anywhere she likes, but in our view it makes sense to put more services in country settings so that people who have needs can have them addressed closer to where they are. That is our commitment because we want to improve the health of country people. In relation to the PAT Scheme, originally it was the responsibility of the commonwealth government. I find it interesting that the opposition only asks questions about this when Labor is in power. They were in government for eight years and, to the best of my knowledge, did nothing to improve this system.

Mrs Penfold: You left us bankrupt.

The Hon. J.D. HILL: The old cry. The excuse for every single inaction in the eight years they were in government. Their excuse for everything. They cut through the services in the health system like a knife going through butter, cut back services everywhere in the South Australian health services and it is this government that is rebuilding the health services. We are attempting to get a better way of spending the available PATS funding.

Unfortunately, the member for Goyder is not here today, but he would be pleased to tell members that he has written to me, enthusiastically supporting a trial in country health transport that has just finished over on Yorke Peninsula. We are evaluating that trial to see if we can use the available funds to get a better outcome for people. I also understand that the current federal Labor government is examining the whole PATS issue as well, so a few things are being done which should help country South Australians.

HAMMILL HOUSE

The Hon. R.G. KERIN (Frome) (14:42): Will the Minister for Health update the house on the government's plans to complete the upgrade of Hammill House, the aged care facility in the

Port Pirie Hospital? The government has on several occasions since 2002 committed to the upgrade of the 32 beds in Hammill House. While some of the work has been done, the majority of the beds are to be upgraded, despite issues of not meeting 2008 accreditation standards.

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Kaurua—Minister for Health, Minister for the Southern Suburbs, Minister Assisting the Premier in the Arts) (14:42): I am happy to provide a more thorough briefing for the member. When he was premier of this state there was a way of resolving this issue which required a bit of political courage. Unfortunately, he and his party did not demonstrate that courage and that nursing home facility was allowed to be maintained in a second-class way. It was this government that came to power and put in a couple of million dollars, from memory, to begin the upgrading process. We are working on how to fix it and I will happily provide a briefing to the member.

MANNUM FERRY

Mr VENNING (Schubert) (14:43): Will the Minister for Transport advise what alternative plans have been developed if the second ferry at Mannum becomes inoperable? In December last year one of the two ferries at Mannum was closed indefinitely as low river levels were preventing the ferry from docking safely to the concrete ramps. This is the first time since the introduction of locks and weirs in the river system in 1936 that a ferry has been shut down. Since the indefinite suspension of the upstream service, the downstream service has been closed for both emergency and routine repair work four times, leaving residents of the town with no way to cross the river other than driving to Blanchetown or Swan Reach.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Elder—Minister for Transport, Minister for Infrastructure, Minister for Energy) (14:44): I am not aware that there is any risk of the second crossing being—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Immediately before I finish a sentence the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, who knows something about everything, has some advice on it. Before I finish a sentence she is telling me what will happen with the second ferry at Mannum. How I wish one day I could meet someone as smart as the Deputy Leader of the Opposition thinks she is, because that would be exciting.

Ms CHAPMAN: On a point of order, sir: it is one thing for the Minister for Transport to make up things, but it is another to stick to the facts.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Find that under the 'Nyah, nyah, nyah' section of the standing orders. I take seriously the access for those people. There is not one person on this side of the house who enjoys the state of the Murray and the difficulties that it causes for so many people, but they are real difficulties caused by forces beyond our control. I am not aware of any risk of the second ferry closing, except for repairs, and there is nothing that we can do about the need for the occasional repair. I will get a full briefing for the member for Schubert, but I am not aware of any risk of the ferry closing on a permanent basis. Like everyone, we wish that the river were in a better state but, until that time, we will simply have to make the best of it.

PORT AUGUSTA GANGS

The Hon. G.M. GUNN (Stuart) (14:46): Can the minister representing the Minister for Police give an assurance to the house that all necessary steps will be taken to ensure the safety of the people at Port Augusta so that they can be protected against gangs who have viciously assaulted people and have no regard for the law. I will quote from the front page of this week's local edition of *The Transcontinental* under the heading 'Almost bashed to death', as follows:

A Port Augusta man 45, and a Port Lincoln man 44, were walking from a party on Taylor Crescent at about 3am when a group of eight Aboriginal men attacked them on Chinnery Street.

The Port Augusta father of three was airlifted to the Royal Adelaide Hospital with serious head injuries...

Further, a letter to the editor states:

The two people who were bludgeoned within an inch of their life were two innocent men, one a local tradesman, the other a friend of his visiting from out of town. They did nothing to deserve what happened to them. They simply were doing what most of us are too scared to do and that was walk in this town in the middle of the night. They were attacked by a group of Aboriginals, some of whom were probably not even old enough to be out at that time of night, armed with an array of weapons, from as sticks and pieces of concrete. Were they not interrupted by a friend of the two who was taking partygoers home, we most certainly would be making funeral arrangements for them today.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON (Croydon—Attorney-General, Minister for Justice, Minister for Multicultural Affairs) (14:47): This is a very important matter, and I shall get a report from the Commissioner about it.

UNLEY DEVELOPMENT PLAN AMENDMENT REPORT

Mr PISONI (Unley) (14:47): Can the minister representing the Minister for Urban Development and Planning explain how during former mayor Keenan's re-election campaign of 2006 the government made a firm commitment to support demolition controls in the City of Unley, yet for the past nine months it has refused to approve the City of Unley Village Living and Desirable Neighbourhoods Development Plan Amendment Stage 1, a plan designed to do just that?

In November 2006, then Labor mayor Michael Keenan signed an MOU with the Minister for Urban Development and Planning (Hon. Paul Holloway), agreeing to the City of Unley Village Living and Desirable Neighbourhoods Development Plan Amendment Report. The report has been known to the minister since it commenced in 2005 yet, to date, it has not been approved by the minister. In the meantime, applications by developers to demolish have increased significantly. The new rules would mean applications would be judged against a set of character criteria.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Elder—Minister for Transport, Minister for Infrastructure, Minister for Energy) (14:48): I will get a report on behalf of the minister. I understand that Michael Keenan is not the mayor there any more, someone else is. This is a serious issue. I do know that the people of Unley, regrettably, can sometimes make very poor judgments. I will get a report on this important matter.

EDUCATION, SPECIAL NEEDS

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (14:49): My question is directed to the Minister for Education and Children's Services. Why has the government not provided adequate resources for the delivery of special needs education to the children of families in the southern Mallee region? Parents in southern Mallee towns have been forced to choose from several unpalatable options to access adequate and appropriate education services for their children with special needs. Those choices are:

1. Keeping the child in a local under-resourced school.
2. Providing daily private transport to and from very distant schools, or prevailing upon others to do so.
3. Placing their children daily on buses as early as 6.30am and returning at 5.30pm.
4. Placing their child into voluntary foster care (which I find abhorrent) in another centre—which one family has had to do already.

These alternatives place extra stress on the children, increasing their anxiety and compounding their learning difficulties. The last alternative is to relocate the entire family to another centre. This is problematic for the parents' employment and severely disrupts the families' social networks which are very important for these families.

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH (Adelaide—Minister for Education and Children's Services, Minister for Tourism, Minister for the City of Adelaide) (14:50): Clearly, the honourable member is relating an issue that reflects a challenge for a family in his electorate. I do not believe that children are taken into foster care under those sorts of circumstances. I have never heard of a situation such as that occurring.

Mr Pederick: There is one in Murray Bridge. You should get a report.

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH: I would be happy to look into those allegations. Generally, the education department would offer the best options for children. It would offer support in terms of access to transport. It would offer support in terms of SSO hours and suitably trained staff and it would offer options. Clearly, there are issues where parents want mainstreaming of children or they want their child in a particular location. To my knowledge extraordinary effort is always put into giving the parents the best service for their child. If there is a particular issue which the honourable member would like to discuss with me, I am happy to investigate the matter. On the face of what the honourable member has told me, I think the actual details seem extremely unlikely.

HUMAN REMAINS

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:52): My question is to the Attorney-General. Why have the remains of Sophie Dauncey and Edward Drew not been reburied or cremated or re-interred since their burial site was unearthed on 14 June 2005?

