

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 24 March 2009

The **SPEAKER (Hon. J.J. Snelling)** took the chair at 11:01 and read prayers.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (ENERGY EFFICIENCY SHORTFALLS) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 5 March 2009. Page 1926.)

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop) (11:01): I indicate that I am the lead speaker for the opposition. I also indicate to the house that the opposition will be supporting this particular measure but wants to make a number of points about the measure and question how clever the government is being. I will come to that shortly.

First of all, I will speak to the bill as the opposition sees it. On 1 January this year, the government's Residential Energy Efficiency Scheme commenced. The scheme did not require any legislative changes for that commencement; the necessary legal instruments were all created through regulation.

The REES scheme is aimed at assisting South Australians, particularly those on low incomes, to reduce their energy bills, cutting greenhouse gas emissions and preparing households for the energy price increases that will result from emissions trading beginning in 2010 under the commonwealth's Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme.

REES is now a licence condition for all retailers of electricity and gas in South Australia. The framework for the REES has been regulated under both the Electricity Act 1996 and the Gas Act 1997. Under REES, retailers are obliged to meet three targets as part of their licence conditions.

They must achieve a certain amount of greenhouse gas savings (measured in tonnes of carbon dioxide equivalent) by incentives or special offers to households of one or more of the following: the installation of energy-saving light globes; the installation of low-flow shower heads; persuading householders to retire second refrigerators or freezers; the installation of energy-efficient hot water systems (solar, heat pump or gas); the installation of ceiling insulation; draught-proofing or the installation of energy-efficient heating and cooling systems.

Another target stipulates that they need to achieve a certain portion of these savings in priority households: that is, households where residents hold concession cards such as veterans' cards, pensioner concession cards or health care cards, or households where the South Australian energy concession has been granted, having been approved for the energy hardship program. The third target that must be met under the scheme is that retailers must also conduct a certain number of energy audits in priority households.

The scheme targets are set by the Minister for Energy, and the program is administered by ESCOSA. The scheme expires in 2014, and targets will be reviewed every three years. The government envisages that, over the next six years, approximately 2,000 households will be targeted by retailers and supposedly benefit from the scheme.

Retailers under the scheme are free to offer audits and incentives both to householders who are their customers and to those who are not. The bill amends the Electricity Act 1996 and the Gas Act 1997 to set up a penalty regime to underpin the REES scheme to ensure that retailers are obliged to meet their commitments. A retailer is obliged to participate in the scheme if they have over 5,000 residential customers under their licences per year. If a retailer has more than one licence (as in the case, for example, of AGL, which holds both electricity and gas licences), they will be obliged to meet targets for those licences.

At this time, retailers who are obliged include AGL, Simply Energy, Origin, TRUenergy, Powerdirect, Red Energy and SA Electricity. It is likely that this list will change each year as small retailers take on or lose customers and fail to meet the 5,000 residential customer threshold. Retailers will face penalties if they do not meet more than 90 per cent of one or more of their targets under the scheme.

If ESCOSA issues a retailer with a noncompliance notice, the retailer can choose either to pay a monetary penalty, which is variable and based on the shortfall amount, or opt to be

prosecuted for breach of licence and risk a criminal conviction and a fine of up to \$1 million. Should the retailer opt for the monetary penalty, they will be fined a flat rate of \$100,000 plus a dollar value for each tonne of carbon dioxide equivalent not saved and each energy audit not undertaken.

The dollar value for penalties will be set above what it would have cost to comply. The actual dollar amounts will be set by regulation following the passing of the bill. All penalties will be paid into the Consolidated Account. If a retailer does not meet their obligation and ignores the notice issued by ESCOSA, or refuses to make a penalty choice, ESCOSA can enforce the monetary penalty as debt or prosecute the retailer for breach of licence. ESCOSA can commence prosecution for breach of licence at any time but, if this course of action is taken, ESCOSA cannot also recover the monetary penalty.

Retailers who do not meet their audit targets will have their shortfall rolled into the next year to prevent companies from just paying a penalty each year, rather than conducting audits. If they do not meet their greenhouse savings targets, they can pay the fine and have the debt wiped. If retailers exceed their targets, the excess is banked and can be credited to the next year's targets. These credits can also be sold between retailers.

I have approached several retailers to ascertain their position on the bill, but I have yet to receive any reply from them. It is interesting to note that, when contacted by the media about a week ago, at least one electricity retailer on the list I read did not seem to have any idea whatsoever about the REES scheme or their targets.

As I said, the opposition will support the bill but, in doing so, we wish to make a number of points, not the least of which (and I am sure one of my colleagues will point this out) is that one of the targets with respect to hot water services is a nonsense in certain parts of the state; however, I will not steal the member's thunder, as I am sure she will put on the record herself the situation in her electorate.

We have a number of concerns. I did, in fact, draft an amendment to the bill, but there is some debate about whether or not this will be classed as a money bill, so I have chosen not to put it on file. However, I suggest to the minister that, if any fines are imposed through this scheme, the government should place any such fines into a fund to support the renewable sector instead of putting them into the Consolidated Account, as the bill proposes. They might go into a fund to support and subsidise the installation of photovoltaic cells in domestic circumstances. That is the thrust of what I would do if I was the minister imposing this particular scheme.

I draw the attention of the house to the front page story in *The Age* of yesterday. The crux of the story—and I will quote parts from it—is that a high-level ministerial brief has been leaked to *The Age*. The article states:

The leaked brief reignites debate over the environmental benefits of billions of dollars in green outlays by households and government, from an individual choosing to spend more for an energy-efficient refrigerator, through to Mr Rudd's \$3.9 billion for insulating homes as part of his economic stimulus package.

It states further:

The confidential ministerial brief advises the state government that it should now only bother with green measures if they are more cost effective than alternatives.

It goes on to say:

In practice, Labor's plan to reduce Australia's carbon pollution by between 5 and 15 per cent by 2020 means that any voluntary efforts to cut emissions will only reduce the price of permits to pollute, not actually achieve additional cuts [to greenhouse gases].

It is interesting that this minister has introduced this re-scheme. I think I am right in saying that the minister is on the record in this place during estimates saying that the answer to this is not necessarily having a whole host of small schemes all trying to achieve the end. At this time, when the Howard government was in power in Canberra, the minister said, 'What we need is a comprehensive emissions trading scheme.' I think at the time he said that that should be a cap-and-trade type scheme. It appears that the minister was thinking along the same lines as the advice that has been given to the Victorian government. *The Age* article continues:

The harder households work, the harder the Melbourne or Sydney city councils work, or the harder the state governments work to cut emissions, the less the big polluters have to work.

We are heading towards a national comprehensive carbon pollution reduction scheme, and it will cost us a significant amount of money. Apparently, the brief to the Victorian government says that, if other smaller schemes are achieving reductions in carbon pollution, the net effect will be that the

targets set by the commonwealth will not be changed—they will be the same—and some of the reduction that needs to be made to meet those targets will happen through these small voluntary schemes managed by the states, and the major polluters across the nation will actually have reduced targets.

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: Industry.

Mr WILLIAMS: Industry will have—

The Hon. P.F. Conlon interjecting:

Mr WILLIAMS: No.

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: Well, who are you talking about?

Mr WILLIAMS: The reality is that industry will be set targets by your federal colleagues, and your scheme is going to transfer the burden to meet those targets from industry to households. That is what is happening, minister. That is what the Victorian government has been advised, apparently. I would suggest that it is very similar to the advice that the minister himself gave this house several years ago. Of course, at that time John Howard was in power and the minister was keen to make a different point. The reality is that it appears that the Victorian government had been advised that a plethora of small schemes will not reduce the total amount of carbon because that will be capped under the commonwealth scheme and that cap will not be reduced or changed for industry because individuals and householders have done their part. The reality is that industry will be let off the targets it would otherwise have had to meet.

That is part of the problem that the opposition has been talking about for some time with a range of schemes. Interestingly, we can get more of a feel for the government's position on this—and I have made this comment with regard to this government on a number of occasions—as the importance of this scheme to this government is the fact that it gets it a headline in the media.

I notice the government has been keen to ensure that everybody knows that this is the first scheme and that it is at the cutting edge of these sort of schemes and out the front of the pack in an attempt to give the image that the government is doing something new and that it is doing something at the cutting edge, is in front of everybody else and is leading the world in this area, but in reality the net impact of this scheme, as far as emissions trading is concerned, is zip. It will be zip. I think the government understands this and that is why it has only put a three or four year life on this as it will expire in 2014. The government knows that it will not have any real impact on the total amount of carbon pollution across the nation, particularly in South Australia.

With those few remarks I again implore the minister that, if he is to impose fines on electricity retailers, he might reconsider where that money goes: whether it ends up in the Consolidated Account or goes back into the renewable sector to try to support some of the efforts there. Having said that, I indicate that the opposition supports the bill. We question how much net benefit we will get, other than a headline.

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (11:18): I, too, support the bill. I looked at the dot points on what will become part of the residential energy efficiency scheme, and they include: the installation of energy saving light globes; the installation of low flow shower heads; persuading householders to retire their second refrigerator and freezers; the installation of energy efficient hot water systems; the installation of ceiling insulation; draught proofing; or, the installation of energy efficient heating and cooling systems.

These are all fine points for anyone to take on board, especially as we move towards the unknown of where electricity and energy prices will get to under any scheme, whether under this scheme or the federal government's carbon pollution reduction scheme. There will be a definite cost to the population and market forces will work out what people can afford to do. Some of this is a little unrealistic. People in regional areas may run a couple of freezers for a big family, or a couple of fridges—

Mr Venning: Keep a bullock in it.

Mr PEDERICK: Yes, as the member for Schubert says, you could have a bullock in a freezer. I remember once I had a big kill of prime lamb—13; I guess it was an unlucky number—

The Hon. P.F. Conlon interjecting:

Mr PEDERICK: We had quite a bit of home-killed meat in the freezer.

Mr Venning interjecting:

Mr PEDERICK: Absolutely.

Mr Williams interjecting:

Mr PEDERICK: No. Just for the benefit of the house, they were definitely my lambs, and they were very good eating. My family does not enjoy the same benefits as the minister to just be able to duck around to Woolies or the corner store at a moment's notice. There is nothing quite like home-grown beef or lamb: at least you know that it is properly labelled, so to speak. So, there are certainly some difficulties moving forward with respect to whatever proposals are put up as far as energy saving, which I commend. I think we all need to do it, and sometimes monetary measures are what is needed to do so. However, we also do not want to place an unnecessary impost on people, especially those who can least afford it.

I digress a bit to talk about clean coal technology, which is our main baseload power source at the moment. Some say that the attainment of clean coal (which may never happen) would involve a carbon permit price of about \$100 per tonne. I would say that that would increase electricity prices not by 16 per cent, as has been stated, but by 40 per cent or better, which would really hurt the man and woman out there in the greater electorate. Those are my concerns with respect to any of these schemes.

I am all for reducing emissions, but not at all costs. Industry representatives to whom I have recently spoken say that, whatever part they take in an emissions trading scheme, if it all gets too hard they will just go offshore and build their industries in countries where they do not need to record their emissions.

I think that we must be very careful about how any sort of scheme is managed, because we have to make sure that we have a real benefit to a global issue—and it is a global issue. If we just fritter around the edges, the only people we will fool is ourselves. However, I fully endorse making energy savings.

I remind members that, with the introduction of an emissions trading scheme, the coal industry has the benefit of being able to access free permits. I hope that similar industries, such as agriculture, are looked on just as favourably, because there is not much point switching off a light or putting in an energy efficient globe if a company can just put its hand up and obtain free permits and there is no encouragement to reduce emissions.

I note that a retailer is obliged to participate in the scheme if it has over 5,000 residential customers under its licence per year. I just wonder whether, under the scheme, companies might just split themselves up into different entities and keep under that level. I know that would be difficult, but I guess—

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: They are not able to do that.

Mr PEDERICK: That is good. I think that would create a lot of logistical problems. However, I guess it would be up to each company to assess that in the broader market. Obviously, retailers will face significant penalties if they do not comply with the scheme.

As I was saying, we do have concerns about the implications for energy prices, especially in relation to the impending carbon pollution reduction scheme. Obviously, at the moment, they have the South Australian renewable energy feed-in scheme. It has been stated that, if you wanted to enter the scheme, you would have to buy the metering to hook into that scheme. That is worth \$400, and some say that it takes 18 months to pay for it. I think it is a commendable scheme but, as with everything, people add up the costs of getting onto all these things and work out whether or not it is worthwhile. With that contribution, I do support the scheme, but we do need to be cautious.

The SPEAKER: The member for Schubert.

Mr VENNING (Schubert) (11:25): Thank you, Mr Speaker.

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: What have you got in your freezer?

Mr VENNING: It varies from time to time. It does vary: it depends which one you're talking about. As the member for MacKillop said, we are supporting this bill, but it does raise a lot of material which could be debated in this house. I believe that we can all save power, because, like everything, power has been too cheap for too long and we have been on the gravy train, so to speak. It is a very appropriate time to say, 'Hang on; regarding the saving of energy, we ought to be looking at how we use this valuable resource.'

I remind the house that the Liberal Party's record on electricity is the best of any party and, in fact, probably of all the parties, it is the thing with which I am the most impressed. The Liberal Party's record in relation to electricity and its distribution is fantastic. Visit a farmhouse in any country in the world and see whether that house is connected to the grid as it is here. It was the Playford Liberal government that must have spent a fortune—an absolute massive amount of money—connecting all the little communities. All the distant farmhouses are on the grid via a SWER (single wire earth return) system. It is fantastic.

People have forgotten that, but it must have been a huge impost to the then government. It had to be—massive. You can imagine what it would cost to do that today. Go to any of the rural communities and you will see the wires going across to the houses—sometimes six to eight kilometres just to get to a single house. Just imagine that. What did it cost? I am afraid that people have all become very blase, and we ought to appreciate what was done and what it must have cost for that power to be connected.

The problem is that much of that was built in 1960. That is nearly 50 years ago, and the cost of maintenance, repair and sometimes replacing it will be of great concern. In many areas, the single wire system is no longer big enough to take the load because there can be up to, say, 30 or 40 various users on a single wire system and it gets overloaded, particularly with the larger welders and larger air-conditioners of today. So, there is a problem with that, too.

It is all part of it, and I think energy efficiency comes into this. This also enables us to fairly share this resource on a system like that. If it is more efficiently used, there will be more power, particularly for those on a single wire system. It concerns me very much that, over the years, we have accepted this wonderful asset but we have not done anything about putting away something for asset replacement or maintenance. I think we need to consider that, certainly within the next 25 years, we will have a problem. We should not forget about that—

The Hon. P.F. Conlon interjecting:

Mr VENNING: I hear what the minister says. I remember the debates back then. You need to read the debates back then. It was a great debate between Sir Thomas Playford, Sir Arthur Rymill and others. It is great reading; you have a read of it. Isn't it funny what history tells us? It was a great debate, because Playford was then the great regulator, the agrarian socialist—the greatest Labor premier that the Liberals ever had, I have been told. However, I do not care; whatever he did was fantastic—and look at the results. I applaud the previous federal Liberal government and the now federal Labor government for the rebates they give to encourage people to fit solar cells.