Nearly three years ago, an 1860s crypt containing three coffins was unearthed during excavation of a property at St Georges. Despite much correspondence from me and others to the Attorney-General urging that legislation be introduced to amend both the Cremation Act and the Births, Deaths and Marriages Act in order to allow the bodies to be respectfully disposed of or re-interred, that legislation was not passed until May or June 2006.

The Attorney-General noted at the time that 'they are stored safely at a funeral director's premises, and what the relatives, the descendants, would like is for these bones to be disposed of in a respectful and regular manner. Changes to that law allow that to happen.' Later that year it was claimed that the remains were of Sophie Dauncey and Edward Drew, her brother. The remains are still stored after three years in a funeral parlour in Adelaide.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON (Croydon—Attorney-General, Minister for Justice, Minister for Multicultural Affairs) (14:53): I shall get a report on the matter.

HOME SUPPORT SERVICES

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop) (14:53): My question is to the Minister for Health. What criteria have changed or been introduced to assess eligibility for home help services to regional South Australians? If there has been no change, will he explain why a 65-year old recipient of such services with multiple health conditions has been excluded from this service?

Over the past four years a 65 year old resident of Naracoorte in my electorate has received home help services. Initially it was two hours per fortnight, then it was reduced to 1.5 hours per fortnight, then 1.5 hours per month, and as of January 2008 no support has been available whatsoever. Medical evidence has confirmed her long list of health conditions, including rheumatoid arthritis, with her overall condition worsening, not improving, over time. The resident has been informed, first, that she did not meet the criteria and, more recently, that there is a lack of funding and there are more in need than her.

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Kaurana—Minister for Health, Minister for the Southern Suburbs, Minister Assisting the Premier in the Arts) (14:54): Obviously, I am not aware of the details of this particular person. I am not sure whether the member has written to me about the issue. If he had, I could find that out.

Mr Williams: You have had correspondence.

The Hon. J.D. HILL: From you?

Mr Williams: Yes.

The Hon. J.D. HILL: I am not aware of the particular circumstances. I will certainly have it investigated. However, as I understand it, there have been no changes in the criteria. The budget, as I am aware of it, has not changed, so I am not sure what the problem is. However, I am happy to obtain a report for the member.

COUNTRY HEALTH SA

Mr PENGILLY (Finniss) (14:55): My question is to the Minister for Health. Why is the minister pretending still to consult the rural community and stakeholders—

The Hon. J.D. HILL: Sir, I rise on a point of order.

Mr PENGILLY: Listen to the question, John.

The Hon. J.D. HILL: There was a clear comment in that question. He said, 'Why is the minister pretending'.

The SPEAKER: Questions must not contain argument. An allegation that the minister is pretending, or anything like that, is out of order. I suggest that the member for Finniss rephrase the question.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Attorney will come to order.

Mr PENGILLY: Why is the minister claiming to still consult the rural community and stakeholders about the development of its country health plan when already employees in Country Health SA are using it to reject services? The government has announced that it is consulting extensively to develop its Country Health Care Plan, having established its single country regional health service. When inquiries were made as to the establishment of a renal unit at the Victor Harbor hospital (the South Coast Hospital), where substantial local donations have been offered from the Port Elliot branch of the CWA (some \$80,000), an executive officer of the department responded on 25 February 2008 as follows:

It now appears that the funding for new [renal] chairs is being allocated to more outlying country areas such as Port Augusta and Berri, which is consistent with the new directions for Country Health in supplying services to people in the country. The Hospital has prepared a Master Plan for a new health unit to be built on the south coast which will include a designated area for such services as Renal Dialysis. However, there is no funding forthcoming from the State Government and with the announcement of the Marjorie Jackson-Nelson Hospital and its associated costs it is unlikely that the local proposal will be considered in the near future.

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Kaurana—Minister for Health, Minister for the Southern Suburbs, Minister Assisting the Premier in the Arts) (14:57): That was not a direct quote from my department. If the member for Finniss suggests that that statement is a direct quote from my department, he is misleading the house. There were a range of facts, allegations, suggestions, opinions and half-truths in the statement made by the member for Finniss. Let me just go through some of the elements.

The first point relates to the country health plan. As I said earlier today, we will be releasing that in the near future, and that will be a document for consultation. We have consulted extensively with country regions over the last couple of years about the services they need. All those services, of course, have to be funded within a budget framework. The process of the approach that the government is taking is to have one integrated networked system of health providers in country South Australia where we can provide a greater range of primary health care and acute services and also a proper range of emergency services.

Clearly, not every town or centre can have everything that it wishes to have. There are not sufficient funds in any budget to do that. We have to allocate the resources to the areas of highest need, and that has to take into account the level of need of the particular communities and also the distance that people in those communities might have to travel in order to obtain those services in another community. That is the general framework.

In relation to renal services, we do want to extend those services in a series of major hospitals. I announced a year ago that it was our intention as a government to increase the range of acute services that were run through the four general hospitals that we have identified: in the South-East the Mount Gambier District Hospital; in the Riverland the Berri Hospital; in the north of the state the Whyalla Hospital; and on the West Coast the Port Lincoln Hospital. What the officer is alleged to have said is totally consistent with that framework.

The claim that has been made on a number of occasions now by members of the opposition (who desperately make up things to suit their own purposes) that, somehow or other, the construction of the Marjorie Jackson-Nelson Hospital is taking resources away from the country is absolutely fallacious, and the budget that will be announced later on today will demonstrate that absolutely categorically.

CUMMINS RURAL CARE FACILITY

Mrs PENFOLD (Flinders) (15:00): My question is to the Minister for Education and Children's Services. Will the minister advise when Cummins will have the funding to build a rural care facility to enable parents to have their children cared for while they work or have time out? The Cummins community has been without a rural care facility for a long time and, in this time of severe drought and the accompanying stress and depression, when there is a need for families to seek off-farm employment, child care is needed more than ever. The community bank has put forward over \$50,000 towards this project which should be funded by the Department of Education and Children's Services. There has been continuing delay in the upgrade of the facility to licensed standards that would enable it to commence operation.

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH (Adelaide—Minister for Education and Children's Services, Minister for Tourism, Minister for the City of Adelaide) (15:01): I regret that I missed the sense of the question. Could the member for Flinders repeat it please? I did not hear the town.

Mrs PENFOLD: Will the minister advise when Cummins will have funding to build a rural care facility to enable parents to have their children cared for while they work or have time out?

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH: I apologise to the member; I did not catch the name of the town to which she was referring. Now I know it is Cummins, I am still unable to give her a precise answer, but I will look into the matter for her.

HOUSING SA

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:02): My question is to the Minister for Housing. Will the minister explain why an 80-year-old resident who has lived in her Blair Athol Housing Trust home for 55 years has had notice that she is to be relocated? The resident has received notice from Housing SA that she is to be moved to alternative accommodation after 55 years in her Blair Athol home. The member for Enfield has written to the minister concerned about the relocation notice that she has received, and I thank him for that. The opposition has received letters from the concerned family highlighting the close proximity to transport and other family to support her in her current home. An appointment with the department to review this matter was cancelled, notwithstanding assurances from the minister's electorate office.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Minister for Families and Communities, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation, Minister for Housing, Minister for Ageing, Minister for Disability, Minister Assisting the Premier in Cabinet Business and Public Sector Management) (15:03): The question of how we deal with the necessary issues of relocation when we embark upon a renewal of some of our neighbourhoods is obviously a delicate one. The Housing Trust (now Housing SA), over the years, has built up an extraordinary amount of expertise in how to handle this. I think it is regarded as one of the pre-eminent authorities across Australia in dealing with these questions. It consistently comes out at the top of every list in terms of satisfaction about its performance, and this is one of the areas on which it concentrates.

It is a delicate matter. Obviously, the mere fact that someone has been in a place for 55 years does tell you something about the age of this housing estate. Obviously, we try to handle those matters with sensitivity. Often it involves lengthy processes of talking with the affected resident and lots of notice. We try to ensure that the notice is appropriate so that we are not worrying people unduly for too long, but we do need to be clear with people about when the immediate date of relocation is necessary. We try to relocate people very close to where they live. We try to relocate them near family and friends. Sometimes we relocate whole streets together so that we can retain the relationships.

We do take these matters very seriously. I will look carefully and sensitively at the matter involving this elderly person to ensure that we take every possible step to ensure that this relocation and the circumstances around it are handled sensitively.

WATER CARTING, LOWER LAKES

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop) (15:05): Will the Minister for Water Security explain why residents around the Lower Lakes, who have been denied access to water as a result of low flows in the river, are not receiving any assistance with water carting? The opposition has been told that water is being carted at no charge—either for the cartage or the water—to several homes and businesses near Lake Bonney in the minister's electorate which have lost access to water. We further understand that this free supply will be maintained for as long as it takes to complete a pipeline for supply to those homes, and we are advised that this project is running well behind schedule.

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) (15:06): There are two issues to the honourable member's question: one relates to the drought; and the second relates to the closure of Lake Bonney and the pipeline that is being installed for people who were accessing water from Lake Bonney. The project at Lake Bonney is funded by the Murray-Darling Basin Commission because of action that was determined necessary under the contingency planning at the national level through the decision making of the Premier and the Prime Minister. The Murray-Darling Basin Commission has funded that project, and that pipeline is being funded as part of the closure of the lake. Down around the Lower Lakes we have not put in place any interventions that have resulted in the waters in the Lower Lakes dropping: the drought has contributed to that.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. K.A. MAYWALD: We have not stopped waters flowing over Lock 1. We are still maintaining a positive flow over Lock 1. The difficulty for opposition members to understand is that there is a drought and we have had 20 months in a row of the lowest flows ever on record, and they are having an impact on the flow.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. K.A. MAYWALD: There is a drought policy and drought support—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. K.A. MAYWALD: A package of measures has been introduced by the federal government in relation to drought support, and members opposite would be aware that drought relief is largely the responsibility of the federal government. The state government does have some responsibility to support these programs and we do that willingly. In terms of the carting of water in South Australia to anyone who is affected by a lack of rainfall, that is not a drought response that this state government supports. That was a response from the previous government, and I understand that a former leader, the member for Frome, supports the policy that the carting of water should not be subsidised. That was the previous Liberal government's policy also.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. K.A. MAYWALD: The Lake Bonney decision was made by prime ministers and premiers as a drought contingency measure to ensure that we could supply critical human needs this year. It was requested by the Murray Senior Officials Group, as closures to wetlands and lakes needed to occur to ensure that we could supply critical human needs, which members opposite do not seem to think is important. Part of the Lake Bonney project is funded by the Murray-Darling Basin Commission, and it is a project because—

Mr Williams interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for MacKillop is warned.

The Hon. K.A. MAYWALD: I suggest to the member for MacKillop that he get a full briefing on what is happening with these measures and what the understanding is. He does not bother to get briefings. He does not want briefings. We offer regular briefings. He does not want them. He just wants to try to undermine the communities in the Riverland and the rest of the River Murray in time of need. What they need now is a joint voice of action and support. They do not need a whinging, whining opposition that tries to provide division and undermine their security. That is exactly what the opposition is doing and that is what the member for MacKillop is doing.

BUDGET PAPERS

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Port Adelaide—Deputy Premier, Treasurer, Minister for Industry and Trade, Minister for Federal/State Relations) (15:00): As Treasurer, I lay on the table the following budget papers:

Budget Overview 2008-09—Budget Paper 1

Budget Speech 2008-09—Budget Paper 2

Budget Statement 2008-09—Budget Paper 3

Portfolio Statements 2008-09—Volumes 1, 2, and 3—Budget Paper 4

Capital Investment Statement 2008-09—Budget Paper 5

Regional Statement 2008-09—Budget Paper 6

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I move:

That the Portfolio Statements, the Capital Investment Statement and Budget Statement be published.

Motion carried.

APPROPRIATION BILL

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Port Adelaide—Deputy Premier, Treasurer, Minister for Industry and Trade, Minister for Federal/State Relations) (15:02): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

Mr Speaker, South Australia is poised for an historic era of growth and development, and this Budget provides the framework on which that prosperity will be built.

This Budget delivers action now for our state's future.

It provides for infrastructure and services needed to meet our future challenges.

And it outlines a commitment to retaining our quality of life through projects and planning that foster continued business and population growth.

It's the seventh Budget of this Labor Government, and the seventh budget in surplus.

The Budget builds on and continues the work of our previous Budgets in preparing South Australia to meet the challenges and opportunities that lie ahead.

This Budget outlines a significant transport investment program. This program will change the way people travel, redefine our city's public transport network over the next decade and help South Australia increase its public transport weekday travel to meet the State Strategic Plan target of 10 per cent by 2018.

It is a program that is worth nearly \$2 billion over the next decade and will deliver:

- the electrification of major rail lines in the city;
- a tram extension from the city to the Entertainment Centre, which will also become a park'n'ride facility, with 800 car parks made available to residents of the western suburbs;
- further extensions to West Lakes, Port Adelaide and Semaphore; and
- new rail and light rail vehicles, extra buses and a new ticketing system.

It is the biggest investment in public transport in the state's history.

But Mr Speaker, this Budget isn't just about transport.

There is record funding for our health, education and criminal justice systems. There is substantial investment to secure our water supplies, for our most vulnerable members of society and to help business and industry prosper.

Across the public sector, over \$10.3 billion will be invested in capital projects over the next four years.

And yes—there is further tax relief and assistance for first homebuyers.

These measures further strengthen our economy and strengthen our community.

Mr Speaker, the hallmark of the Rann Labor Government has been strong financial management—so much so that in relation to the economy we now are the party of choice.

Why? Because we have invested in vital infrastructure and services, continued to deliver Budget surpluses and maintained our hard won triple A credit rating.

Mr Speaker, this Budget continues our tradition of Budget surpluses.

It delivers a net operating surplus of:

- \$160 million in 2008-09;
- \$356 million in 2009-10;
- \$434 million in 2010-11; and
- \$424 million in 2011-12.

And in the current year we're estimating a surplus by 30 June 2008 of \$373 million. That is what I call surpluses.

Large net operating surpluses allow significant infrastructure investment in schools, hospitals, prisons, water security and the public transport system.

Large surpluses allow us to meet future pressures, particularly in this uncertain time in the national and international economy.

This record level of investment results in a prudent increase to our net debt levels. In this Budget, net debt is projected to increase from \$82 million at 30 June 2008 to \$1.983 billion at 30 June 2012.

Mr Speaker, the increase in our liabilities is manageable because of the government's commitment to strong surpluses.

Mr Speaker, this is a Budget that is about taking action now for South Australia's economic future.

South Australia's economy continues to be strong despite rising interest rates and the adverse effects of the ongoing drought on our farm sector.

Gross State Product is forecast to grow at 2¾ per cent and employment is forecast to grow by 1½ percentage points in 2008-09.

Employment growth has been very strong at an estimated 2¼ per cent through 2007-08.

South Australia's population is growing at its fastest pace in 25 years, a quarter of a century.

Household consumption spending grew by 3.2 per cent in real terms during 2007.

Business investment remains near historically high levels—71 per cent higher than in 2001.

Mineral exploration expenditure was up 78 per cent during 2007.

The housing construction sector was up by some 6.6 per cent.

And South Australia's unemployment rate remains at historically low levels, with the labour force participation at its highest level since the early 1990s.

Mr Speaker, it is in this economic context that the government provides further tax relief to encourage future investment in our state.

It delivers further payroll tax relief and provides additional assistance for first homebuyers.

This Budget brings the total of the government tax relief since coming to office in 2002 to be, by 2011-12, \$3 billion.

In last year's Budget the government announced that the payroll tax rate would be reduced in two stages from 5.5 per cent to 5.25 per cent from 1 July 2007 and then to 5 per cent from 1 July 2008.

Last year the government also announced measures to harmonise payroll tax arrangements with other states and territories. This provides consistency for businesses working across state borders and significantly cuts red tape as it relates to payroll tax.

Today the government is announcing further payroll tax relief.