Personally, I and my family have considered this but we have not done anything because it is just not worth it. When you fit these facilities, your current tariff alters with your supplier and you change to a different level of tariff. We have worked out that as a result of our own usage it is of no benefit to us. Even over 10 years cost recovery, there is still no benefit. It needs to tie in with the supplier. If we could maintain our tariff level at the same rate, I am sure we would be in there. We ought to be doing something about that and we ought to be encouraged to do it. It is fantastic that people install these cells.

In our regions where there is a lot of sunlight, people ought to be encouraged to do it. I have renovated several homes in my time but there was never enough incentive to install a solar hot water service, which is the single biggest saver of power. We have a solar hot water service installed in our house and for only one or two days a year we switch on the power. After four or five cloudy days, we just switch on the booster. The single biggest saving is a solar hot water service, but there is not enough incentive—and there has not been an incentive for years—for people to find the extra cost to install it. After all, it is far cheaper to install it when you are building a house rather than trying to install it afterwards.

Retrofitting of these things, as well as buying the equipment, is extremely expensive. We have made huge inroads, but I would like ministers at both the state and federal levels to consider why more people have not jumped onto the rebate system. They have not done so because of the arrangement in which suppliers tie you up. They do not want you to do that and they hold you to ransom, purely because they say, 'If you fit one of these things, your tariff range will change.'

Mrs Geraghty: Ours didn't change.

Mr VENNING: Well, I am happy to hear that. I saw the minister make a note then, and I hope to hear what he has to say. Certainly, we would be doing it tomorrow, particularly when we hear that it will not continue forever. I believe that we should be looking at this issue.

I also note that the bill lists several things that we and the general consumer should consider in relation to doing our bit about the Residential Energy Efficiency Scheme—which this bill is about. The first one listed is energy efficient globes. I have messed around with these globes for years. When I bought my first ones it was at a huge cost. It is my experience that I never get the life out of these globes that they say I should. Whether it is because of the voltage drop, I do not know. We are now told that there is a problem with the disposal of them because of their mercury content. So is it such an advantage? The old globes were cheap at \$1.50 or \$2. These globes cost \$9 or \$10 for quality ones.

Secondly, the bill refers to the installation of low-flow shower heads. We fitted those but they are now in the shed because I did not like them. More work needs to be done on them. These things are just back stinging devices. I call them squirt aerators rather than a shower head. Most of us are used to a nice flood of water rather than the squirt that comes from these little shower heads.

Mrs Geraghty interjecting:

Mr VENNING: Maybe the member for Torrens has a newer one. We shower in rainwater. Maybe we should do something about that. In relation to a second freezer, most of us have fridges in the laundry or on the back veranda. It is usually only half full.

Members interjecting:

Mr VENNING: You are right; we have been rather extravagant about that. Often we have the car fridge which is in the car and which is plugged in. When you count them, you would be surprised how many refrigeration items are plugged in. We need to be reminded about that; and I have no problem with that.

In relation to energy efficient hot water systems, solar heat pump or gas, as members will tell you—and I know one member will do so—in some areas we do not have gas and in other areas, particularly in the South-East and the Adelaide Hills, there is not much sunlight on some days, so we need to have a bit of flexibility.

Mr Pederick: It's always raining down there.

Mr VENNING: Well, that would be nice. I'll take the rain, you can have the sunlight. We need to be flexible about that. With respect to ceiling insulation, I understand that the federal government has something going on there at the moment. I just hope that that is accessible because I have had several calls to my office and we could not give people the exact information they required because it is all a bit fuzzy. I hope that has been resolved, but I think it is a great thing. That ought to be automatic. It should be mandatory that every new house has adequate ceiling insulation and also draught-proofing of ill-fitting doors.

You go into some homes and you see heating devices and you know that they are absolute power guzzlers, particularly the oil columns that you wheel around. They are convenient, yes, especially for the nursery, but do they gobble up power, particularly in these large country, stone homes. These things gobble up electricity, and people leave them on all day. Again, an education program, minister, would be a good idea. Let these people know what these things cost to operate versus, say, a reverse cycle air conditioner, which is—

Mr Pederick: Or a door snake.

Mr VENNING: A door snake? That is right, he is the minister for door snakes, isn't he? All jokes aside, he is correct. After his comment, we went and bought a couple of door snakes and they are used. They are common sense, especially when you can feel a draught under a door on a cold night. We are supporting this bill, but we need to have an open brief on this. I have put several questions and, when he closes the second reading, I hope the minister will address them.

Mrs REDMOND (Heysen) (11:36): As has already been indicated, the Liberal Party is supporting this bill. Essentially, as I understand it, the bill relates to the imposition of penalties, and it certainly makes no sense to me to introduce a compulsion regime without having penalties in place. In that sense I do support the essence of the bill. I wanted to speak more particularly about one aspect of the bill, that is, the Residential Energy Efficiency Scheme (REES), because I do have some questions that I will be pleased if the minister can answer. He did indicate during the contribution of, I think, the member for Schubert, that these companies that are obliged to comply with this would not seek to avoid complying by reducing the number of households on their licence and dividing themselves up into smaller companies to avoid these obligations.

I am sure that the minister will be able to tell us the details of why he is so certain that will not occur. I am quite happy to take him at his word on that, but I will be interested to hear just how they audit the auditing process. My understanding is that each of these retailers is obliged to go around to houses and conduct audits and supply a range of things to them, including the famous door sausages (as we used to call them)—the door snakes or draught excluders (whatever you will), energy efficient light globes and low-flow shower heads.

All that sounds very well in theory but, when you start to think about it, what I want to know is how you then audit the outcome in terms of greenhouse gas reductions. I agree with the member for Schubert's comment that draught excluders really do make a difference. I use them, and, in fact, I can recommend a very clever innovation on a draught excluder. The big problem with a draught excluder is that you can have it at your door but, when you leave your house, you open the door, close the door behind you and, if it is just a door snake, the thing is there. Some smart person figured out that if you put a bit of material underneath and joined another one on the other side, you have a double-edged draught excluder, so that when you pull the door shut you stop the draught from going in.

My question really is more about the issue of how you then determine, having supplied your low-flow shower heads and all those things—

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: It's energy use.

Mrs REDMOND: The minister is saying that it is about energy use, and I have to say that I am trying to be more conscientious. So, in spite of the rate of payment for electricity going up, I am managing to reduce my bills. I find very useful the little diagram on my bill comparing my usage this year with my usage last year, and I can tell I am using less energy all the time. I have put in heaters that use J tariff (the off peak tariff) and I have noticed also that the J tariff is going up at a much faster rate in terms of cost than the other tariff, so it is gradually becoming less useful having your heating on J tariff.

I wonder about the value of a range of these things, for example, so-called energy saving light globes. I have found them to be singularly inefficient. They do not provide light that is as good. I do not mind the fact that they come on a moment or two after the other lights. My house is an old house and has several light fittings which take five and seven light globes, and certainly they have not lasted nearly as long as ordinary light globes and, increasingly—

Mr Pisoni interjecting:

Mrs REDMOND: As the member for Unley says, they cost a lot more. So they are costing me a fortune for no apparent improvement in efficiency. I would be prepared to tolerate the slightly lower level of light that I achieve, but it seems to me that they are preposterously overpriced and extremely hard to dispose of. I get complaints to my electorate office about where we can take these, and I think I may have even written to the minister about how we do that. They simply do not last. In fact, I had one the other day explode across my lounge room floor, and I am still getting out bits of glass and it took a long time to get the rest of the globe out. So, I have a light at the moment which is not working because I installed some of these things.

The minister is already well aware that I have some difficulty with the idea that it will now be compulsory when your hot water service reaches the end of its useful life to replace it with a service which is either solar, gas or electric heat pump. I thank the minister for making his officers available to talk to me about that, and we will no doubt talk about that further.

However, at the end of the day, I really wonder about the benefit in terms of creating lower greenhouse gas emissions of promoting to customers the idea that they perhaps get rid of their bar fridge. The bar fridge, especially if it is only opened very occasionally, does not seem to me to be a really big problem in a household. I would have thought that an inefficient fridge without a good seal on it is more of a problem. I would have thought that using dishwashers is more of a problem. I would have thought the same about using a clothes dryer, which is one of the most inefficient things in the world. I constantly try to get my children to use solar power to dry clothes—I think hanging them on the line is the best way to dry clothes.

I am fearful of the situation in some states of America. In some parts of America it is actually unlawful to hang your clothes on the line, and it strikes me as an absolute nonsense that America can regulate that. I know this from having spent time there. I was in North Dakota during one summer when it was 110° Fahrenheit, quite hot weather. We were the only adults using the local swimming pool—it was all kids. However, the interesting thing was that when we came back

to the house I would, of course, rinse the clothing and get the towels and swimming costumes and put them on the line to dry, and my mother-in-law would rush out to the clothesline and grab them all, take them down to the basement and put them in the dryer—and it was 110° Fahrenheit outside! I worry about the thinking of these places, so I am pleased that we are heading in somewhat the right direction.

However, as I said, I worry that we are concentrating on the idea of removing a second fridge or a bar fridge which, although the minister says it is on all the time, uses a minuscule amount of energy if it is not being opened and used—

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: That's not true.

Mrs REDMOND: It certainly does not use anything like the energy of a clothes dryer, yet I think people use clothes dryers far too much in our society, as they do dishwashers.

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: That's why you like the scheme; it mandates nothing.

Mrs REDMOND: As I said, I thoroughly endorse the idea that we have penalties for non-compliance because it is silly to have a scheme where you have a compliance regime and then no way effectively to enforce it. However, I raise some questions in terms of the underlying scheme about how effectively we are going to reduce greenhouse gases, and I absolutely endorse our desire to reduce greenhouse gases. I just do not see that some of these things are necessarily the most efficient things. I think that ceiling insulation, for instance, is an absolute win—easy, no questions—putting in ceiling installation is going to fix a whole range of these things.

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: You don't mandate anything; you've got to get the reduction.

Mrs REDMOND: The minister keeps talking about not mandating anything, and I am glad about that, but at the end of the day, if you have teenagers at home, it will not matter whether or not you have a low-flow shower head. If they are going to shower for 45 minutes, you will still have problems with the energy use.

I am pleased to report that I no longer have teenagers and, as well as saying to them that 'board' in our household is no longer spelt 'bored', we have a new concept of board in our household. Furthermore, because the electricity bills were going up, I said, 'In addition to paying board, you are now going to pay a percentage of the electricity bill.' That actually had quite a good effect on their attitude to how much electricity they wanted to use, how often they wanted to use the dryer and how many lights they left on.

My youngsters (I say youngsters although they are in their 20s) have been working lately and have been down in town by 7am, so they have been leaving when it is dark. Some mornings I get up and find that every light in the house is turned on. I am pleased that, as in all good systems, there are carrot-and-stick approaches and, to some extent, the carrot works and sometimes you enjoy using the stick in terms of saying that you must pay a share, and that has had some beneficial effect.

As I said, I absolutely endorse the idea that we want to reduce greenhouse gases. I am not persuaded that these schemes are likely to be as effective as we would want. I absolutely agree with the minister that we do not want to be mandating what people have to do, but I think we need to think a bit more about what other approaches we might take, what other things we might do to induce people to behave in a way which is going to result in the reduction of greenhouse gases and unnecessary use of power in our community overall.

Mr PISONI (Unley) (11:49): I take this opportunity to make some comments about energy-saving and the things we can do as governments, societies and communities. I was made very aware from a very young age about the value of saving electricity and keeping the house warm by being smart about the way we operate the house. Although my father is Italian, I did not learn a lot of Italian as a kid but I did learn 'Chiudi la luce' which was 'Turn off the light' because my father was mad about making sure that the light was always turned off in rooms that we were not occupying and would run around after us whenever he was home, shouting 'Chiudi la luce, chiudi la luce'; in other words, 'I do not want to have to pay the excess power bills that we will get because the light is operating in a room that I'm not using.' Unfortunately, I was hounded with that message as a young boy and, as a result, I drive my own family mad. I do not actually demand that they turn off the lights, I just follow them around the house and turn the lights off after them.

When my wife and I were renovating our homes, both in Nailsworth and Hyde Park, we were quite taken by Art Nouveau pendant lighting. Therefore, we collected Art Nouveau pendant

lighting as we restored the house room by room, and we took that with us when we moved from Nailsworth to Hyde Park. We then found that the light fittings take the so-called energy-saving globes; but, as the member for Heysen said, we experienced some frustration with the length of the life of those globes to such an extent that we have now started to write the date that we purchased them on the globes themselves, on the ceramic section just near the bayonet, so that we can confirm whether or not we feel we have received value from that globe. I think that the shortest period of time that we have received light from a globe before it has blown is about three weeks, which is a bit frustrating. We have found that the trick seems to be that, if you leave the light on and do not switch it on and off every time you leave the room, you tend to get a longer lasting—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr PISONI: Well, the globes last a lot longer. At 12 and 15 bucks a pop it is tempting to leave the globe on when you are not in the room. Of course, it does save you that warm up period for that minute or two after you switch on the light when you enter the room. I would also like to contrast the way that this government, for example, tries to perceive itself as a so-called green government as opposed to actions that it takes.

I want to tell the house about the success of a green project in a high school I visited in Forest City, Iowa, last year, where a genuine wind proposal created real energy for their school. I documented this story in one of my newsletters last year, which went out to my electorate. Iowa is a very flat state and, of course, it can be quite windy; so, a lot of wind farms have been set up in Iowa over the past 10 years or so. Forest City High School felt that this was an opportunity for it to not only save energy from the grid for the school but also to use it as a school project for schools to introduce wind power and understand the benefits of wind power for the whole community.

The school project was set up whereby students and a teacher were given the task of doing calculations as to whether a proper 30 metre wind turbine tower on the school grounds would, first of all, generate electricity and whether that electricity would generate enough for the school to make a substantial saving. To cut a long story short, they estimated that the wind turbine would produce about 75 per cent of that school's power. Consequently, they went on to lobby the local government. In many states of the United States local government tends to have responsibility for schools rather than the state government.

They obviously needed about a \$3,000 outlay to get the wind turbine built and installed. The residents might not necessarily have had children as students of that school at that particular time but, at some stage, would have had their kids going to that school because it was the only high school in the town. Forest City has a population of about 5,000 people. They held a plebiscite, if you like, of the town, and everybody agreed to placing a levy on their property taxes to enable the school to raise the money to purchase this wind turbine. That levy would have a sunset clause, so when enough money was raised over several years they could purchase the wind turbine and the levy would be removed, having served its purpose. Consequently, that is what happened and the wind turbine was built—and they were right: it does provide about 75 per cent of the school's power.

Let us contrast that with the Green Schools program of the Department of Education and Children's Services here in South Australia, the Minister for Education and Children's Services, the Premier, Mike Rann, and their so-called green credentials. When I asked questions of Public Works about the solar panels and wind turbines that were to go into South Australian schools and what they would deliver, I was told that the question could not be answered and that they would have to get back to me. When they did, we found out that, provided of course the wind turbines were working (and I will cover that shortly), on a windy and sunny day the renewable energy component of that school would power three computers for about eight hours. Of course, if there was cloud cover or it was one of those beautiful, still days, that would be greatly reduced.