The payroll tax threshold will be increased from \$504,000 to \$552,000 from 1 July 2008, with a further increase to \$600,000 from 1 July 2009.

The payroll tax rate will also be further reduced from its current 5 per cent, from 1 July 2008, to 4.95 per cent from 1 July, 2009.

As from 1 July 2009, when all of these measures are implemented, the government will be delivering an annual payroll tax relief to business in this state of \$136 million per year—nearly \$600 million of relief over five years.

These payroll tax reforms will also mean that from 1 July 2009, historically I think for the first time, the first time that I can recall, South Australia will have a more competitive payroll tax regime than the state of Victoria and the state of New South Wales.

These reforms continue to provide a further stimulus for employers and business investment.

Over 6,500 businesses employing 380,000 South Australians will benefit from lower payroll tax rates and 300 businesses will be exempt from payroll tax once the threshold is increased to \$600 000.

Mr Speaker, young South Australians deserve the Australian dream of owning their own property.

In many other parts of Australia it has been increasingly difficult for young people to get on the property ownership ladder. We want to help our young people invest in our state and stay in our state.

The current first homebuyer stamp duty concession scheme phases out at a purchase price of \$250 000.

This scheme, which has been in place now for many years, if not decades, has clearly not been as good as the state can provide, and is a scheme that no longer is relevant to this state. As of 5 June I can say that that scheme will be scrapped and replaced with a first home bonus grant scheme of \$4000, which will be available for first home purchases valued up to \$400,000.

It will then phase out for first home purchases valued between \$400,000 and \$450,000. The old scheme was worth about \$8 million a year; this scheme now is worth \$32 million a year approximately, a four-fold increase in the amount of money being provided to assist first home buyers, and my advice is that that will make possible for 95 per cent of first home buyers now to access financial relief from the state government.

The bonus grant delivers \$130 million of assistance to first homebuyers over four years, and will be available for first home purchase contracts, as I said, entered into from today.

The \$4000 bonus grant will be additional to the existing \$7000 First Home Owner Grant and more than 9000 first home buyers are expected to receive the full grant in 2008-09. This is almost double the number of young South Australians that would have benefited from the stamp duty concession in 2008-09.

Mr Speaker, this Budget is about action now for the future of our public transport system.

In this budget we begin a decade-long \$2 billion investment program in the state's public transport system.

The Budget alone provides \$648.4 million over the next four years for rail and light rail investment including:

- \$162 million to extend the tram line from North Terrace to the Adelaide Entertainment Centre and to purchase new light rail vehicles, with the first trams making that journey in 2010. And as I indicated earlier, there are 800 parking spaces available during the course of a day at the Adelaide Entertainment Centre. That site will become a park'n'ride facility, where a charge will be provided for both parking and transportation into the city. It will give a benefit to the CBD of reducing the number of cars in the city by 800 per day, a significant reduction in urban congestion.
- \$83 million to commence the electrification of the existing Outer Harbor line. We have documentation available. The tram line will connect from the Entertainment Centre, across Port Road, through Bowden, Brompton, and connect up with the existing Outer Harbor train line.
- \$209.7 million for the electrification of the Noarlunga line, with work on that line to begin almost immediately.
- \$116 million for the re-sleepering the Gawler line. That will be the first stage of electrification of that line, but a major re-sleepering program is needed before we are able to put in the electrification system.
- a further \$14 million has been allocated in this budget to purchase additional, or lease additional trams to meet current demand pressures on the service. My understanding is that the minister will go to the market almost immediately to seek out the appropriate trams to deal with what is clearly a very popular public service—the Glenelg to Adelaide tram.
- \$29 million for a new public transport ticketing system.
- \$40.2 million to upgrade ageing rail infrastructure and equipment.

In addition, the Budget provides some \$64.4 million to acquire and operate 80 extra buses over the next four years. That will be 20 buses per year for four years. That will provide an additional—and I find this number quite extraordinary—the extra 80 buses will provide 9 million passenger journeys over the next four years. Increased capacity on our bus network.

Alongside that, we have a program to replace with state of the art, brand spanking new buses, 130 of them, some of our existing fleet.

Mr Speaker, but this is only the beginning.

Future Budgets will provide for the extension of the tram line to a refurbished and re-built AAMI stadium at West Lakes. And, further, through the city of Port Adelaide, a major urban redevelopment program under way there. And, almost back to the future, for the nostalgic ones in this chamber, and I think Steph Key, and Pat Conlon used to enjoy it, we are running the tram down Semaphore Road to Semaphore jetty. We will have coast to coast trams—which is quite an achievement, given we only have one coast! But we think that will give us a great improvement in our current public transit system.

Over the next decade the Gawler line will be electrified and 50 new trains, 58 refurbished and electrified trains, 15 new tram/trains and additional light rail vehicles will be delivered to service our rebuilt tram and rail transport system. Train/trams—

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: Dual voltage.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Dual voltage. They will be able to be on the tram line and go on to the train line, and vice versa.

Mr Speaker, our record investment on roads continues:

- \$377.9 million for the design, construction and maintenance of road infrastructure on the state's AusLink transport network.
- \$51.4 million for road/rail safety initiatives, including road shoulder sealing, in the country, level crossing upgrades, removal of rural road hazards, drug driver testing equipment, and additional speed cameras, to keep the community safe.
- \$24.9 million to upgrade two major road intersections—the South Road/Victor Harbor Road intersection and the Diagonal Road/Morphett Road intersection.

Mr Speaker, this government is taking action now to guarantee the future of our state's health system.

We are reforming the system and modernising our hospitals. The operating budget for health units in 2008-09 is 69 per cent more than was spent in 2001-02, the last year of the former Liberal Government.

The Budget commits a further, that is on top of already provisioned substantial growth moneys in health, \$462 million over the next four years, for health initiatives in our state's health system.

This extra funding allows us to treat more patients and to employ more doctors and more nurses. Between June 2002 and June 2007 we have employed an extra 2,406 nurses and an extra 699 doctors.

Among the new measures I can announce are:

- an extra \$357.1 million to provide more services in hospitals and continue the work of rebuilding the state's hospital system—as a result our health care system will treat an extra 50 000 South Australians over the next four years.
- an extra \$26.6 million in funding for the South Australian Ambulance Service, for 96,000 additional services over the next four years.
- Can I say that this is a government that loves to build and re-build hospitals, and I can say that in this budget we are at it again. The Berri Hospital will be rebuilt, almost a brand-new hospital. There was strong lobbying from the member for Chaffey for that hospital. And there was the member for Giles with her strong lobbying, and there will be a major re-build of the Whyalla Base Hospital. This is a significant plan to redevelop two of our major regional hospitals, and it will be part of a \$56 million program as part of the soon to be announced South Australia's Country Health Care Plan.

There will be continuing investment in rebuilding South Australia's hospitals through the 2008-09 Budget including:

- \$95.8 million to continue redevelopments under way at Flinders Medical Centre, the Queen Elizabeth Hospital and Lyell McEwin Hospital's stage B project;

- \$16.2 million for Lyell McEwin Hospital's \$202 million stage C of its redevelopment;
- \$25.6 million to replace and upgrade medical equipment, including \$2.6 million to replace two country mobile vans for BreastScreen SA, installing in them state-of-the-art digital mammography technology; and
- \$2.7 million of the \$36 million redevelopment of the Ceduna Hospital, including upgrades of diagnostic, treatment and primary health facilities. And I am happy to put on the record lobbying by the member for Flinders. I know she will be appreciative.

Mr Speaker, the Rann Labor Government is taking action now for the future of our education system.

This year we will increase our investment on each student to \$11,568—an increase of 52 per cent on the \$7,598 per student that was being spent when we came to office.

We will also invest over \$70 million this year to provide modern new school buildings in schools across South Australia. This funding includes ten new school upgrade projects worth a total of almost \$35 million.

We will also spend \$10.5 million over four years to continue three very successful programs under the Social Inclusion Board's School Retention Action Plan including \$5 million for the continuation of four Innovative Community Action Networks.

There is also within this Budget, a provision for a wage increase, currently under negotiation with the unions, for approximately 18 000 full-time equivalent public education staff.