On top of that, we have a DECS policy that schools must reduce their power consumption to 2001 levels. I know that the school at which I am a parent, and where I am on the school council, now has a \$30,000 shortfall for this year's power bill because its budget has been reduced accordingly. It has been impossible for the school to meet that reduction in power consumption, particularly, as we know, because in 2001 a computer in a school was a novelty, yet it is now a tool of trade. We will see even more of those computers introduced into schools, whether they be laptops or desktops. They will, in fact—

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I rise on a point of order. The bill before the house relates to penalties for the residential energy efficiency scheme. The member for Unley has been talking

about schools for the last 10 minutes; they are not in any way, shape or form within the purview of this bill.

The SPEAKER: I uphold the point of order. The member for Unley has drifted away from the bill in question.

Mr PISONI: The bill is, of course, about saving energy. I am a strong supporter of saving energy, and I spoke earlier about the measures I have taken in my own home to save energy. I know the energy minister is embarrassed about the government's policy in relation to schools, and he will be even more embarrassed about the failed wind turbines—

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I rise on another point of order. The member for Unley is not taking any notice of me and I do not think he is taking any notice of you either, Mr Speaker.

The SPEAKER: There is no point of order.

Mr PISONI: I would like to quote from the September 2006 edition of *E-mission*, the government's climate change newsletter, regarding the mini wind turbines that the government purchased. The newsletter stated:

Mini wind turbines are being installed on prominent buildings in Adelaide's CBD as part of a Rann government's commitment to renewable energy. 'The first of five [wind] turbines was installed on the roof of my office-building—

this is the Premier speaking—

in the State Administration Centre in Victoria Square and a second has been commissioned on Wakefield House,' Mr Rann said. 'This is the first installation outside of the United Kingdom—

another world first, incidentally, for South Australia—

of...rooftop wind turbines, which can provide a cost-effective renewable energy source for homes—

and this is the residential section for which the minister has been waiting—

communities and industrial buildings. The mini wind turbines installation, as part of the Capital City project—

and I suppose residential homes are included in Capital City projects as well—

is another example of our commitment to renewable energy initiatives.

Well, let us just look at the story behind these wind turbines. In November 2006, Swift 1.5 kilowatt turbines were installed on the roof of the London Climate Change Centre, and these were the very wind turbines the Premier was boasting about. Six weeks later, the wind turbines were recalled because of faulty components. Replacements were promised to be delivered within weeks, but the new wind turbines did not arrive until early 2008.

In June 2007, Rann extended the mini turbine program and announced funding of \$331,000 for 20 turbines. The Premier claimed that the investment would cut 280 tonnes of greenhouse gases per year, or 1.4 tonnes per turbine. So, that is the claim made by the so-called green Premier. Obviously, the Premier was hoping other states would be green with envy about his policy.

In November 2007, there was a report in the *Guardian* newspaper stating that mini turbines in urban areas produce only a tenth of the power predicted and that the manufacture and maintenance was likely to add to the owner's carbon footprint. Oh, okay! Experts suggested that solar heating and better insulation would be more effective investments in renewable energy. I note that those sorts of things are covered in the minister's bill, and I support those measures.

Autodom Limited, a subsidiary of aiAutomotive, an automotive components company, became a joint partner with Insurance Australia Group in the distribution of the Swift micro wind turbine, which is the same micro wind turbine located on the administration building that Premier Rann was boasting about—and he had just spent \$330,000 to buy more of these wind turbines. Their new venture—Micro Wind Turbines Australia Pty Ltd—was capitalised with \$500,000.

A company announcement on 13 January said that the venture was 'driven off the back of the South Australian government's leadership in developing business opportunities for companies that want to get on board its climate change initiatives'. The announcement also claimed that the South Australian government had provided an order for 40 Swift turbines for its buildings. Swift's owners, Renewable Devices Pty Ltd, a firm started by two young Edinburgh engineers, claimed that it was now valued at £30 million, having sold a 2 per cent stake to an Australian company. Interestingly, that Australian company was the provider of the Rann wind turbines.

On 16 February 2008, the London Climate Change Centre's experiment with mini wind turbines was revealed to have cost £UK436,000 for 14 turbines and had resulted in an economic value of £3,560. The London Assembly was told that the scheme was an expensive flop. Peter Hulme Cross MP said:

So much for this being a flagship project. The lesson for anyone concerned with energy conservation is to look elsewhere for energy-efficient solutions. The scheme is a flop.

I suppose it would be a flop, regardless of whether the installation involved the roof of commercial or residential premises.

On 16 April 2008, the education minister, Jane Lomax-Smith, announced that wind turbines (the very same wind turbines that had collapsed in the UK) and solar panels would be fitted to South Australian schools when they underwent a major upgrade, as part of a Rann government initiative to help 'green' state schools and preschools. She claimed the move would help schools improve their energy efficiency and environmental sustainability, and 13 schools were named as being the first to get the wind turbines.

In July 2008, aiAutomotive's CEO resigned. On 31 August 2008, in an announcement to the stock exchange, Autodom stated that it would 'write off all the carrying value of investments made in Micro Wind Turbines Australia Pty Ltd'. Its 50 per cent investment was listed as \$300,000.

On 16 September, Zelco Lendich resigned from the board of Autodom, the parent company of MWTA Pty Ltd, and was replaced by Scott Mutton, a South Australian and former owner of Henderson Components now acquired by Autodom. Scott Mutton's job is to run Project Refocus, aimed at turning the company around after what is described as a 'dreadful financial performance', and obviously he was referring to this investment in the Premier's wind turbine.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Unley is canvassing issues that go way beyond the scope of the bill. They may be valid issues for him to raise, but this is not the time nor the place to raise these other issues. The member for Unley must confine his remarks to the bill and to the passage of the second reading of the bill. That does not give him licence to probe into other areas of the minister's portfolio. The member for Unley.

Mr PISONI: Certainly, sir. I thank you for your advice. In closing, I would say that the opposition is supporting the bill, but we do need to remember that things tend to start at a smaller level and move out into bigger areas. Although I may have been speaking about schools and the Premier's claims about his wind turbines, this does affect every household because we are all very concerned about energy use.

We are concerned about global warming and the effect that global warming has on the environment. This bill will help South Australia go some small way to pulling its weight in the world as a global citizen in helping to reduce energy use and consequently, because here in South Australia we do rely heavily on fossil fuels for our energy production, this will have an effect on our contribution to reducing greenhouse gases.

Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens) (12:07): I have listened to members opposite and I feel somewhat disillusioned, disheartened and quite depressed about the whole thing. You can contribute to saving greenhouse gases and, while you are doing that, save money. We have installed solar panels at home, so we have saved money on electricity.

Ms Bedford interjecting:

Mrs GERAGHTY: Thank you. Yes, the member for Florey says that we have had them for a long time. So, we have saved money on electricity. We use energy efficient light globes; in fact, we have been using them for donkeys years, and I have never had one explode. We do not always buy the most expensive, but I have never had one explode.

I agree that some have not lasted as long as we would have liked, but the normal old globes—I cannot remember what they were called—did not last very long either in a lot of cases. Some of that is the light fitting. Some light fittings—I would say the cheaper made ones, but still expensive—do damage the globes, and so the globe goes. So, we have saved money on electricity. We are putting power into the grid and saving ourselves some money.

On the weekend we were looking to replace one of our freezers, because we have a fridge freezer and a separate freezer and we were looking to replace that. I know everyone says that that will cost more, because we are looking to replace it with a bigger one, but there are those now that have new energy efficient gases. I think it is an R600a gas, or something like that. I am not really

up with this stuff so do not take my word for it. You can buy freezers and fridges with this new gas in, but they are difficult to come by, which is the problem that we have found. We have been shopping around for one because it is more energy efficient.

We have also had to replace our air conditioner in recent years, so we looked for an air conditioner that had an inverter in it which is more energy efficient, contrary to what the member for Schubert says. We have water-saving shower heads. It takes a little bit of getting used to but we get a really good flow out of it. We have reduced our water consumption quite dramatically, not just through the use of the shower head but through other means, as well.

So, I think there really are ways that we can contribute to saving our environment and, at the same time, save ourselves money. It requires a little bit of homework. You can either get onto the net where there is plenty of information available or you can go through government departments, as we have done, to get advice about items that can be purchased which are energy-efficient and which, in the long term, contribute to our environment by saving greenhouse gases and, most importantly of all to quite a number of us, save us money. I would not be pessimistic about any changes that people can make, and I most certainly support the bill.

Mr RAU (Enfield) (12:11): I have been listening to this very informative debate with considerable interest and I have found a number of the contributions thought provoking. The member for Schubert has provoked me into thinking about a matter which I now want to put before the chamber. I hope the minister can listen to this matter a little bit. What I am about to say is as relevant as most of the contributions that have gone before, with the exception of the honourable member for Torrens.

I do not know how many members in this place have been to the toilets in Parliament House but I assume that, at some point or other, most people have been there. Members may or may not know that approximately 12 months ago (it might have been a little bit longer) the fairly majestic large porcelain models which were there disappeared—completely disappeared—and, overnight, a number of very sort of art deco looking super thin models turned up.

What I think is very important to be considering in the context of this debate, and particularly in the context of the honourable member for Schubert's contribution about his shower, is that they are apparently intended to save water, because the cistern is smaller than the cistern in a normal regulation device.

However, whoever invented them did not put enough water in them for them to do the job properly (if you will excuse the pun) when being used only once. What happens is that—and, minister, I would like you to consider this in the context of the bill—people are obliged to press the button and then wait and then press the button again. It has come to the point—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr RAU: I have not been into the ladies area so I cannot comment on that but I can tell you that, in the gentlemen's area, there is now a sign on these things—I will not go into what it says on the sign because that is probably a bit tasteless—but it does invite people to use the brush. If that is not an admission—a tacit admission, at least—that there is a design flaw with these things, I do not know what is. It is very frustrating.

I contemplated whether to raise this with the JPSC or whether I should have spoken to Madam Deputy Speaker or perhaps the Speaker, but I thought that, since we were in the context of this particular legislation and since the contributions of the member for Schubert have focused on so many of these issues, it was probably an appropriate matter for me to raise. It comes out of the school of thought that gave us the contribution on the shower rose; that is really how we come here. I ask the minister whether, in working his way through this problem, he can take some account of this, and his own experience, no doubt, in this building, where he has seen this inefficient efficiency.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Elder—Minister for Transport, Minister for Infrastructure, Minister for Energy) (12:15): The debate today is on the penalty scheme for an act already passed by the parliament. I do note that people then took the opportunity to debate the previous act—fair enough! We get off it a bit, and some went a little further. Then we had the member for Unley essentially going on with whatever was plodding through his stream of consciousness at the time. However, I can say that I do not know if the member for Enfield reached new heights or plumbed new depths.

I will answer some of the issues that were raised, even though I think they were not entirely on point. I refer, firstly, to the member for Unley and the absolute lack of any depth to his contribution. The member for Unley says that Iowa is a success because the school has a wind tower and South Australia is a failure.

I wish he were here so that he could tell me just what the installed capacity of wind is in Iowa, because I am sure he knows. I am sure he could tell me what the installed capacity of wind in Iowa is as a percentage of the overall installed capacity. I could tell him that South Australia has a percentage of installed capacity in wind that is exceeded, I believe, only in some part of Scandinavia. It is outstanding.

Mr Bignell: It was zero under the Libs.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: It was zero under the Libs. It is now recognised by many world commentators as being one of the greatest achievements in renewable energy in the world but, according to the member for Unley, apparently it is not a success because the wind towers are not built in schools.

I am struggling with that one, and I am not quite sure how many schools would like a wind tower out on the oval. It might make a mess of the footballs when they are kicking them, for example. It is a tremendous example of the lack of any depth of analysis when dealing with what is a serious matter.

Coming to that matter, this bill is about penalties for failure to meet the Residential Energy Efficiency Scheme. It is not about mandating any type of power, and it is not about any type of renewable energy. It grew from some acts interstate but, also, from a scheme of low income energy audits which we ran at government expense which proved to be outstandingly successful.

The central point is that it is an energy efficiency scheme for residences where people do it primarily—oddly enough, in this world—because it will save them money. It will also, as a result of using less energy (you would think) reduce carbon emissions. The audits have worked and have worked in an outstanding fashion when they were run by us.

I thought maybe, for some of the speakers on the other side, it would be a bit of a giveaway that the scheme is particularly aimed at low income households for two reasons: they are the people we would like to see benefit from residential efficiency and they are also the type of people who have not had either the information or the capacity to make the investment to improve energy efficiency in their homes.

Another important element of residential energy efficiency not touched on by the other side is that part of the audit that goes to making the homes more efficient at times of what you might call weather extremes. In particular, if we make homes more efficient in times of heat, the demand on air conditioning comes down. That is only 5 per cent of the year, so, in terms of overall energy efficiency, it is not so relevant but, in terms of the cost of installed infrastructure for electricity, it is enormously important and goes very much to the price of electricity and the dangers people face.

The lead speaker for the opposition relied on a minute, which I have not seen, from the Victorian government saying that you should let the most cost-effective way of reducing energy proceed. That is exactly what the scheme does. The retailer is not told what to do, nor is it mandated. The retailer is mandated to achieve energy efficiency in the best way they can. I would have thought that what they were purporting to read was support for the scheme.

However, what I could not get over was the criticism that, by doing this and by reducing emissions voluntarily, we were letting off the polluters. This is such a tremendous example of how the opposition loves to walk both sides of the street. During the Frome by-election of blessed memory (wasn't that a marvellous time?), they were up there running around telling people that the emissions trading scheme would punish industry—in this case, a zinc smelter.

Mr Pederick interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I am talking about this notion that we are letting off the polluters. According to the opposition, one day they are industry, the next day they are polluters; you cannot have it both ways. I say to you: if voluntary action, voluntary improvements, saves people money and reduces the burden on industry, I do not have a problem with it, and I do not know why you do. I certainly do not have a problem with it. Can I tell you this: if you take your logic to its conclusion—that we should not have these voluntary improvements in existing homes—you must then say that

we should not mandate new designs for new homes to make them more energy efficient because that just lets the polluters off the hook.

In his confusion, the opposition spokesman said that one of his criticisms of the scheme was that our achieving energy efficiency in homes meant that industry (or 'polluters' as they call them) faced a lower target. If you take that to its logical conclusion, we should not impose building standards, either, because that will also let them off the hook and lower the standards. It is patent nonsense. On this issue, the opposition demonstrates nothing but its confusion.

It was good to see that one or two opposition members actually made some reference to the bill before us, rather than to something that was not before us. Retailers with under 5,000 residential customers should not be very common in the industry. The reason they would not break themselves up into fewer than 5,000 homes in small businesses is not only that they must have a billing scheme for each and every one of them but also that the South Australian energy market is extremely volatile, and the larger retailers are better able to manage that volatility. No-one in the market is exposed to greater risk than small retailers, particularly at a time when liquidity in the market seems to be very tight. I have no fear of that occurring, unless it were done by some ruse, and we would not allow that to happen.