The government's offer as part of this budget is worth \$306 million over the three-year life of the agreement.

Mr Speaker, the Rann Labor Government also takes action to give the most vulnerable members of our society protection into the future.

In line with the *Keeping Them Safe—In Our Care* strategy, the government is continuing to care for children in need.

The Budget provides \$190.6 million of new money to meet the needs of children in care and to provide additional support to carers and families.

This includes a range of targeted new initiatives to provide frontline assistance, directly to those families and carers who need support:

- \$15.0 million for early intervention case management and home visiting services to stabilise and support children in their families;
- \$13.2 million for increased capacity for specialised placement support and intensive family preservation and reunification efforts;
- \$8.3 million for additional services to support carers;
- \$7.3 million for increased support to non-government organisations responsible for carer recruitment; and
- \$4.6 million for increased subsidies to attract and retain carers.

This Budget also contains measures to assist the disabled including:

- \$26.6 million over four years for ongoing support to supported residential facilities;
- \$9.3 million over four years on improving disability access to public transport;
- \$5 million in 2007-08 for additional disability equipment;
- \$2 million to Novita Children's Services for a hydrotherapy pool at Regency Park; and
- \$1.5 million in additional resources for the Strathmont Centre redevelopment.

They are all significant and sizeable increases in support provided in previous years.

To help the homeless, as a Labor government the Premier has made programs for the homeless a priority, and to assist the homeless we will provide:

- \$4 million to assist the Foyer Plus project to provide accommodation for the homeless in Port Adelaide; and

- \$2.8 million to assist Common Ground in establishing a facility for the homeless in Port Augusta.

Mr Speaker, this government has never shied away from taking a tough stance on law and order to improve the safety of our communities.

As a result recorded crime, according to South Australia Police statistics, has fallen by more than 18 per cent since we came to office and more offenders are being sent to jail and being sent to jail for longer.

This success in itself creates pressure on the criminal justice system.

Therefore, the Budget builds capacity in the criminal justice system to address these pressures and to improve the efficient delivery of services.

Our police are on the frontline—protecting our community.

Funding for police operations, as we well know, suffered years of neglect under the Liberals. Under this government, South Australia Police has never been better funded or staffed.

Record funding will continue this year with a further 11 per cent increase in their operational budget to nearly \$630 million. Again, 62 per cent more money spent by this government since we came into office in 2002.

We will also provide more than \$38 million to relocate SAPOL headquarters, which is rapidly approaching its use-by date, to a new state of the art premises, with the most modern technology and services available to support our police, to a purpose-built facility elsewhere in the CBD of Adelaide.

The Budget also provides a further \$5.7 million to install new CCTV equipment in police stations to enhance the management of prisoners held in cells.

There will also be:

- \$5.2 million to SAPOL for a new IT system to police outlaw motorcycle gangs, and increasing and stepping up this government's war against the bikie gangs in this state; and
- \$1.2 million to replace Live-scan fingerprint scanning equipment.

Our broader criminal justice system will also benefit—and I can almost hear the applause from chambers—through a decision to refurbish and re-open the former Sturt Street court facilities, providing two additional courtrooms in the District Court—\$18.9 million will be provided over four years for this initiative. And we will also be funding three additional judges and associated operational initiatives. And I am sure the judiciary are very pleased with their new courts.

Over the next four years we will also provide:

- \$8.4 million for increased capacity for DNA testing and pathology services.
- A particular favourite and pleasing decision of mine—a \$7.5 million commitment to address workload issues in the Office of the Director of Public Prosecutions—as a result the number of staff in the office will have more than doubled since we came to office.
- And as a Labor government I am very proud to announce that we will also be increasing the budget to the legal aid services by a further \$8.3 million.

Of course, we need to keep convicted offenders off the street, so, yes, there is money for our state's prison system. There will be:

- \$35.9 million extra to accommodate the growth in prisoner numbers; and
- \$2.7 million to assist in meeting the growth in probation orders.

It is no secret that the Rann Government is locking up more prisoners, with prisoner numbers increasing from 1,479 at July 2002 to 1,934 in April 2008. That is an increase of some 450 prisoners since we came to office.

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: We make no apologies.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: We make no apologies. Mr Speaker, we also acknowledge that we have to act to prevent some of our young people becoming statistics of the criminal justice system in the first place.

Therefore, we will fund a range of initiatives that have emerged as a result of Monsignor David Cappelletti's report on youth repeat offending entitled *To Break the Cycle*.

These include:

- \$5.6 million over four years for a community protection panel that will provide intensive monitoring and intervention for serious repeat offenders;
- \$4.0 million over four years for youth justice teams to provide case management, programs and services to young offenders; and
- \$1.0 million over four years for the Tirkandi school retention program for Aboriginal youth attending Warriappendi School.

Mr Speaker, the 2008-09 Budget provides support for the future economic development of South Australia.

In particular, we will further assist our growing defence industry by providing:

- \$7.8 million to undertake site preparation works for stages 3 and 4 of the Techport Australia Supplier Precinct; and
- \$15.0 million for works on other land holdings within the Techport Australia site, which we know is rapidly becoming the major centre of defence construction and defence electronics in the nation—and, I might add, in the Southern Hemisphere.

On the mining front, the South Australian minerals sector continues to boom.

In 2004—this is extraordinary—there were five major mines operating in South Australia. That has now doubled and there are a further 27 currently in an advanced stage of assessment and approval.

We are aware that we need to keep ahead of the demand so we are taking action now to encourage further exploration and investment.

Therefore, the government will commit an additional \$11 million over four years to strengthen the ability of the Minerals and Energy Resources Division of PIRSA to manage the flood of new mines seeking assessment and approval.

A further \$3.1 million has already been allocated to the division's Petroleum and Geothermal Group to help speed up the assessment process for applications for geothermal exploration leases.

We will also invest \$7.9 million to improve South Australia's planning and development system—which has been very much the work of the member for Napier (Michael O'Brien). There will be further detail on this when the state's Planning Review is released by the government in the near future.

We also recognise that in an economy of record levels of employment, we need to bring in skilled migrants to South Australia.

Therefore, we will commit a further \$5.3 million over the next four years to continue and expand the government's program of attracting and retaining skilled migrants.

Mr Speaker, South Australia is a wonderful place to live (as we all know) and a wonderful place to visit and this government continues to support our tourism industry.

It is an industry that currently generates \$4.2 billion of expenditure in South Australia.

Specific measures in this Budget include one of which I am very fond and which I am very pleased with, one that I embraced with great enthusiasm from the outset, because it is the right thing for a government to be doing, and that is a once-off capital grant of \$18.9 million to the Adelaide Zoo to enable one of the most loved and cherished institutions in this state to undertake a transformation of its animal and visitor facilities.

The Adelaide Zoo (for anyone who is not aware) has nearly 400,000 visitors every year. It is about to become the only zoo in the Southern Hemisphere to host giant pandas, Wang Wang and Funi, under an important conservation breeding program.

This money will help our Zoo to grow, modernise and generate extra income to care for the animals.

I am advised that the fenestration of the fairy penguin enclosure is of particular significance.

For those unfamiliar with the concept, it means pedestrians will be able to view the fairy penguins from outside the Zoo through windows. That's a bit odd; they won't pay to go into the Zoo if they can see in for free. I am not sure we thought this one through all that well.

The Tour Down Under has been a hugely successful event for South Australia. This is a very important event on the international cycling calendar and an event that this year attracted well in excess of 500 000 spectators. The Minister for Tourism and the Premier are passionate supporters of cycling, as is the member for Mawson, a former cyclist and cyclist reporter, and the way Patrick is going he will be out there on the old two-wheeler. Patrick in lycra, what a thought!

We will provide a further \$14.6 million over the next four years to ensure the status of the event as part of the UCI's ProTour circuit and to ensure that it stays in South Australia for years to come.

Mr Speaker, this is not only the day on which the Rann Labor Government hands down its seventh Budget but, importantly, it is also World Environment Day.

I am conscious that throughout this Budget there are many measures that underline the leading role this government is playing in taking action now for a sustainable future.