In terms of the penalties going somewhere other than consolidated revenue, my view is that we will see very few penalties out of the scheme, and I would hope that to be the case. The government is aiming to achieve not fines but outcomes. The government ran a substantial number of audits (I do not know the exact number) through welfare agencies, and we know that if the retailers make a modicum of effort they can get outstanding results. So, we are confident that, as long as the retailers apply themselves, no-one needs to face a penalty.

Everyone had a bit of fun talking about the best way to reduce energy and improve energy efficiency. We are quite happy to hear all that but, at the end of the day, it is about the retailer finding the most cost-effective way of achieving that and aiming it at low income households; if they do not do that, they face a penalty, as per the bill.

We believe that this is a small piece of a comprehensive approach and not a piecemeal approach. One of the things that we have achieved out of the previous energy audits was the removal of a lot of very bad second fridges. In low income households, the second fridge tends to sit there running all year, even though there may not be a lot in it and, because it is an old fridge, it may well be leaking through a seal. The truth of the matter is that removing those second fridges was one of the great successes of the previous audit. So, even though some people may think it is not effective, I can tell you that it does work.

Overall, it is about the outcome. It is not about mandating a way to do it. I want to make the point that that does not work, because some people are doing this stuff already. They are not the households you aim it at. You do not go out to an energy-efficient household and seek to improve it: you go to an energy-inefficient household. Because this does not mandate an outcome, it may well be that, in conjunction with what is happening separately, installation is one of the major outcomes in terms of the move to energy efficiency.

Members would not believe some of the things that were seen in the audit of low-income households regarding energy efficiency. There were air conditioners sitting in windows with gaps to the open air. Many improvements can be made. This is a scheme to work in conjunction with new planning laws that require energy efficiency in buildings. It is about not wasting energy. This is not a scheme to get more renewables on, as some people seem to believe. It is certainly not a scheme about mini turbines or schools, as the member for Unley—in that dimly-lit world of his—seems to believe. It is a very useful thing for those who save money, and it is a very useful thing for the environment. It is a scheme that I think should be embraced a little more warmly and without the carping, whingeing, whining and complaining from the other side, and I commend it to the house.

Bill read a second time and taken through its remaining stages.

SURVEY (FUNDING AND PROMOTION OF SURVEYING QUALIFICATIONS) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 5 March 2009. Page 1924.)

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop) (12:28): I indicate that I am the lead speaker on behalf of the opposition on this very complicated piece of legislation. I expect that we will be here for many hours if all my colleagues want to speak on this bill.

Members interjecting:

Mr WILLIAMS: I jest, Madam Deputy Speaker—I hope. This bill has come about because, at this time, there just is no training for surveyors in South Australia. The degree course that used to be run by the University of South Australia is no longer being run and, as a consequence, there is no course for aspiring surveyors in South Australia to receive the relevant educational qualifications to become a registered surveyor. This, of course, has the potential to have a significant impact in a number of areas. We often fail to understand the importance of skills such as surveying. They are used in a great many areas of our daily lives, but that goes unnoticed by the average man or woman in the street.

In my opinion, the reason that we no longer have a course for surveying in South Australia is that the South Australian government has ignored what has been incredibly obvious to many people—certainly the opposition—for a long time; namely, we have failed to have a decent education system in this state. We have failed to promote the study of maths and sciences in our schools.

When I was shadow minister for mineral resources, this matter was highlighted to me by the South Australian Chamber of Mines and Energy, which had been tracking the fall-off in the study of maths and sciences in high schools in South Australia since 1992, and there had been an incredible drop-off in the number of students studying maths and science, both in raw numbers and as a percentage of studies they were undertaking in high schools. Consequently, when students got to year 12 and were about to graduate from high school and were deciding what career path to take in their future life, many options were closed off to them. That remains the case. It fascinates me that a government that purports to support something like the mining industry and believes that the economic future of this state hinges significantly on the success of the mining industry would allow this to happen.

I say this because my daughter is in the mining industry and she studied at The Levels through the University of South Australia at the Gartrell School of Mines. I was out there about 18 months ago, and that university at The Levels used to offer, among other things, courses in surveying, geology, mining engineering and metallurgy. The Gartrell School of Mines at the University of South Australia is empty. There is nobody out there, and no courses or undergraduate courses are being run in that area. Importantly, in the context of this bill, that is what has happened to the surveying courses.

Surveying is incredibly important to the mining industry. You cannot operate a mine without surveyors; particularly if you are operating an underground mine, you absolutely need very good surveyors. In any mine you need surveyors to know what is happening. The geologists who manage the grade control of the operations and must have surveyors so that the whole operation works and people know what they are digging and where they are digging it.

This government has failed the young people of South Australia and failed the economic future of South Australia by not doing something to address the drop-off in the study of maths and science in high schools. That is the problem. To come back to this bill, which is a reaction to that problem, the opposition will support the bill reluctantly, as there is a principle involved here with which we are not overly happy. Importantly, we support it reluctantly because it treats the symptoms and not the cause. I have highlighted the cause.

The Hon. P.F. Conlon interjecting:

Mr WILLIAMS: That is exactly what I am saying. I have already pointed out that the Chamber of Mines and Energy has told me what is the problem, and it has been highlighting it to the minister's government for a number of years, and the government has refused to do anything about it. Today it is the surveyors; tomorrow it will be another profession. The problem is that the minister's government has dumbed down education in this state. It has this fixation that education is about getting more kids staying at school until they are 17, 18, 19 or 20—that has been the government's fixation. The government has had no input or concern about what they do whilst they are at school for 15 or 16 years or about what skill level they achieve. That is why we have this problem whereby students graduating from high school have had options closed to them.

Even those who might have considered a career in surveying all of a sudden find that they do not have the qualifications at the end of their high school education to enter a surveying degree course. As a consequence, no-one is applying to enter a surveying degree course, and the university has said, 'We have no applicants for this course. We're going to shut the course down. We are not going to continue to put resources into running a course that no-one is applying to do.'

It is pretty logical but I am sure that, as the minister is wont to do, he will take no responsibility for it and will deny that this is a consequence of his government's lack of action in education. I know that that is what his position will be. However, the reality is that, if this state is to go forward we must have a good education system and produce students who, at the end of their high school years, have a basic set of skills that will enable them to go into science and engineering type courses. Without scientists, engineers and surveyors, this state will not go ahead and meet the challenges of the years to come, and that is the fundamental problem.

However, in this case, with respect to surveyors, there is a stopgap measure. The Institution of Surveyors has suggested that we put an extra cost on the clients of surveyors and use that money to underpin another course at the University of South Australia so that at least we have a course available. We will also try to use some of that money to encourage high school graduates to apply for that course—or, indeed, in this case, we will try to encourage graduates from the GIS (geospatial information systems) courses to take an additional course to obtain the requisite qualifications to become a registered surveyor.

In my opinion, this is a stopgap measure. As I said, the opposition is reluctantly supporting it because, under this government, there appears to be no alternative. We cannot see there being a dramatic shift in what is happening in our high schools and, as a consequence, we cannot see this matter being addressed in any other way in the near future. It will take a dramatic change in policy from government to change this situation. Because it has been going on for so long, it will take something like 10 or 12 years to change the culture of our education system and, consequently, the skill level of students coming out of that system. This is a matter of grave concern. Notwithstanding that the bill before us is quite simple—it is quite a small bill—it reflects the malaise that is taking place in our education system, in my opinion.

The issue here is that the surveyors board has a role in the accreditation of surveyors. It also believes that it has a role in the further education of graduate surveyors. In noting that the courses have been shut down because of a lack of interest from high school graduates, the surveyors board, in consultation with other members of the profession, has done some workshopping to try to establish how it can address this issue. It has talked extensively with the University of South Australia, and the reality is that the university has suggested that it would cost something like \$750,000 over a five year period to introduce a new course and encourage some high school graduates to apply to undertake that course.

The surveyors board also has reciprocal arrangements with other jurisdictions so that, when we have surveyors moving from other states or New Zealand, they can be accredited with the relevant registration. The geospatial information systems course which is currently run by the University of South Australia does not satisfy the criteria, so that people graduating from that course cannot be accredited as registered surveyors in other jurisdictions and, indeed, in South Australia. The board has obviously come to government and said, 'We—that is, the institute and the board—would like to be able to support the education system such that we have a course which will give us viable graduates who could become registered surveyors.'

The Survey Act, which gives the power to people like the board for the functions they carry out, in section 10 sets out the functions of the Institution of Surveyors under the act. Section 12(2) states:

Fees and levies received by the Institution of Surveyors under this Act may only be used in carrying out the functions assigned to the Institution by this Act.

Section 10 (which sets out the functions) does not give the institution the power to put moneys towards a course, or towards encouraging high school graduates or other young people (hopefully) to undertake that course. That is what the board has decided is part of the answer to this.

The reality is that they would fund that by increasing the levy, which is payable when plans certified by licensed surveyors are lodged with the Lands Titles Office. I understand that a levy of some \$50 on such lodgement is currently paid to the Institution of Surveyors to perform their existing functions. The opposition has been informed that an increase in that levy in the order of

some \$30 would be required to give the institution the financial wherewithal to meet the requirements of the University of South Australia to set up the appropriate courses.

That is what the bill does. The bill puts another function into section 10 of the act simply to allow the Institution of Surveyors to apply the funds that it receives under the act to ensure that we in South Australia are producing new graduates who have the educational requisites to become registered surveyors. As I said, the opposition supports the measure but we do so reluctantly, and we implore the government to relook at what is happening in our schools, because this is just one profession in which it is occurring. As I say, we have a similar sort of problem across all the science and engineering fields because our schools are concentrating on numbers and retention rates, and they place very little concentration on what they are actually teaching our students, particularly in the area of science and maths.

Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder) (12:43): I also rise to speak to this bill and support the member for MacKillop as the shadow minister and the person responsible for putting our position on it. One report about which I became aware last year and which highlighted the need for South Australia to ensure that it does plan for its future workforce needs—and the member for MacKillop has certainly spoken at great length about the education system in South Australia—was a report from the Economic Development Board talking about the future workforce needs of the state. It identified that, across a 15 year period, 206,000 people (commonly known as the baby boomer generation) will retire. Those people are employed in a variety of fields in this state and it is important, that we have the skill set to replace them. That is where the real concerns espoused by the Liberal Party are quite valid.

I know it is easy to shake your head and say, 'What we are talking about does not make any sense', but it is important to respect the fact that we do talk to communities and business and a variety of people across all electorates that we serve and in our shadow portfolio roles, and they express concern to us all the time about where the skill set will come from and where is the intellectual expertise that will be available across the state in order to perform in different areas?

It is important that we respect what surveyors do. Our system of land tenure and ownership in South Australia is based upon titles, whether it be freehold or Torrens title. It requires the lodgment of a plan, which has been prepared by a surveyor, with the Lands Titles Office. Having worked in local government and spoken to many surveyors about subdivision applications, it is obvious to me that the skill set those people possess is quite specific and it is important that we ensure we have people coming through the system to replace them.

I read the briefing paper prepared by the shadow minister, which highlights that the last time an intake occurred at the University of South Australia was in 2005. When I asked a question about this bill, he indicated that the intake probably involved about 20 people.

Mr Williams: It was probably fewer than that.

Mr GRIFFITHS: The shadow minister confirms that it was probably fewer than that. It came as a real surprise to me that this area has not been identified in the last four years as one that needed to be addressed quicker. As I understand it, the surveyors association has brought this matter before the government in order to ensure that there is an ability to promote the need for this skill set and for surveyors to go to university to become qualified and then practise out in the field; and that, by doing this, there is some financial incentive attached to the bill which is part of the lodgement of fees by surveyors when they lodge plans with the LTO.

While I have some support for that, a philosophical viewpoint was raised in our shadow joint party discussion about this matter. Previously, education within the university system has been predominantly the financial responsibility of the federal government. Now we find there is a need to not only have and maintain levies but also increase the amount of the levies to ensure a sufficient pool of funds to promote the need for this type of career opportunity within the education system and to ensure that costs associated with the course itself can be partially offset.

While I recognise that it does occur, it is frustrating that there is a need to do this. It comes back to the fact that the person who pays for it will be the South Australian taxpayer. The South Australian taxpayer is a person for whom I have a lot of sympathy because there is no doubt they are being forced to take money from their pocket for a vast array of charges that are increasing exponentially and at a greater rate than inflation.

Mr Williams interjecting:

Mr GRIFFITHS: The member for MacKillop reminds me that South Australians are the most heavily taxed people in the nation. I believe, in comparing it with the national average, we are 11 per cent above that—111 per cent of the national mean. This is another example of community people—who are trying to get development opportunities happening and engaging the services of a surveyor—paying not only for the skills that the surveyor brings to that role but also to ensure that, in future, more surveyors will be available to do more work for people. The question that could be asked—and we on this side of the chamber believe quite legitimately—is: why is it constantly necessary for taxpayers to be forced to pull out of their pocket money that they would like to devote to other causes in order to ensure that this is available?

I have some concerns about the fact that we hear that mining is an important opportunity for the state—and it certainly is. As the shadow minister for industry and trade, I am talking to people all the time who are involved in this area. I know that the Chamber of Mines and Energy has spoken publicly and at length in the past about the fact that, in order for the mining potential in this state to be realised, we need a capital investment of something like \$20 billion in infrastructure. It is important that the support services which allow this infrastructure to be developed are there, and surveyors are an important part of that.

While the opposition supports this bill, we do have some reservations about the fact that planning must take place at the highest levels of government to ensure the skill sets that will be needed in the future—not just for the next five or 10 years but, rather, across the next 50 years—will be there.

We have heard about the report of the EDB, which was presented recently to the Premier, and a desire to increase our population to two million by 2027 instead of the original target of 2050. In itself I believe that will require the construction of an additional 250,000 homes, or thereabouts, in South Australia to accommodate that increase in population. Most of that growth will occur in the metropolitan area, and we understand that. Most of that growth will occur in greenfield sites which will have to be subdivided, and that work will require surveyors to be engaged. It is obvious to me, and certainly it is obvious to my colleagues on this side of the chamber, that the complete skill set as it needs to exist across the state is lacking in terms of planning; but particularly in regard to surveyors, and the fact that we are considering this bill today does present a lot of concerns.

Whilst I and certainly the member for MacKillop indicate support for the bill, we do have enough concerns about the fact that planning is not there. We want to make sure that the surveying industry is there for the long term. I admit that, when I read the briefing paper, I thought, 'Well, if the people of Goyder decide not to have me in the parliament anymore, it might even be a reasonable career for me to pursue', because I have a bit of an interest in numbers, plans and that sort of stuff. You never know, we all have mid-life career crises—

The Hon. K.A. Maywald interjecting:

Mr GRIFFITHS: True. You never know, I might be one of the people in 52 weeks who will be looking for another career, and it might be that I express an interest in this one. We support the fact that the funds are intended to be in place now—

Mr Bignell interjecting:

Mr GRIFFITHS: No. I look beyond the polls. We talk to the people and we know what people think. We do. We are getting a very different message to the poll result that was in *The Advertiser*. I can assure the member for Mawson that the people we are talking to have different philosophical points of view. We support the bill, and we hope that not only is the fund established to a reasonable level as soon as possible but also, and importantly, that the attractiveness of skills to secondary school students is such that young people who have some level of interest and skill in this area are identified and that they are attracted to an industry that provides them with a great long-term future.