Specifically, there are a series of other measures that further acknowledge our commitment to sustainability:

- \$7.7 million over two years from 2010-11 for the purchase of green power and carbon offsets by government;
- \$8.0 million in 2007-08 to the Royal Agricultural and Horticultural Society to install solar panels on the new Goyder Pavilion at the Wayville showgrounds; and
- \$2.4 million over four years to support improved energy and water efficiency and reduce waste in private sector buildings.

Mr Speaker, the Rann Government is taking action now to deliver water security for our state's future.

The government is pleased to have settled the national agreement on a plan to manage the River Murray. This provides a strategic direction and will deliver improved outcomes for the River Murray.

In 2008-09 we will spend \$97 million of our commitment to build the 50 gigitalitre desalination plant at Port Stanvac. This investment will allow the necessary planning and groundwork to be completed for construction of the plant to begin in 2009-10.

We will also spend \$80 million in 2008-09 on upgrades and expansion to wastewater treatment plants and water recycling infrastructure. This investment will continue over the next four years, with \$426 million worth of projects to be completed. The upgrades will increase the percentage of wastewater reused in South Australia to nearly 45 per cent.

In addition, \$33.5 million will be spent upgrading water quality plants at Myponga, Mount Pleasant and in the Riverland.

The state government will continue its successful rebates package of \$24 million over three years to encourage greater household water efficiency inside and outside the home.

Mr Speaker, Labor Governments in South Australia have had a long association with the Arts which is why we are taking action now for the future of the Arts in South Australia.

We will spend \$43 million on an exciting project which has been a passion of the Premier for as long as I have known him, which, of course, has seen him star in four films in his own right, with each one rated worse than the previous one, according to my colleague. We will spend \$43 million to construct a Film and Screen Hub to replace the Hendon studios within the Glenside Cultural Precinct.

This initiative represents a major investment in the future of the South Australian film industry and provides economic and cultural growth opportunities for the state.

Other Arts measures include:

- \$4.2 million over four years to support the next generation of South Australian based

screen writers, directors and film producers;

- \$1.9 million over four years for the staging of arts events including additional support for the Adelaide Cabaret Festival;
- \$1.8 million over two years from 2010-11 for the establishment of a third Regional Centre of Culture;
- \$1.8 million for the Adelaide Symphony Orchestra, including a \$400 000 contribution to the construction of a new acoustic sound shell; and
- \$1.5 million over four years to support the State Opera and State Theatre, our major performing arts companies.

Mr Speaker, South Australia has a proud sporting history and we recognise the important role that sport plays in our daily lives which is why this Budget provides significant grant funding for sporting bodies, including:

- \$100 million over three years, commencing in 2009-10 to assist with the substantial upgrading of AAMI stadium—the only stadium solution supported by the SANFL, the AFL and our two great Adelaide clubs, Adelaide Crows and Port Adelaide;
- additionally, we will provide \$2.5 million each to the Adelaide Football Club and the Port Adelaide Football Club for the clubs' sporting and community facilities;
- \$1.5 million in 2008-09 for a permanent replay screen at Hindmarsh Soccer Stadium.
- Following a long and sustained lobbying effort from the member for Light to support regional horse racing in this state, our government will provide \$6.0 million towards redeveloping the Gawler racetrack. As the Premier has said, the member for Light drove him crazy over this issue with the amount of lobbying he did.
- \$5.0 million to the SAJC to create a second track at Allan Scott Park at Morphettville.

Mr Speaker, in this Budget the Rann Government will invest in measures now to secure the future of our emergency services.

The Budget provides significant additional resources of \$19.6 million over four years to the CFS to address the findings of the Wangary bushfires coronial inquest including:

- \$15.9 million over four years for aerial firefighting, including an air crane dedicated to South Australia, staffing for aerial firefighting supervision and operations management and improved fire retardant mixing infrastructure; and
- \$2.9 million over four years for community education on bushfires, enhanced training for bushfire management teams and the employment of a regional public warnings officer.

Mr Speaker, this Budget is delivered in a new and welcome era of cooperation between state and federal governments.

However, it is important to also note that because of this new relationship a number of other measures will emerge as the result of negotiations with the Commonwealth through the COAG process. COAG, of course, meets four times a year, and I am grateful that the treasurers attend as well to keep an eye on the premiers.

We will be making further announcements once this process is complete on investments in GP Super Clinics, providing additional support for transition care, dental services, mental health initiatives and indigenous children as well as additional skills training places for South Australia.

State and Federal Labor Governments are also acting together to reform specific purpose payment arrangements to focus on efficient and effective service delivery.

This reform includes revisions to the way payments are to be made to the states.

The revised process will commence from 1 January 2009 and I foreshadow that to enable implementation of these changes I will be bringing forward a supplementary appropriation bill before the end of 2008.

Mr Speaker, today I am handing down a Budget with a significant investment in infrastructure and services that will prepare South Australia for the future.

This is a responsible, prudent Budget and as such we have identified a savings strategy that will:

support the underlying strength in the Budget forward estimates for infrastructure expenditure; and

maintain a focus on reducing administrative costs and ensuring administrative and service delivery efficiency.

I say today, as I have with many budgets, there is a savings task scripted that will be clear and transparent and allocated to agencies in the Budget papers that will deliver the following savings over and above already publicly announced savings initiatives:

- \$25 million in 2009-10;
- \$75 million in 2010-11; and
- \$150 million in 2011-12.

Details of the specific measures that will achieve the first target of \$25 million in 2009-10 will be presented in the 2009-10 Budget.

Mr Speaker, with this Budget I again underline that this government is taking action now for the future.

The legacy of the Rann Labor Government will be the rebuilding of the state's infrastructure.

This Budget - previous Budgets - and future Budgets will:

- rebuild the state's health system including a new \$1.7 billion central hospital and redevelopments of our other major metropolitan and regional hospitals;
- rebuild our state's schools through the Education Works strategy, including six new Super Schools for Adelaide;
- secure our water supplies through measures including a major new desalination plant for Adelaide;
- build new men's and women's prisons at Mobilong, youth training, pre-release and forensic mental health facilities;
- invest in an ambitious new roads program that includes the Northern and Port River expressways and the South Road upgrade; and

as I outlined earlier—rebuild our public transport infrastructure with a decade-long \$2 billion program that will:

- electrify our major rail lines;
- extend our tram system through to West Lakes, Port Adelaide and Semaphore;
- purchase dozens of new trains and light rail vehicles;
- provide an additional 80 new buses; and
- a new state-of-the-art ticketing system.

Mr Speaker, the Rann Labor Government will do all of this while maintaining strong surpluses, prudent economic management and our triple A credit rating.

I would like to thank for their outstanding work the Premier, my Ministerial colleagues, their Chief Executives and their staff in assisting in the preparation of this Budget.

I would also like to thank the Under Treasurer, Mr Jim Wright, all the Treasury staff with whom I have worked closely over the last 12 months and those who work very hard in my agencies but whom I do not meet on a regular basis. I would also like to thank my Chief of Staff, Stephen Mulligan, my Media Adviser, Rik Morris, and Nick Alexandrides, the Premier's Chief of Staff, as well as the staff of the Premier's office.

I would also like to put on the public record my thanks to Paul Flanagan. Paul is one person whom we rarely (if ever) publicly recognise in this government, but I have worked with him for the last seven years, I am the bane of his life and I cause him great stress. I am a prickly

customer at times, surprising as that is, but this guy comes through all the time, and I would like to put on the public record my thanks to him and his team.

This is the seventh Labor Budget, a Labor Budget that builds for this state's future, that sets us up with the best set of accounts this state has ever had. We on this side of the house together with our Independent members can be very proud of the work that we have undertaken to date, and we now lay a future for the next decade that will make South Australia the best place to live in anywhere in Australia.

Mr Speaker, I commend the Budget to the House. I seek leave to insert the explanation of clauses in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1: Short title

This clause is formal.

Clause 2: Commencement

This clause provides for the Bill to operate retrospectively to 1 July 2008. Until the Bill is passed, expenditure is financed from appropriation authority provided by the *Supply Act*.

Clause 3: Interpretation

This clause provides relevant definitions.

Clause 4: Issue and application of money

This clause provides for the issue and application of the sums shown in Schedule 1 to the Bill. Subsection (2) makes it clear that the appropriation authority provided by the *Supply Act* is superseded by this Bill.

Clause 5: Application of money if functions or duties of agency are transferred

This clause is designed to ensure that where Parliament has appropriated funds to an agency to enable it to carry out particular functions or duties and those functions or duties become the responsibility of another agency, the funds may be used by the responsible agency in accordance with Parliament's original intentions without further appropriation.

Clause 6: Expenditure from Hospitals Fund

This clause provides authority for the Treasurer to issue and apply money from the Hospitals Fund for the provision of facilities in public hospitals.

Clause 7: Additional appropriation under other Acts

This clause makes it clear that appropriation authority provided by this Bill is additional to authority provided in other Acts of Parliament, except, of course, in the *Supply Act*.

Clause 8: Overdraft limit

This sets a limit of \$50 million on the amount which the government may borrow by way of overdraft.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Hamilton-Smith.

STANDING ORDERS SUSPENSION

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Port Adelaide—Deputy Premier, Treasurer, Minister for Industry and Trade, Minister for Federal/State Relations) (16:01): I move:

That standing orders be so far suspended as to enable me to introduce a bill forthwith.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (BUDGET 2008) BILL

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Port Adelaide—Deputy Premier, Treasurer, Minister for Industry and Trade, Minister for Federal/State Relations) (16:02): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the First Home Owners Grant Act 2000, the Stamp Duties Act 1923 and the Payroll Act 1971. Read a first time.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Port Adelaide—Deputy Premier, Treasurer, Minister for Industry and Trade, Minister for Federal/State Relations) (16:02): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

I move that this Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill contains measures relating to first home buyer assistance and pay-roll tax relief that form part of the Government's budget initiatives for 2008-09.

The Bill amends the *First Home Owner Grant Act 2000*, the *Stamp Duties Act 1923* and the *Pay-roll Tax Act 1971*.

With effect from today, the Government will provide additional assistance to first home buyers through the replacement of the stamp duty first home concession scheme with a first home bonus grant.

First home buyers who qualify for the Government's \$7 000 First Home Owner Grant ('FHOG') will also be eligible for a first home bonus grant of up to \$4 000 if the market value of the home is less than \$450 000.

The first home bonus grant will be available for first home contracts entered into on or after 5 June 2008 and for owner builders who commence construction on or after that date, subject to applicants meeting the FHOG eligibility criteria.

A \$4 000 first home bonus grant will be provided in respect of first homes with a market value up to \$400 000. The \$4 000 grant will phase out for first homes with a market value between \$400 000 and \$450 000 at a rate of \$8 for every \$100 in excess of \$400 000.

Where a first home buyer purchases land and subsequently builds a home on the land, the market value will have regard to both the value of land and the home built on the land.

The Bill also provides for an increase in the pay-roll tax threshold from \$504 000 to \$552 000 from 1 July 2008 with a further increase to \$600 000 from 1 July 2009. The pay-roll tax rate will also be reduced from 5 per cent to 4.95 per cent from 1 July 2009.

Around 6 500 employers are expected to benefit from these pay-roll tax measures, including an estimated 300 employers who will no longer be liable for pay-roll tax when the threshold increases to \$600 000.

I commend the Bill to Members.

Explanation of Clauses

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

This clause is formal.

2—Commencement

Part 1 and Schedule 1 will commence on the day of assent. Parts 2 and 3 will be taken to have come into operation on 5 June 2008. Part 4 will be taken to have come into operation on 1 July 2008.

3—Amendment provisions

This clause is formal.

Part 2—Amendment of *First Home Owner Grant Act 2000*

4—Insertion of section 18B

The Act will now provide for the payment of a *bonus grant* if the commencement date of the eligible transaction under the Act is on or after 5 June 2008 and the market value of the home to which the eligible transaction relates is less than \$450 000. If the market value of the home to which the eligible transaction relates does not exceed \$400 000, the bonus grant will be \$4 000. If the market value of the home to which the eligible transaction relates exceeds \$400 000, the bonus grant will be reduced by \$8 for every \$100 of value in excess of \$400 000.

The market value of the home to which an eligible transaction relates will depend on the nature of the relevant eligible transaction. The Commissioner will be able to make a determination as to market value in appropriate cases. As is the case under section 60A of the *Stamp Duties Act 1923*, the Commissioner will be able to seek satisfactory evidence of market value or require a valuation to be undertaken if the Commissioner considers that this is necessary to determine market value.

As is the case with section 71C of the *Stamp Duties Act 1923*, special provision is made for situations where the home is situated, or to be built, on a genuine farm.

Part 3—Amendment of *Stamp Duties Act 1923*

5—Amendment of section 71C—Concessional rates of duty in respect of purchase of first home etc

This amendment will provide that section 71C of the Act ceases to apply to conveyances where the relevant date for the purposes of the section is on or after 5 June 2008.

Part 4—Amendment of *Pay-roll Tax Act 1971*

6—Amendment of section 9—Imposition of pay-roll tax on taxable wages

The rate of pay-roll tax imposed on taxable wages paid or payable on or after 1 July 2008 is currently 5%. The amendment made by this clause has the effect of reducing the rate in respect of wages paid or payable after 1 July 2009 to 4.95%.

7—Amendment of section 11A—Deduction from taxable wages

8—Amendment of section 13A—Meaning of prescribed amount

9—Amendment of section 14—Registration

10—Amendment of section 18K—Interpretation

The tax-free threshold is currently \$504 000. The amendments made by these clauses relate to an increase in the threshold to \$552 000 for the 2008/2009 financial year and to \$600 000 for subsequent financial years.

Schedule 1—Transitional provisions

1—Transitional provisions

The transitional provisions will address various issues associated with the application of section 71C of the *Stamp Duties Act 1923* and the period between 5 June 2008 and the date of enactment of this Act.

In particular, it will be necessary to ensure that the commencement of the legislative entitlement under new section 18B of the *First Home Owner Grant Act 2000* does not lead to a doubling up of payments. Equally, a process needs to be in place in case a person receives an *ex gratia* benefit under the scheme that is to be established and then obtains a benefit under section 71C of the *Stamp Duties Act 1923*. A provision is also to be included to provide a right of recovery if a person obtains a benefit under section 71C of the *Stamp Duties Act 1923* despite the 'closure' of the scheme under that section on the enactment of this measure (due to timing issues).

Debate adjourned on motion of Ms Chapman.

CIVIL LIABILITY (FOOD DONORS AND DISTRIBUTORS) AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON (Croydon—Attorney-General, Minister for Justice, Minister for Multicultural Affairs) (16:03): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Civil Liability Act 1936. Read a first time.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON (Croydon—Attorney-General, Minister for Justice, Minister for Multicultural Affairs) (16:03): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

The bill aims to encourage food businesses, as well as individuals, to donate safe surplus food to charity. Everyone knows that every day food businesses throw away good food that they have been unable to sell. Although we cannot be certain, the government thinks that an important factor in causing businesses to dispose of food rather than donate it is the fear of legal liability should a consumer suffer ill effects. The government would like to remove that deterrent in the hope of encouraging businesses to choose to donate safe surplus food to the many charities ready to distribute it to those in need.

A similar initiative in Victoria has substantially increased food donations through the organisation One Umbrella. New South Wales has also now provided food donor protection. Accordingly, this bill proposes to give legal protection to food donors, rather like the legal protection we already give to good Samaritans. Our law already says that a good Samaritan who comes to the aid of another in an emergency is not legally liable for any harm as long as the good Samaritan was acting in good faith and without recklessness. I congratulate the member for Davenport on his initiative, which forms part of our law—and long may it do so.

In the same way, this bill would protect a food donor from liability as long as at the time the food was donated the donor neither knew the food to be unsafe nor was reckless about this. Fears have naturally been expressed about the risk of dumping unsafe food on charities as a cheap risk-free alternative to rubbish disposal. The bill guards against that risk in that, if the person knew the food was unsafe or is reckless about its safety, legal liability remains. There is, therefore, a basic obligation on the donor not to donate food that the donor knows or should know is unsafe.