The Hon. K.A. MAYWALD (Chaffey—Minister for the River Murray, Minister for Water Security) (12:51): I thank members opposite for their contributions and support for the surveying industry which this bill will provide to future surveyors. The government is very pleased to have this legislation before the house at the request of the surveying industry, and I thank members for their contributions.

Bill read a second time and taken through its remaining stages.

RENMARK IRRIGATION TRUST BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 4 March 2008. Page 1797.)

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (12:54): I rise to speak to this bill and note that, in conjunction with the Irrigation Bill 2009, it replaces the Irrigation Act 1994 and the Renmark Irrigation Trust Act 1936 respectively. During both contributions I will probably branch into aspects that affect both bills before the house because they are so similar, but it is noted that, because of its unique position, Renmark has its own separate bill. The Renmark Irrigation Trust Act 1936 gave irrigators no opportunity to transform a water right into a licence. Trade of water was not even mentioned in that act. A second matter with the Renmark Irrigation Trust relates to its structure which has left it outside of other, newer legislation, most of this being new federal legislation, including the Water Act 2007.

There are several objectives in regard to both bills but, notably, there is a need to take into account current management practices, policy directions and compliance with federal policy directions. Among other things, both bills also remove references to government irrigation districts, which no longer exist, and delineate the function of irrigation trusts—in this regard, the Renmark Irrigation Trust—to that of service providers rather than land tenants. Other important features of the bill relate to the federal requirement for there to be no impediment to the trade of water outside irrigation districts.

With respect to the Renmark Irrigation Trust Bill, its major function is to transform a member's existing water right into an owned and tradeable right. Until now, Renmark Irrigation Trust members were not able to sell their rights separately because it remained with the trust, and were subsequently unable, among other things, to access the federal government's exit packages. With respect to the Renmark Irrigation Trust structure, ratepayers have become members, and members of the board become directors. This allows definitions and other qualifications defined in the new acts to cover participants of the Renmark Irrigation Trust. Also, directors will now be elected from the membership, as opposed to being appointed by the board.

Referring to consultation regarding the Renmark Irrigation Trust and comments received, people involved in the trust generally are fully supportive of the drawing up of the bill and they fully support the bill going through for the benefit of those irrigators remaining in the industry. The board's main concerns were with matters of federal control, which include Victoria's preventing trade through its caps and an issue with transformation which leaves the trust with no control over water leaving a district, but at least the land goes with it.

The Renmark Irrigation Trust supports an individual's right to own and sell their entitlement, but that sale reduces the cost-effectiveness of the trust for those remaining, as it reduces the number of irrigators contributing to the same running costs. A lateral supply line might no longer be cost-effective, as several have sold leaving a few others further along the line still requiring the service. Exit packages also complicate the infrastructure cost-sharing equation with supply and maintenance. A five year quarantine on re-use of the exited land leaves irrigation trusts with no chance to restore economic balance to supply lines for some years at least, even though neighbouring farmers might wish to expand and take on exited land. Uneconomic infrastructure cannot necessarily be removed, because there still may be a few requiring it now, or later when that quarantine period expires. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

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

STATUTES AMENDMENT (TRANSPORT PORTFOLIO—ALCOHOL AND DRUGS) BILL

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

MOUNT GAMBIER HOSPITAL HYDROTHERAPY POOL FUND BILL

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

FUNDS MANAGEMENT CORPORATION OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA BILL

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

GLENTHORNE FARM

Mr HANNA (Mitchell): Presented a petition signed by 1,342 residents of South Australia, requesting the house to urge the government to maintain its commitment to no urban development on the Glenthorne site.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

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

TRANSITIONAL ZONE LEASES

171 The Hon. G.M. GUNN (Stuart) (30 September 2008). Will the decision made by the former minister not to allow leaseholders in the transitional zone the ability to freehold their leases be reviewed?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Minister for Environment and Conservation, Minister for Early Childhood Development, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation, Minister Assisting the Premier in Cabinet Business and Public Sector Management): In accordance with the recommendation of the Select Committee on the Crown Lands (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill 2002, freeholding in the transitional zone is permitted. There is no intention to review this decision.

The issue of freeholding perpetual leases in the rangelands is, as also noted in the Select Committee report, considered separately on a case-by-case basis.

ABORIGINAL LEADERSHIP

218 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (21 October 2008). What plans were implemented in 2007-08 towards achieving part of South Australia's Strategic Plan with respect to Aboriginal leadership, what were the associated costs, how many participants were there, who assisted in the implementation, what were the outcomes and how many of the participants have since gained employment or attained a position of leadership?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Minister for Environment and Conservation, Minister for Early Childhood Development, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation, Minister Assisting the Premier in Cabinet Business and Public Sector Management): The Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation has advised that:

In 2007-08 considerable outcomes were achieved under the SASP Aboriginal leadership target around leadership in Aboriginal heritage, governance and State public sector for middle level to senior Aboriginal State public sector employees.

During 2007-08 a total of 187 Aboriginal people undertook training designed to strengthen their leadership abilities, with associated costs being approximately \$260,000.

A number of partners assisted with implementation from both State and Commonwealth public sector agencies, which included Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation Division (AARD), Office of Consumer and Business Affairs, Office of the Registrar for Indigenous Corporations and the Australian Indigenous Leadership Centre.

The Department of Further Education, Employment Science and Technology, on behalf of AARD is currently developing an Aboriginal Leadership Register. The Register will assist SA Government Boards and Committees wishing to fill their vacancies with Aboriginal people. In addition, State Government agencies will also be able to seek Aboriginal people through the Register, who are interested in undertaking senior roles in the public sector.

ABORIGINAL WELLBEING

219 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (21 October 2008).

1. What plans were implemented in 2007-08 towards achieving that part of South Australia's Strategic Plan relating to Aboriginal wellbeing, what were the associated costs, how many participants were there, who assisted in the implementation, what were the outcomes and how will the benefits of this program be measured?

2. Did the Minister for Health give any funds or staff for the implementation of this plan?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Minister for Environment and Conservation, Minister for Early Childhood Development, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation, Minister Assisting the Premier in Cabinet Business and Public Sector Management): The Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation has advised that:

South Australia's Strategic Plan (SASP) contains 9 Aboriginal-specific targets that seek to improve the wellbeing of Aboriginal people and communities in South Australia. These include T1.26 on Aboriginal unemployment, T2.5 relating to Aboriginal life expectancy, T4.5 on understanding Aboriginal culture and T6.18 concerning Aboriginal education. Additionally, tracking of progress against many of the other targets also includes disaggregation by Aboriginality, for example T6.3 which records rates of low infant birthweight. (Information on progress against SASP targets is available at www.stateplan.sa.gov.au).

Of particular importance to achieving improved Aboriginal wellbeing is Target 6.1 (Aboriginal Wellbeing). It is a unique target in that it aims to holistically track progress in Aboriginal wellbeing across all relevant Strategic Plan targets. The Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation Division (AARD), DPC is responsible for this coordinating target, which seeks to produce an overarching framework that enables the South Australian Government to deliver improved outcomes—in all areas—to Aboriginal people in this State.

Significant work is being undertaken in areas such as leadership, heritage and culture; education, training and employment; economic development; health and wellbeing; housing and infrastructure; and caring for country. This is reflected in DPC's 2007-08 Annual Report.

The coordinated approach to Aboriginal wellbeing required by Target 6.1 is being complemented by efforts to maximise Aboriginal input into planning and policy development. This has included engagement with the peak Aboriginal policy body, the SA Aboriginal Advisory Council, and at a community level through the negotiation of Community Development Plans in each discrete Aboriginal community.

Finally, in response to the honourable member's question asking specifically for information relating to Aboriginal health initiatives and funding, I advise that the government's efforts in this area are captured in the Department of Health's 2007-08 Annual Report.

MIMILI AND AMATA BUSH GARDENS

220 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (21 October 2008). What are the annual operating costs of the Mimili and Amata bush gardens and what funding if any, has the state government allocated for the garden's operation in 2008-09?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Minister for Environment and Conservation, Minister for Early Childhood Development, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation, Minister Assisting the Premier in Cabinet Business and Public Sector Management): The Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation has advised that:

The annual operating costs of the two plots consist principally of CDEP wages of those who work on the plots along with the supply of water and power. Bungala Aboriginal Corporation calculates that CDEP wages for the workers and supervisor as approximately \$60,000 for a 12-month period. The cost to supply water and power to the two plots are absorbed by the relevant community into their general operating costs.

The Department of the Premier and Cabinet (DPC) continues to support the maintenance and development of the bush food plots at both Amata and Mimili in the APY Lands by contracting the provision of horticultural expertise and practical on-site maintenance to June 09 at a cost of \$56,000.

CONSULTANTS AND CONTRACTORS

226 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (21 October 2008). For each department and agency reporting to the minister, what is the detailed breakdown of the expenditure on consultants and contractors in 2007-08 including, the name of the consultant or contractor, cost, work undertaken and method of appointment?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Minister for Environment and Conservation, Minister for Early Childhood Development, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation, Minister Assisting the Premier in Cabinet Business and Public Sector Management): Details of Contracts and Consultancies issued during 2007-08 for the Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation Division are as follows:

Name of Contractor	Amount of Contract (net)	Description of Contract	Method of Appointment
Key Energy and Resources	23,636	Electricity Retailing Operations for Remote Aboriginal Communities	Selective Tender
Cavill Power Products Pty Ltd	158,557	Generator Maintenance for Remote Area Power Supplies for Aboriginal Communities There are no other viable contractors to do this work. This contract went before the Accredited Purchasing Unit in DPC	Direct Negotiation
Anne Prince Consulting (APC Environmental Management)	144,740	Development of Waste Management Plan for the APY Lands	Selective Tender
ETSA Utilities (Works Contract via DAIS)	715,120	Oak Valley Aboriginal Community Overhead Reticulation System—Electrical Services Upgrade—Trade Contractor	Selective Tender
John Thurtell Consulting Services Pty Ltd	27,273	Independent Review of the Operation of the 2005 Amendments to the Anangu Pitjantjatjara Yankunytjatjara Land Rights Act	Selective Tender

ABORIGINAL ADVISORY COUNCIL

370 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (17 November 2008).

1. How many applications were received for positions on the South Australian Aboriginal Advisory Council?
2. How many interviews were undertaken?
3. Who was on the interview panel?
4. How many applicants were successful in being appointed and what is the tenure of each person appointed?
5. How many members of the Council were previous members of the South Australian Aboriginal Advisory Council announced in December 2005?
6. Who was appointed to the Council in 2006 and 2007?
7. Were interviews or applications accepted for positions on the Council in 2005, 2006 and 2007?
8. Is the South Australian Aboriginal Advisory Council required to submit an annual report to the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation or to the Department of Premier and Cabinet?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Minister for Environment and Conservation, Minister for Early Childhood Development, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation, Minister Assisting the Premier in Cabinet Business and Public Sector Management): The Interim South Australian Aboriginal Advisory Council (Interim SAAAC) was established in November 2005 to recommend structures to better engage Aboriginal people. In May 2007 it recommended that a permanent Aboriginal Advisory Council be established. In December 2007 the State Government permanently established the Aboriginal Advisory Council.

No new appointments were made to the SAAC in 2006 or 2007.

In May 2008, I re-appointed five (5) of the original interim council members to the new permanent SAAAC for one year, and its Chairperson for two years. I further appointed four (4) new members for two years commencing from 1 May 2008.

Seventy-nine (79) applications were received from across the State to fill the four vacancies.

I made appointments after assessing each application against set criteria, including:

- Possesses a strong understanding of Aboriginal culture;
- Have standing within the Aboriginal community;
- Have policy and service delivery experience;
- Are able to strongly contribute to the Council performing its role as identified in the Terms of Reference; and
- Considering the Council's gender and age balance.

The South Australian Aboriginal Advisory Council is required to submit an annual report to me as the Minister responsible, commencing from 1 July 2008 for the period ending 30 June 2009.

ABORIGINAL HERITAGE FUND

410 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (2 December 2008). With respect to the Report of the Auditor-General 2007-08—part B, volume 3, page 829, note 17—what is the total value of funds held in the Aboriginal Heritage Fund?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Minister for Environment and Conservation, Minister for Early Childhood Development, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation, Minister Assisting the Premier in Cabinet Business and Public Sector Management): The Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation has advised that:

The balance in the Aboriginal Heritage Fund as at 30 June 2008 was \$708K.

PUBLIC SCHOOLS

In reply to **Mr PISONI (Unley)** (27 June 2008) (Estimates Committee B).

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH (Adelaide—Minister for Education, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for Tourism, Minister for the City of Adelaide): An analysis of the 2007 Resource Entitlement Statement (RES) shows that approximately 87 per cent of RES funding is allocated for school-based salaries. Of this, 79 per cent of funding relates to classroom staffing, including teachers, principals and school leadership positions. In practice the percentages of actual salaries may be higher as schools can convert grants and other sources of funding into salaries.

The average per-capita funding in 2008-09 is \$11,568. The table below shows indicative average per capita funding according to the Index of Educational Disadvantage based on the relative percentages of resources provided to schools through the annual Resource Entitlement Statements

Indicative Average Per Capita Funding by Index of Disadvantage 2008-09

Index of Disadvantage	Primary School Students	Secondary School Students
1	\$13,809	\$13,532
2	\$12,546	\$13,543
3	\$11,584	\$13,089
4	\$11,105	\$12,063
5	\$10,435	\$11,735
6	\$9,948	\$11,311
7	\$9,670	\$10,899

CHILD ABUSE

In reply to **Mr PISONI (Unley)** (27 June 2008) (Estimates Committee B).

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH (Adelaide—Minister for Education, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for Tourism, Minister for the City of Adelaide): The Department of Education and Children's Services has provided the following information:

The current system for making mandatory reports in South Australia is through the Child Abuse Report Line (CARL) which is a unit within the Department for Families and Communities (DFC).

The Department of Education and Children's Services (DECS) does not maintain a central data base of notifications additional to that held by DFC.

As the confidentiality of the identity of the mandatory notifier is assured under the Child Protection Act 1993, there are no records maintained in DECS about the number of students that have been subject to a mandatory report.

Individual learning plans are put in place in situations where concerns are identified and students require further support in their learning or wellbeing.

It is not possible to answer this question as there is no database of such assistance. Schools make decisions locally as part of their daily business to respond to emerging and varying needs for additional support for children and students. To maintain the confidentiality of mandatory notification, schools would not record any decisions as related to a mandatory notification status.

GLENSIDE HOSPITAL REDEVELOPMENT

In reply to **Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (2 July 2008) (Estimates Committee B).

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Minister for Environment and Conservation, Minister for Early Childhood Development, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation, Minister Assisting the Premier in Cabinet Business and Public Sector Management): I am advised that:

1. The area designated for the movie hub comprises 2,777 hectares, subject to finalisation of the survey plan.

SURPLUS EMPLOYEES

In reply to **Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder)** (2 July 2008) (Estimates Committee B).