The bill is not a licence to take risks with people's health. The government has consulted the charitable sector through the peak body, the South Australian Council of Social Service (SACOSS), which now supports the bill. The government has agreed to keep the new law under review in light of any evidence that SACOSS or others may gather about the effects of the bill. Accordingly, the bill includes a clause providing for a review after two years. We have also promised that food safety information will be made available to charitable distributors of food so that they can adequately protect the recipients.

I wish to thank the Law Society for its enthusiastic support of the measure. I acknowledge, in particular, the work of the society's New Lawyers Committee, which was instrumental in formulating the proposal and in securing the support of SACOSS. I also acknowledge the support of Restaurant and Catering SA, which indicates that it expects the bill substantially to increase

donations by the restaurant and catering trade. I seek leave to have the explanation of clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Commencement

3—Amendment provisions

These clauses are formal.

Part 2—Amendment of *Civil Liability Act 1936*

4—Insertion of Part 9 Division 11A

This clause inserts a new Division as follows:

Division 11A—Food donors and distributors

74A—Food donors and distributors

This new section protects a food donor or distributor from civil liability for loss of life or personal injury arising from consumption of food donated or distributed, except if the donor or distributor knew or was recklessly indifferent to the fact that when the food left his or her possession or control it was unsafe within the meaning of the *Food Act 2001*.

A food donor or distributor is one who, acting without expectation of payment or other consideration and for a charitable or benevolent purpose, donates or distributes food with the intention that the consumer of the food would not have to pay for the food.

The provision requires the Minister to report to Parliament on the operation of the provision over its first 2 years.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. I.F. Evans.

ADJOURNMENT DEBATE

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

That the house do now adjourn.

CHILDHOOD OBESITY

Mr VENNING (Schubert) (16:08): First, I want to make a brief comment about the budget in relation to South Australia and, more particularly, to my area, that is, the Barossa Valley.

The SPEAKER: Order! That is not in order.

Mr VENNING: I can't do that? No, I will not, sir. I was just disappointed to know that the Barossa missed out.

Also, I want to say that the Australian Institute of Health and Welfare estimates that somewhere between 20 and 25 per cent of children and adolescents are overweight or obese. As noted before in this house by the Minister for Health, the rate of obesity among four year olds is about 20 per cent and is growing at about 1 per cent a year, which is disgraceful and quite a serious matter. Being an overweight or obese child can lead to many health problems, including respiratory disorders and orthopaedic problems (arthritis, among others), consequently placing an enormous strain on our health services. Obesity is a preventable condition and, particularly with regard to children, it is completely avoidable.

Before I state the obvious, and before the minister states the obvious, when I was young I was not obese. You can see my condition now, so things have deteriorated. All I can say is, if I had been obese as a child, what would I be like now? I am very concerned about that.

Studies show that once a child or an adolescent is overweight they are unlikely to reduce their weight as they get older. It is clear that, if we continue like this, our future generations will face a massive health crisis, as we heard earlier today. Speaking from experience, and my own dilemma, obesity is becoming a massive problem right around the world, and the World Health Organisation has declared it a global epidemic. In this house on 9 April, the Hon. Jane Lomax-Smith said:

I think this shocking revelation is enough to shake everyone into action, and doing nothing is not an option.

I also note the work of the member for Unley in relation to canteen food programs. I commend him for that work, because he has highlighted and discovered some quite alarming facts about what is happening.

Given the magnitude of this problem, one must ask what the government is doing. I am aware that on 1 April this year the government launched the Eat Well, Be Active program, but what is it doing to increase the facilities available for people to use in order to get physically active?

Earlier this year, Jan Sutherland, Chief Executive of Sports SA (the state's peak sports body) said that a lack of physical activity is aligned with a lack of facilities. In January this year, the acting minister for recreation and sport (Hon. Paul Caica) said that the provision of local sporting and recreational facilities was the responsibility of local councils. He said that 'sporting organisations and councils should apply for funding under the state government's Community Recreation and Sports Facilities Program, where grants of up to \$300,000 are available'. The acting minister went on to say that major projects are assessed on a case-by-case basis. I wholeheartedly agree with one Adelaide reader who wrote to *The Advertiser*, as follows:

Who is acting sports minister Paul Caica kidding? The state government's Community Recreation and Sports Facilities Program grants of up to \$300,000 wouldn't buy any sports facility worth the name. The state government has effectively buck-passed the provision of community sports facilities to cash-strapped local councils, which find it very difficult to do anything effective.

I invite the minister—and his government colleagues—to visit the YMCA centre that serves the entire Barossa Valley and tell me whether he thinks the upgrade of this dated facility can be undertaken if the local council were to receive a \$300,000 grant—because I am certain it could not be done. It would not pay for the floor, let alone anything else.

The government should be developing surplus parcels of land which are suitable to be turned into recreational centres and sporting ovals; instead they are selling them in order to meet the budgetary requirements of burgeoning bureaucratic departments. Jan Sutherland of Sports SA said:

We believe that there needs to be an audit of sport facilities. I don't think anyone has really looked at what is around at the local and regional level.

I agree. It is all well and good for the government to implement programs which educate youngsters about healthy eating and the need to exercise, but how can they put an exercise regime into practice if there are not enough sporting and recreational facilities for them to use (and those that are in place are run down, old and very unattractive)?

We all need to make a concerted effort to reverse the alarmingly accelerating trend of childhood and adult obesity. The state Rann Labor government must stop merely emphasising the need for exercise and become proactive in constructing new recreation and sporting facilities and upgrading the run-down facilities already in place; only then we might see this worrying trend slow down rather than grow at a rapid pace.

We need a program in schools to educate students on the value of good diet and regular exercise, and we also need to implement physical education programs as we used to see them years ago. It needs to be a public expectation that we all shall eat and work healthily because the alternative is a life of ill health and early death.

We could start in this place, particularly in view of the recent controversy in relation to the members' lounge. That money could have been better spent on equipment for members to use. We once had a gym in this place, which I did use. Now there is no gym here in the building, and members who spend many hours in this place have no opportunity at all to exercise, apart from using a solitary exercise bike at the top of the stairwell—which, incidentally, I own and which I do not use very much. I believe we should think about it and ensure that at least one room in this building has an exercise bike, a television and a walker so that members can do some exercise. I think it is a very serious matter. You only need to stand outside Parliament House and observe people as they go past, particularly the younger ones, some of whom are so grossly obese. It is a real worry. I commend these thoughts to the house. I speak with some conviction on the matter. I know that, when I am home on the farm for more than two or three weeks, the weight falls off me, no doubt about it. It is exercise that you need.

Mr Piccolo: It bounces back!

Mr VENNING: It certainly does. When you are the whip, you do not get a chance to get out of the place and exercise, and I am afraid that, being tired, you eat, and that is a bad habit. We have to instil in people the good habit of eating good, healthy food. If we do not address this, we

will pay for it, anyway. We will pay a lot of money into the health system to look after these people. They will be a cost to the health system from a very young age, suffering from heart and cardiovascular problems and so on. I think a step in time certainly saves nine. I think we should spend that money right now. I ask the health minister to address this matter. It is a serious problem. We all know about it; we are all talking about it: it is time to do something about it.

MEMBER'S REMARKS

Mr PICCOLO (Light) (16:16): I will take a few moments to put on the record and to distance myself from comments made by the member for Schubert earlier today in this place when he implied in an earlier debate that the only areas worthy of any tourism were Kangaroo Island and the Barossa. I take exception to that. It is an appalling remark when one considers areas such as the Limestone and Copper Coast which have enormous tourism potential. The Clare Valley, the Flinders Ranges and, within my own region, Kapunda and Gawler have great historical and tourism potential.

For the member for Schubert to come into this place and suggest that the only places worthy of any note are the Barossa and Kangaroo Island is wrong. The member for Mawson, on many occasions, has also brought to the attention of this house the great contribution the area of McLaren Vale makes to this state from tourism and the wine industry. I would hope that the member for Schubert would retract that comment and apologise to the other regions of the state.

Motion carried.

At 16:18 the house adjourned until Tuesday 17 June 2008 at 11:00.