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Minister for Environment and Conservation, Minister for Early Childhood Development, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation, Minister Assisting the Premier in Cabinet Business and Public Sector Management): Attached is a suggested response for your consideration.

Surplus Employees as at 30 June 2008

Minister for Environment and Conservation

Department/Agency	Position Title	Classification	TEC Cost
Department for Environment & Heritage	Co-ordinator Aboriginal Heritage & Native Title	ASO6	\$89,252
	Graphic Designer	TGO1	\$59,414
	Business Manager, Adelaide Gaol	ASO5	\$85,348
	Special Events & Sponsorship Manager	ASO6	\$89,252
	Application Administrator	ASO4	\$68,270
			TOTAL: \$391,536

GRANT EXPENDITURE

In reply to **Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder)** (2 July 2008) (Estimates Committee B).

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Minister for Environment and Conservation, Minister for Early Childhood Development, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and

Reconciliation, Minister Assisting the Premier in Cabinet Business and Public Sector Management): Attached is a suggested response for your consideration.

Expenditure on grants

Minister for Environment and Conservation 2007-08

Department for Environment and Heritage—Controlled Funds

Grant agreement templates are used to create grants, and these templates have been created to ensure compliance with Treasurer's Instruction 15.

Name of Grant/Contribution Recipient	Amount of Grant/Contribution (\$)	Purpose of Grant	Subject to grant agreement (Y/N)
BUSH HERITAGE AUST	1,000,000.00	Grant for purchase of Bon Bon Station for conservation purposes	Y
RSPCA SOUTH AUST INC.	580,000.00	RSPCA Grant	Y
NATIONAL TRUST OF SOUTH AUST	286,363.63	Heritage Direction-National Trust	Y
CONSERVATION COUNCIL OF SA INC.	120,000.00	Community Grants Program Funding	Y
UNIVERSITY OF ADELAIDE	88,000.00	Contribution For Chair of Conservation Biology	Y
NATIONAL TRUST OF SOUTH AUST	63,636.37	Contribution to the National Trust	Y
NATURE FOUNDATION SA INC	50,000.00	Nature Foundation Support Grant	Y
UNIVERSITY OF ADELAIDE	50,000.00	Contribution For Chair Of Climate Change	Y
UNIVERSITY OF ADELAIDE	50,000.00	Contribution Engagement Of Psychologist	Y
SALISBURY CITY OF	46,990.45	One Million Trees Grant	Y
UNIVERSITY OF ADELAIDE	45,000.00	Trial of coastal/marine condition indicators	Y
SOUTH AUST WATER CORPORATION	42,000.00	One Million Trees Grant	Y
SALISBURY CITY OF	41,209.70	One Million Trees Grant	Y
UNIVERSITY OF ADELAIDE	40,000.00	Research Funding-Genetic Restoration Research	Y
MARION CITY OF	32,818.00	One Million Trees Grant	Y
LA TROBE UNIVERSITY	32,000.00	Mallee fire and effect biodiversity	Y

Name of Grant/Contribution Recipient	Amount of Grant/Contribution (\$)	Purpose of Grant	Subject to grant agreement (Y/N)
SOUTH AUST UNIVERSITY OF	30,000.00	State Heritage Register Review	Y
FLINDERS UNIVERSITY	25,000.00	Avian recruitment-managing biodiversity	Y
CATHOLIC CHURCH ENDOWMENT SOCY	25,000.00	Heritage Grants Programme	Y
SALISBURY CITY OF	22,000.00	One Million Trees Grant	Y
UNIVERSITY OF NEW SOUTH WALES	20,000.00	Fertility management kangaroos and koalas	Y
UNIVERSITY OF ADELAIDE	20,000.00	Develop DNA ID tool for marine microalgae	Y
BUSHFIRE CRC LTD	20,000.00	Contribution to Bushfire CRC for 2007-08 per the Commonwealth Agreement	Y
NATURE FOUNDATION SA INC	20,000.00	Nature Foundation Support Grant	Y
FLINDERS RANGES COUNCIL THE	20,000.00	Heritage Direction	Y
ONKAPARINGA CITY OF	19,834.00	One Million Trees Grant	Y
SALISBURY CITY OF	19,662.00	One Million Trees Grant	Y
MARION CITY OF	16,409.00	One Million Trees Grant	Y
FLINDERS UNIVERSITY	16,000.00	Fire Management Grant-Optimal Fire Mosaics	Y
SALISBURY CITY OF	15,178.85	Heritage Fund Agreement	Y
UNIVERSITY OF ADELAIDE	15,000.00	Trial of coastal/marine condition indicators	Y
ADELAIDE & MT LOFTY RANGES	15,000.00	Statewide Marine Integration	Y
UNIVERSITY OF ADELAIDE	15,000.00	Life and times of Hobbitt Man	Y
UNIVERSITY OF ADELAIDE	15,000.00	Health assessment of threatened flora	Y
UNIVERSITY OF ADELAIDE	15,000.00	Impact of Phytophthora on native vegetation	Y
ENVIRONMENTAL DEFENDERS OFFICE	15,000.00	Contribution to the EDO for 2007-08	Y

Name of Grant/Contribution Recipient	Amount of Grant/Contribution (\$)	Purpose of Grant	Subject to grant agreement (Y/N)
FATCHEN T	15,000.00	Heritage Grants Programme	Y
MANTUNG MAGGEA LAND MANAGEMENT	14,600.00	Management of Heritage Agreement Areas	Y
NSW HERITAGE OFFICE	12,575.45	Mortars Technicals Guide	Y
NSW HERITAGE OFFICE	12,254.55	State Heritage Fund-Education Program	Y
LAND MANAGEMENT CORPORATION	11,550.00	One Million Trees Grant	Y
CHILDREN YOUTH & WOMENS	11,050.00	Wildlife Conservation Grant	Y
BUSHFIRE CRC LTD	10,000.00	Fire Research	Y
ONKAPARINGA CITY OF	10,000.00	Heritage Direction	Y
WAKEFIELD REGIONAL COUNCIL	10,000.00	Heritage Direction	Y
UNIVERSITY OF ADELAIDE	10,000.00	Contribution to ACEBB	Y
UNIVERSITY OF ADELAIDE	10,000.00	Mud springs invertebrates	Y
TRANSFER PAYMENT DEPT PRIMARY INDUSTRIES	10,000.00	Kangaroo Management	Y
UNIVERSITY OF ADELAIDE	10,000.00	Genetics of marsupials	Y
ADELAIDE CITY COUNCIL	10,000.00	One Million Trees Grant	Y
CSIRO ACCOUNTS RECEIVABLE	10,000.00	Assessing biological outcomes water management	Y
GOYDER REGIONAL COUNCIL OF	10,000.00	Heritage Direction	Y
PORT AUGUSTA CITY OF	10,000.00	Heritage Direction	Y
MITCHAM CITY OF	10,000.00	One Million Trees Grant	Y
PLAYFORD CITY OF	10,000.00	One Million Trees Grant	Y
COPPER COAST DISTRICT COUNCIL	10,000.00	Heritage Direction	Y
SOUTH AUST WATER CORPORATION	10,000.00	One Million Trees Grant	Y
GAMEAU TE & A	9,418.00	Threatened Fauna Protective Fencing	Y
PRIMARY INDUSTRIES &	9,400.00	Australian Sealion Pup Production Assessment	Y
LAND MANAGEMENT CORPORATION	9,090.91	One Million Trees Grant	Y

Name of Grant/Contribution Recipient	Amount of Grant/Contribution (\$)	Purpose of Grant	Subject to grant agreement (Y/N)
PLAYFORD CITY OF	8,250.00	One Million Trees Grant	Y
SALISBURY CITY OF	7,000.00	One Million Trees Grant	Y
TEA TREE GULLY CITY OF	6,675.00	One Million Trees Grant	Y
BOTANIC GARDENS & PARKS	6,123.00	Contribution Aust. Seed research co-ordinator	Y
ST AIDAN'S ANGLICAN CHURCH	6,026.82	Heritage Grants Programme	Y
ROYAL ZOOLOGICAL SOCIETY	6,000.00	Wildlife Conservation Grant	Y
ROYAL ZOOLOGICAL SOCIETY	6,000.00	Wildlife Conservation Grant	Y
UNIVERSITY OF ADELAIDE	6,000.00	Wildlife Conservation Grant	Y
KANGAROO ISLAND COUNCIL	5,949.00	KI Tourism Optimisation Management Model	Y
PRIMARY INDUSTRIES &	5,820.00	Wildlife Conservation Grant	Y
ONKAPARINGA CITY OF	5,431.00	One Million Trees Grant	Y
ARTS SA-SA MUSEUM	5,131.20	Wildlife Conservation Grant	Y
KRUSZEWSKI H	5,000.00	Heritage Grants Programme	Y
SHERLOCK G	5,000.00	Heritage Grants Programme	Y
WATERED AUST PTY LTD	5,000.00	Landscape science cluster	Y
TURNER S	5,000.00	Heritage Grants Programme	Y
WEST TORRENS CITY OF	5,000.00	Heritage Direction	Y
WALTER N	5,000.00	Heritage Grants Programme	Y
VICTOR HARBOR CITY OF	5,000.00	Heritage Direction	Y
UNLEY CITY OF	5,000.00	Heritage Direction	Y
UCA MCLAREN VALE MEMORIAL WALL	5,000.00	Heritage Grants Programme	Y
STREAKY BAY DISTRICT COUNCIL	5,000.00	Re-Vegetation & Signage	Y
MID MURRAY COUNCIL	5,000.00	Heritage Direction	Y

Name of Grant/Contribution Recipient	Amount of Grant/Contribution (\$)	Purpose of Grant	Subject to grant agreement (Y/N)
SPORTING SHOOTERS ASSOC	5,000.00	Statewide Friends Of Parks Grants	Y
UNIVERSITY OF SYDNEY	5,000.00	Kangaroo Management	Y
NORWOOD PAYNEHAM & ST PETERS	5,000.00	Heritage Direction	Y
ADELAIDE HILLS COUNCIL	5,000.00	Heritage Direction	Y
RAYLEL SUPER FUND	5,000.00	Heritage Grants Programme	Y
WILLS M	5,000.00	Heritage Grants Programme	Y
PETERBOROUGH DISTRICT COUNCIL	5,000.00	Heritage Grants Programme	Y
PARNELL D	5,000.00	Heritage Grants Programme	Y
DAVIS R	5,000.00	Heritage Grants Programme	Y
NARACOORTE LUCINDALE COUNCIL	5,000.00	Heritage Direction	Y
MITCHAM CITY OF	5,000.00	Heritage Direction	Y
LIGHT REGIONAL COUNCIL	5,000.00	Heritage Direction	Y
LIGHT REGIONAL COUNCIL	5,000.00	Heritage Grants Programme	Y
KEENAN J	5,000.00	Heritage Grants Programme	Y
HAMPEL B	5,000.00	Heritage Grants Programme	Y
DEFENCE SA	5,000.00	One Million Trees Grant	Y
DAY M	5,000.00	Heritage Grants Programme	Y
MARION CITY OF	5,000.00	Heritage Direction	Y
FLINDERS UNIVERSITY	5,000.00	Management of South Australian Groundwater	Y
NATIONAL TRUST OF SOUTH AUST	5,000.00	Heritage Grants Programme	Y
JUDGE P	5,000.00	Heritage Grants Programme	Y
FALKENBERG J	4,920.00	Heritage Grants Programme	Y
FRIENDS OF BROWNHILL CREEK	4,800.00	Statewide Friends Of Parks Grants	Y
UNIVERSITY OF ADELAIDE	4,784.00	Trial of Coast/Marine Resource Indicators	Y

Name of Grant/Contribution Recipient	Amount of Grant/Contribution (\$)	Purpose of Grant	Subject to grant agreement (Y/N)
BROWN'S WELL LANDCARE GROUP	4,710.00	Management of Heritage Agreement Areas	Y
REYNOLDS B	4,558.00	Heritage Grants Programme	Y
TREASURE A	4,545.45	Heritage Grants Programme	Y
ST JOHN'S CHURCH	4,503.91	Heritage Grants Programme	Y
FRIENDS OF O'HALLORAN HILL	4,448.00	One Million Trees Grant	Y
JONES JB	4,375.00	Heritage Grants Programme	Y
FRANKEL A	4,370.00	Heritage Grants Programme	Y
DTF SUPPORT OPERATIONS	4,325.00	One Million Trees Grant	Y
ADELAIDE AIRPORT LTD	4,250.00	One Million Trees Grant	Y
FRIENDS OF SIMPSON DESERT PARK	4,165.00	Statewide Friends Of Parks Grants	Y
HOSKING W	4,024.45	Heritage Grants Programme	Y
AUSTRALASIAN FIRE AUTHORITY COUNCIL LTD	4,000.00	Contribution to Bushfire CRC for 2007-08 per the Commonwealth Agreement	Y
FOSTERS WINE ESTATES	4,000.00	Heritage Grants Programme	Y
PRIMARY INDUSTRIES &	3,960.00	Wildlife Conservation Grant	Y
FRIENDS OF BLACKHILL/MORIALTA	3,800.00	Statewide Friends Of Parks Grants	Y
UNIVERSITY OF ADELAIDE	3,676.80	Wildlife Conservation Grant	Y
ARTS SA-SA MUSEUM	3,646.80	Wildlife Conservation Grant	Y
GOOLWA CHRIST CHURCH	3,644.00	Heritage Grants Programme	Y
ANGLICAN PARISH OF GLENELG	3,600.00	Heritage Grants Programme	Y
UNIVERSITY OF ADELAIDE	3,600.00	Wildlife Conservation Grant	Y
ADELAIDE AIRPORT LTD	3,557.25	One Million Trees Grant	Y
FRIENDS OF SHEPHERD HILL	3,440.00	One Million Trees Grant	Y

Name of Grant/Contribution Recipient	Amount of Grant/Contribution (\$)	Purpose of Grant	Subject to grant agreement (Y/N)
UNIVERSITY OF TASMANIA	3,432.00	Wildlife Conservation Grant	Y
STEELE E	3,398.00	Management of Heritage Agreement Areas	Y
UNIVERSITY OF ADELAIDE	3,359.40	Wildlife Conservation Grant	Y
FRIENDS OF CARRICK HILL	3,350.00	One Million Trees Grant	Y
UNIVERSITY OF ADELAIDE	3,344.00	Wildlife Conservation Grant	Y
FRIENDS OF KIMBA DISTRICT PARK	3,300.00	Statewide Friends Of Parks Grants	Y
JMD STUART SOCY INC	3,182.00	Heritage Grants Programme	Y
ECOLOGICAL HORIZONS PTY LTD	3,181.82	Management of Heritage Agreement Areas	Y
UNIVERSITY OF ADELAIDE	3,168.00	Wildlife Conservation Grant	Y
FRIENDS OF OLD GOVERNMENT	3,000.00	Statewide Friends Of Parks Grants	Y
FRIENDS OF FLINDERS RANGES	3,000.00	Statewide Friends Of Parks Grants	Y
NATURE CONSERVATION SOCIETY OF	3,000.00	Wildlife Conservation Grant	Y
VAN RIET A	3,000.00	Heritage Grants Programme	Y
FRIENDS OF MOANA SANDS	2,900.00	Statewide Friends Of Parks Grants	Y
UNIVERSITY OF ADELAIDE	2,888.00	Wildlife Conservation Grant	Y
UNIVERSITY OF ADELAIDE	2,836.80	Wildlife Conservation Grant	Y
ROYAL ZOOLOGICAL SOCIETY	2,832.00	Wildlife Conservation Grant	Y
FRIENDS OF ANSTEY HILL	2,800.00	Statewide Friends Of Parks Grants	Y

Name of Grant/Contribution Recipient	Amount of Grant/Contribution (\$)	Purpose of Grant	Subject to grant agreement (Y/N)
McMILLAN V & DELBEN R	2,727.27	Management of Heritage Agreement Areas	Y
ROYAL ZOOLOGICAL SOCIETY	2,692.08	Wildlife Conservation Grant	Y
SMITH IMPRESS PTY LTD	2,600.00	Kangaroo Management Plan Reports	Y
SMITH IMPRESS PTY LTD	2,600.00	Kangaroo Management Plan Reports	Y
PRIMARY INDUSTRIES &	2,580.00	Wildlife Conservation Grant	Y
MCCLLOUD B & PARKER K	2,500.00	Management of Heritage Agreement Areas	Y
ARTS SA-SA MUSEUM	2,433.00	Wildlife Conservation Grant	Y
ARTS SA-SA MUSEUM	2,421.20	Wildlife Conservation Grant	Y
ARTS SA-SA MUSEUM	2,404.73	Wildlife Conservation Grant	Y
UNIVERSITY OF ADELAIDE	2,400.00	Wildlife Conservation Grant	Y
FRIENDS OF SHOREBIRDS S.E.	2,245.00	Statewide Friends Of Parks Grants	Y
BAKER JL	2,200.00	Wildlife Conservation Grant	Y
UNIVERSITY OF ADELAIDE	2,098.40	Wildlife Conservation Grant	Y
FRIENDS OF MOUNT GEORGE	2,000.00	Statewide Friends Of Parks Grants	Y
FRIENDS OF KENNETH STIRLING	2,000.00	Statewide Friends Of Parks Grants	Y
BEHAN K & R	2,000.00	Management of Heritage Agreement Areas	Y
SCHRIEVER KB & MB	2,000.00	Management of Heritage Agreement Areas	Y

Name of Grant/Contribution Recipient	Amount of Grant/Contribution (\$)	Purpose of Grant	Subject to grant agreement (Y/N)
McBAIN A	2,000.00	Management of Heritage Agreement Areas	Y
KUSS R	2,000.00	Heritage Grants Programme	Y
NEW SPRINGS LANDCARE GROUP	2,000.00	Statewide Friends Of Parks Grants	Y
HARRINGTON A	2,000.00	Management of Heritage Agreement Areas	Y
DAWSON B & D	1,960.00	Management of Heritage Agreement Areas	Y
REYNOLDS T	1,930.00	Management of Heritage Agreement Areas	Y
FRIENDS OF SHEPHERD HILL	1,916.00	Statewide Friends Of Parks Grants	Y
FRIENDS OF PARKS INC	1,900.00	Statewide Friends Of Parks Grants	Y
PRIMARY INDUSTRIES &	1,880.00	Wildlife Conservation Grant	Y
HANSON R	1,818.18	Management of Heritage Agreement Areas	Y
BLACK AB	1,818.18	Management of Heritage Agreement Areas	Y
STEEDMAN G & LAWS R	1,818.18	Management of Heritage Agreement Areas	Y
JR & HC SCHIRMER & SONS TRUST	1,818.18	Management of Heritage Agreement Areas	Y
JH RYAN & SON	1,818.18	Management of Heritage Agreement Areas	Y
BIRDS AUSTRALIA	1,818.18	Management of Heritage Agreement Areas	Y
NORTH HAVEN SCHOOLS	1,818.18	One Million Trees Grant	Y

Name of Grant/Contribution Recipient	Amount of Grant/Contribution (\$)	Purpose of Grant	Subject to grant agreement (Y/N)
WIEBKIN S & O	1,818.18	Management of Heritage Agreement Areas	Y
NATURE CONSERVATION SOCIETY OF	1,800.00	One Million Trees Grant	Y
FORT GLANVILLE HISTORICAL	1,800.00	Statewide Friends of Parks Grants	Y
WILLING RL & GK	1,786.36	Management of Heritage Agreement Areas	Y
MALLEE ECO SERVICES	1,780.00	Management of Heritage Agreement Areas	Y
NATIONAL TRUST OF SA	1,760.00	Management of Heritage Agreement Areas	Y
BAULDERSTONE C	1,759.00	Management of Heritage Agreement Areas	Y
AUSTRALIAN DEER ASSOC INC	1,721.82	Management of Heritage Agreement Areas	Y
UNIVERSITY OF ADELAIDE	1,720.00	Wildlife Conservation Grant	Y
UNIVERSITY OF ADELAIDE	1,680.00	Wildlife Conservation Grant	Y
PRIMARY INDUSTRIES &	1,672.80	Wildlife Conservation Grant	Y
MILNE M	1,670.00	Management of Heritage Agreement Areas	Y
OWEN GM & PJ	1,656.82	Management of Heritage Agreement Areas	Y
DENNIS K	1,630.00	Management of Heritage Agreement Areas	Y
PRIMARY INDUSTRIES & RESOURCES	1,625.00	Trial Resource Condition Indicators	Y
WALKING TRAILS SUPPORT GROUP	1,625.00	Statewide Friends Of Parks Grants	Y

Name of Grant/Contribution Recipient	Amount of Grant/Contribution (\$)	Purpose of Grant	Subject to grant agreement (Y/N)
DOUGLAS-HILL A	1,620.00	Management of Heritage Agreement Areas	Y
ARTS SA-SA MUSEUM	1,603.20	Wildlife Conservation Grant	Y
WYATT RF & P	1,600.00	Management of Heritage Agreement Areas	Y
UNIVERSITY OF ADELAIDE	1,600.00	Wildlife Conservation Grant	Y
TWO WELLS, LEWISTON & DISTRICT LANDCARE	1,500.00	One Million Trees Grant	Y
HODGE M	1,500.00	Management of Heritage Agreement Areas	Y
LIGHT REGIONAL COUNCIL	1,500.00	Heritage Fund Agreement	Y
JOHNSTON L	1,454.55	Management of Heritage Agreement Areas	Y
FRIENDS OF GRANITE ISLAND	1,372.00	Wildlife Conservation Grant	Y
TRENGOVE M	1,363.64	Management of Heritage Agreement Areas	Y
WHILLAS PJ & CO	1,316.36	Management of Heritage Agreement Areas	Y
UNIVERSITY OF ADELAIDE	1,299.20	Wildlife Conservation Grant	Y
PRIMARY INDUSTRIES WATER &	1,292.73	Wildlife Conservation Grant	Y
GATES J	1,254.00	Wildlife Conservation Grant	Y
MILNE TI & TM	1,250.00	Management of Heritage Agreement Areas	Y
GOWLING B	1,227.27	Management of Heritage Agreement Areas	Y

Name of Grant/Contribution Recipient	Amount of Grant/Contribution (\$)	Purpose of Grant	Subject to grant agreement (Y/N)
AUSTRALIAN DEER ASSOC INC	1,225.45	Management of Heritage Agreement Areas	Y
UNIVERSITY OF ADELAIDE	1,218.40	Wildlife Conservation Grant	Y
SCHWERDT S	1,210.00	Heritage Grants Programme	Y
FRIENDS OF HALLET COVE	1,200.00	One Million Trees Grant	Y
NARADALE GROUP PTY LTD	1,195.45	Management of Heritage Agreement Areas	Y
WYATT RF & P	1,145.45	Management of Heritage Agreement Areas	Y
BERRI BARMERA LOCAL ACTION	1,127.27	Wildlife Conservation Grant	Y
ARTS SA-SA MUSEUM	1,092.00	Wildlife Conservation Grant	Y
MARTIN S	1,020.00	Management of Heritage Agreement Areas	Y
STRADBROKE SCHOOLS ROSTREVOR	1,000.00	One Million Trees Grant	Y
TRINITY GARDENS PRIMARY SCHOOL	1,000.00	One Million Trees Grant	Y
PORT ELLIOT PRIMARY SCHOOL	1,000.00	One Million Trees Grant	Y
NETHERBY KINDERGARTEN	1,000.00	One Million Trees Grant	Y
LE FEVRE PENINSULA PRIMARY	1,000.00	One Million Trees Grant	Y
DAVIES N	1,000.00	Management of Heritage Agreement Areas	Y
ARTS SA-SA MUSEUM	1,000.00	Wildlife Conservation Grant	Y
HAHNDORF PRIMARY SCHOOL & CPC	1,000.00	One Million Trees Grant	Y
NATIONAL PARKS HERITAGE CTTE	1,000.00	Statewide Friends Of Parks Grants	Y
HEWETT PRIMARY SCHOOL	1,000.00	One Million Trees Grant	Y
EASTERN FLEURIEU STRATHALBYN	1,000.00	One Million Trees Grant	Y

Name of Grant/Contribution Recipient	Amount of Grant/Contribution (\$)	Purpose of Grant	Subject to grant agreement (Y/N)
FRIENDS OF SCOTT CREEK	1,000.00	Statewide Friends Of Parks Grants	Y
CLARENDON PRIMARY SCHOOL	1,000.00	One Million Trees Grant	Y
ABERFOYLE PARK HIGH SCHOOL	1,000.00	One Million Trees Grant	Y
ST FRANCIS XAVIER'S CATHOLIC	997.50	One Million Trees Grant	Y
THREATENED PLANT ACTION GROUP	990.00	Statewide Friends Of Parks Grants	Y
RIVERSIDE GRAZIERS	909.09	Management of Heritage Agreement Areas	Y
TATACHILLA LUTHERAN COLLEGE	890.00	One Million Trees Grant	Y
ONKAPARINGA CITY OF	887.00	Coastal Cliff Stabilisation	Y
GRAY S	885.00	Management of Heritage Agreement Areas	Y
SPORTING SHOOTERS ASSOC	820.00	Statewide Friends Of Parks Grants	Y
FRIENDS OF SHOREBIRDS S.E.	751.00	Statewide Friends Of Parks Grants	Y
GOYDER REGIONAL COUNCIL OF	750.00	Heritage Grants Programme	Y
WYNN VALE SCHOOL	727.27	One Million Trees Grant	Y
SCHUBERT R & V	681.82	Management of Heritage Agreement Areas	Y
FRIENDS OF NEWLAND HEAD	625.00	Statewide Friends Of Parks Grants	Y
SA MEDITATION CENTRE	603.64	Management of Heritage Agreement Areas	Y
FRIENDS OF PARKS INC	600.00	One Million Trees Grant	Y
FRIENDS OF KI PARKS	600.00	Statewide Friends Of Parks Grants	Y
TRENGOVE M	545.45	Management of Heritage Agreement Areas	Y

Name of Grant/Contribution Recipient	Amount of Grant/Contribution (\$)	Purpose of Grant	Subject to grant agreement (Y/N)
FRIENDS OF PARA WIRRA	502.00	Statewide Friends Of Parks Grants	Y
FRIENDS OF THE LOWER FIELD	500.00	One Million Trees Grant	Y
DIXON B & T	480.00	Management of Heritage Agreement Areas	Y
ELIZABETH SPECIAL SCHOOL	477.50	One Million Trees Grant	Y
FRIENDS OF O'HALLORAN HILL	461.00	Statewide Friends Of Parks Grants	Y
DONALD W	300.00	Management of Heritage Agreement Areas	Y
CASH JG	253.09	Management of Heritage Agreement Areas	Y
SQUIRES GH	195.00	Management of Heritage Agreement Areas	Y
STARK R, P & B	145.45	Management of Heritage Agreement Areas	Y
FRAHN R	120.00	Management of Heritage Agreement Areas	Y

Department for Environment and Heritage—Administered Funds

Grant agreement templates are used to create grants, and these templates have been created to ensure compliance with Treasurer's Instruction 15.

Name of Grant/Contribution Recipient	Amount of Grant/Contribution \$	Purpose of Grant	Subject to grant agreement (Y/N)
Royal Zoological Society	18,900,000.00	Government Grant for the Precinct Development	Y
Royal Zoological Society	3,126,000.00	Annual Government Grant	N
Adelaide City Council	1,236,000.00	Grant to any parklands related activity including, watering, management and administration costs.	Y
City of Salisbury	180,000.00	Coast Protection Fund Grant	Y
District Council of Tatiara	75,000.00	Contribution for Bordertown Scout Hall Relocation	Y

Name of Grant/Contribution Recipient	Amount of Grant/Contribution \$	Purpose of Grant	Subject to grant agreement (Y/N)
Delta Society Australia Ltd	75,000.00	Delta dog safe program SA	N
City of Port Augusta	57,000.00	Coast Protection Fund Grant	Y
City of Onkaparinga	51,000.00	Coast Protection Fund Grant	Y
RSPCA South Australia Inc	40,000.00	Capital upgrade for the City of Playford Animal Shelter	Y
Animal Welfare League of South Australia	40,000.00	Maintenance and supply of facility for dogs in from Councils	Y
City of Port Augusta	20,000.00	Coast Protection Fund Grant	Y
Animal Welfare League of South Australia	10,000.00	Upgrade for Nursery/Shelter facilities	Y
RSPCA South Australia Inc	10,000.00	Capital upgrade for Animal Shelters	Y
Animal Welfare League of South Australia	10,000.00	Upgrade overnight animal pens	Y
District of Yorke Peninsula	10,000.00	Coast Protection Fund Grant	Y
Larcombe General Builders	8,500.00	Coast Protection Fund Grant	Y
City of Victor Harbour	6,000.00	Coast Protection Fund Grant	Y
District Council of Grant	2,750.00	Coast Protection Fund Grant	Y
The Corporation of the City of Whyalla	2,750.00	Coast Protection Fund Grant	Y
City of Port Augusta	2,700.00	Coast Protection Fund Grant	Y

PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYMENT

In reply to **Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder)** (2 July 2008) (Estimates Committee B).

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Minister for Environment and Conservation, Minister for Early Childhood Development, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation, Minister Assisting the Premier in Cabinet Business and Public Sector Management): Attached is a suggested response for your consideration.

TEC of Employees > \$100K as at 30 June 2008

Minister for Environment & Conservation

Department/Agency	Total Employment Cost	No. of employees
Department for Environment & Heritage	Greater than \$100,000	59
Department for Environment & Heritage	Greater than \$200,000	3

Department/Agency	Total Employment Cost	No. of positions created during 2007-08	No. of positions abolished during 2007-08
Department for Environment & Heritage	Greater than \$100,000	0	0

Department/Agency	Total Employment Cost	No. of positions created during 2007-08	No. of positions abolished during 2007-08
Department for Environment & Heritage	Greater than \$200,000	0	0

ARKARoola WASTE

In reply to **Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder)** (2 July 2008) (Estimates Committee B).

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Minister for Environment and Conservation, Minister for Early Childhood Development, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation, Minister Assisting the Premier in Cabinet Business and Public Sector Management): I am advised that:

The EPA first became aware of the inappropriate disposal of waste within the Arkaroola Sanctuary on 4 January 2008.

ENVIRONMENT PROTECTION AUTHORITY

In reply to **Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder)** (2 July 2008) (Estimates Committee B).

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Minister for Environment and Conservation, Minister for Early Childhood Development, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation, Minister Assisting the Premier in Cabinet Business and Public Sector Management): I am advised that:

EPA records show the following numbers of complaints were received by the EPA relating to the building and construction industry for the financial year 2007-08:

Building/Construction Site-Dust	175
Building/Construction Site-Noise	271

RADIOACTIVE WASTE

In reply to **Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder)** (2 July 2008) (Estimates Committee B).

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Minister for Environment and Conservation, Minister for Early Childhood Development, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation, Minister Assisting the Premier in Cabinet Business and Public Sector Management): I am advised that:

The EPA conducted a major audit of radioactive waste during its audit of radioactive material completed in 2003. The audit revealed 134 sites where radioactive material was used or stored, of which 80 contained radioactive waste.

Since the major audit of radioactive material, the EPA has conducted two audits of radioactive waste that may be destined for the interim store or repository. These audits were conducted in 2005 and 2007.

In addition to these audits the EPA has inspected radioactive waste storage during the course of its routine inspections, targeted inspections of security of higher activity waste radioactive sources, and regular visits to uranium mine sites.

ENVIRONMENT PROTECTION AUTHORITY

In reply to **Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder)** (2 July 2008) (Estimates Committee B).

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Minister for Environment and Conservation, Minister for Early Childhood Development, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation, Minister Assisting the Premier in Cabinet Business and Public Sector Management): I am advised that:

1. The applications closed on 11 March 2008. Thirteen applications were received. A selection panel was convened and in view of the limited field a decision was made to engage a recruitment agency. Subsequently, four candidates were interviewed. The successful applicant, Helen Fulcher, was then appointed.

WATER POLICY

In reply to **Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder)** (2 July 2008) (Estimates Committee B).

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for State/Local Government Relations, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Consumer Affairs, Minister for Government Enterprises, Minister Assisting the Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Energy): I am advised that:

The Department of Water, Land and Biodiversity Conservation has endorsed and published Customer Service Standards for the processing of licence and permit applications.

I am advised that, the amount of time required to process an application varies depending on the type of application and whether a technical assessment is required when assessing the application against the relevant Acts and principles in the relevant Natural Resources Management Plans and Water Allocation Plans. In some cases the technical assessment may require the applicant to undertake an aquifer pump test, which adds to the time to process the application.

Four applications for new water licences involving water allocation transfers in the Clare Valley have been received and processed in the last three water use years. In the Clare Valley. An application for a water allocation transfer must accompany the application for new water licence, since there is no new water available to be allocated. The average time for processing these applications was 57 days.

The standard for new water licences is to have 90 per cent processed within 10 business days. The standard for water allocation transfers requiring technical assessment is to have 90 per cent processed within 40 business days. Where a new licence involves a water allocation transfer, the water license application is usually not processed until the allocation transfer application has been technically assessed.

REGULATORY FEES

In reply to **Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder)** (2 July 2008) (Estimates Committee B).

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Minister for Environment and Conservation, Minister for Early Childhood Development, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation, Minister Assisting the Premier in Cabinet Business and Public Sector Management):

1. The previous Minister was advised that this variance was a result of a one off transaction. Following further investigation, I am advised that the \$212,000 extra in income is a result of \$100,000 in increased revenue receipts from Regulatory Fees, while the balance is the result of the Regulatory Fee revenue being assigned against the 'Other' revenue classification incorrectly. This correction did not increase the overall revenue for the program.

SURPLUS EMPLOYEES

In reply to **Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite—Leader of the Opposition)** (2 July 2008) (Estimates Committee B).

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Minister for Environment and Conservation, Minister for Early Childhood Development, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation, Minister Assisting the Premier in Cabinet Business and Public Sector Management):

Surplus Employees as at 30 June 2008

Division/Agency	Position Title	Classification	TEC
Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation Division	Project Officer	ASO3	\$61,469
Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation Division	Snr Project Officer	ASO7	\$90,636
			Total \$152,105

FIRE MANAGEMENT PLANS

In reply to **Mr PEDERICK (Hammond)** (2 July 2008) (Estimates Committee B).

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Minister for Environment and Conservation, Minister for Early Childhood Development, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and

Reconciliation, Minister Assisting the Premier in Cabinet Business and Public Sector Management): I am advised that:

1. The five fire management plans being developed by the Department for Environment and Heritage that are nearing completion cover reserves located in the:

- South-Western Fleurieu Peninsula;
- Southern Foothills (Mt Lofty Ranges);
- Hills Face Zone (Mt Lofty Ranges);
- Southern Flinders Ranges (Mt Remarkable); and
- Ngarkat District.

DOG FENCE BOARD

In reply to **Mrs PENFOLD (Flinders)** (2 July 2008) (Estimates Committee B).

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Minister for Environment and Conservation, Minister for Early Childhood Development, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation, Minister Assisting the Premier in Cabinet Business and Public Sector Management): I am advised that:

1. The Dog Fence Board expenditure for the 2007-08 financial year is \$805,000 (unaudited at this time). This level of expenditure compares with the actual expenditure of \$935,000 as reflected for the 2006-07 financial year, shown on page 11.70 of Budget Paper 4, Volume 3.

The expenditure budget shown for the Dog Fence Board for 2008-09, as per page 11.70, reflects employee expenses of \$150,000 and grants and subsidies of \$397,000, a total of \$543,000. This expenditure reflects only part of the expenditure budgeted in relation to the Dog Fence Board for 2008-09, as adjusting journals relating to revenues collected were not processed in time for the publication of the 2008-09 budget. Allowing for these outstanding items, the total expenditure budget is estimated at \$880,000.

The omission of information in respect of the 2007-08 financial year reflects ongoing changes in accounting policies and a review of the overall Administered Items budget for the Department.

AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT

In reply to **Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop)** (11 November 2008).

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Minister for Environment and Conservation, Minister for Early Childhood Development, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation, Minister Assisting the Premier in Cabinet Business and Public Sector Management): I am advised that:

The services being delivered under the MOU with DEH and the EPA fall under the following categories:

- Financial Services
 - Accounts Payable
 - Accounts Receivable
 - Financial Accounting
- Human Resource Management Services
- Payroll Services
- Information Technology Services
- Occupational Health Safety & Welfare
- Rehabilitation and Injury Management
- Procurement

- Risk Management
- General Administrative Services
- Facilities Management

It is worth noting that of the above services, the Payroll and Accounts Payable functions were been transitioned to Shared Services SA in August 2008 and October 2008 respectively. Furthermore, a number of Financial Accounting responsibilities (namely the preparation of Year End Financial Statements) are being transferred back to the EPA from DEH during 2008-09 and as such, the MOU has been amended accordingly.

ENVIRONMENT AND HERITAGE DEPARTMENT

In reply to **Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop)** (11 November 2008).

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Minister for Environment and Conservation, Minister for Early Childhood Development, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation, Minister Assisting the Premier in Cabinet Business and Public Sector Management): Since 2003, more than 20 boards and committees have been disbanded within the Department for Environment and Heritage.

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:

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

Regulations under the following Act—
South Australian Country Arts Trust—Revocation

By the Minister for Sustainability and Climate Change (Hon. M.D. Rann)—

Climate Change and Greenhouse Emissions Reduction Act 2007—South Australian Government Report dated February 2009

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

Rules of Court—
Supreme Court—Civil—Amendment No.7

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

Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science—Report 2007-08
Mid North Health—Report 2007-08
Northern Adelaide Hills Health Service Inc—Report 2007-08

By the Minister for Environment and Conservation (Hon. J.W. Weatherill)—

National Environment Protection Council—Report 2007-08

By the Minister for Families and Communities (Hon. J.M. Rankine)—

Regulations under the following Act—
Liquor Licensing—Dry Areas—Bordertown
Local Council By-Laws—District Council of Orroroo Carrieton—
No.1—Permits and Penalties
No.2—Moveable Signs
No.3—Local Government Land
No.4—Roads
No.5—Dogs
No.6—Cats

By the Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries (Hon. P. Caica)—

Regulations under the following Acts—
Primary Industry Funding Schemes—Olive Industry Fund
Primary Produce (Food Safety Schemes)—Food Safety Schemes—Dairy Industry

By the Minister for Industrial Relations (Hon. P. Caica)—

Rules—

Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation—Rule 30—Costs of Proceedings
Fair Work—Industrial Proceedings—Fire and Emergency Services

By the Minister for Correctional Services (Hon. A. Koutsantonis)—

Regulations under the following Act—

Correctional Services—Exclusions from Automatic Release on Parole

By the Minister for Gambling (Hon. A. Koutsantonis)—

Regulations under the following Act—

Authorised Betting Operations—Contributions Payable

Codes of Practice—Authorised Betting Operations—

Advertising—Authorised Interstate Betting Operations

Advertising—Bookmakers

Responsible Gambling—Authorised Interstate Betting Operations

Responsible Gambling—Bookmakers

Requirements for Systems and Procedures Designed to Prevent Betting by
Children

FINKS MOTORCYCLE CLUB

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON (Croydon—Attorney-General, Minister for Justice, Minister for Multicultural Affairs, Minister for Veterans' Affairs) (14:05): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: Last month I advised the house that in December I received the first ever application from the South Australian Police Commissioner to declare an organisation under the newly created Serious and Organised Crime (Control) Act 2008. I have been asked to consider declaring the Finks Motorcycle Club under part 2 of the legislation. I told the house that the application is supported by a statutory declaration that outlines the evidence that police rely upon in making the application. I will not repeat the particulars that set out the background to the application.

As required by the act I published a notice and invited the public to make submissions about the application for a declaration of the Finks Motorcycle Club. I have also acted carefully to comply with the principles of procedural fairness required by common law. For example, I wrote to people who have been identified as members or ex-members of the Finks Motorcycle Club in the statutory declaration providing them with further opportunity to make submissions about the application.

I gave members and ex-members the opportunity for their solicitors to attend my office and read the statutory declaration redacted to admit criminal intelligence and material withheld on the basis of public interest immunity. In the application, 48 persons are named by the police commissioner. To date, I have received 41 written submissions on the application.

It is now my view that it is appropriate that I invite the police commissioner to comment on the submissions made by those representing those named in the application as Finks. Late Friday afternoon Assistant Commissioner Tony Harrison advised me that he would provide a response to those submissions as soon as possible. When I receive the assistant commissioner's response I may have to take additional steps if I think it necessary. Although I will not canvass submissions received in this place, I have noted that the thrust of many is concern about the extent to which I may be satisfied of and give weight to assertions contained in the commissioner's application.

Lawyers representing those named as Finks have not provided me with any evidence through their submissions. I have assured the lawyers that I will take account of the submissions. I have also explained to interested parties that it is in the public interest that the application currently before me be determined soon. Having said that, I intend to be thorough and meet the requirements of due process. On that basis, I have given their lawyers the opportunity to place any evidence before me swiftly.

To make a declaration I must be satisfied that a case has been made out for an organisation to be declared under the act. I may make such a declaration if I am satisfied that members of the organisation associate for the purpose of organising, planning, facilitating, supporting or engaging in serious criminal activity, and that the organisation represents a risk to public safety and order in this state.

As I have previously stated, this is not a foregone conclusion. If I make a declaration, I must, as soon as practicable, publish notice of the declaration in the *Government Gazette* and in a newspaper circulating throughout the state.

I await the response from the commissioner and lawyers representing those named in the application as Finks, and I am concerned that the application be brought to a conclusion soon.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN JOCKEY CLUB

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT (Lee—Minister for Police, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:11): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: In December last year, Thoroughbred Racing SA (TRSA) retained the legal firm Lipman Karas to undertake a review of the corporate governance structure of the South Australian Jockey Club (SAJC), with special reference to the validity of last year's SAJC board elections.

TRSA is the controlling body of horseracing in South Australia, representing the interests of all metropolitan, regional and country clubs around the state. It was formed after the racing industry was corporatised by the former Liberal government. As a result of corporatisation, the state government no longer has control or influence in the industry's management. Let me make it very clear that TRSA's decision to engage Lipman Karas to undertake this review of the SAJC was not initiated as a result of any concerns or issues as to the adequacy of the standards of probity and stewardship associated with the conduct of thoroughbred racing events in South Australia, the conduct of wagering on thoroughbred racing events, the sale of Cheltenham or the SAJC's decision to vacate Victoria Park.

The independent review was conducted to look into the corporate governance of the SAJC following allegations of membership voting irregularities in the lead-up to elections in November 2008. The Independent Gambling Authority was provided with a copy of the Lipman Karas report by TRSA on Wednesday 4 March, pursuant to statutory powers available to the authority under the Authorised Betting Operations Act. The Independent Gambling Authority advised the SAJC that allegations contained in the Lipman Karas report were of a serious nature and that, if TRSA's recommendations were not adopted, the authority would consider its own inquiry into the allegations made.

On the afternoon of Thursday 5 March, TRSA provided me with a copy of the Lipman Karas report on the basis that I formally agreed to a number of conditions, including that I keep the contents of the report confidential and that I acknowledged that TRSA would maintain its claims of legal professional privilege in relation to the entire report. Of course, I reserved the right to disclose the document to the police if that were appropriate.

Following my reading of the report, I immediately forwarded the report to the Crown Solicitor's Office on the morning of Friday 6 March for advice. In particular, I obtained advice as to whether the full report, or parts of the report, should be referred to SAPOL for consideration in order to determine whether there were any matters that warranted further investigation. I also obtained advice on the appropriateness of tabling the report in parliament. Acting on this advice, and in line with previous undertakings I had been given, I immediately referred the report that day to SAPOL.

On 18 March, the Acting Commissioner of Police wrote to me advising that SAPOL intended to pursue the investigation of alleged offences, under the Criminal Law Consolidation Act and the Associations Incorporation Act, through the establishment of a task force involving officers from SAPOL and the Office of Consumer and Business Affairs.

On Friday 20 March, the board of the South Australian Jockey Club accepted TRSA's recommendations arising from the Lipman Karas review. The TRSA board made a series of recommendations that have been accepted by the SAJC. They included:

- the termination of the employment of SAJC Chief Executive Officer, Steve Ploubidis;
- the resignation of the current SAJC board and the election of a new board;
- the process for confirming the eligibility of members to vote at a fresh election;
- the conduct of a fresh election and the calling of nominations;
- agreement that the State Electoral Commission conduct the next SAJC election; and
- that the Chairman of the SAJC, John Naffine, and Deputy Chairman, Travis McLeay, not stand at the forthcoming elections.

The Lipman Karas report has been referred to SAPOL for investigation. The matters raised in the report are now the subject of police and Office of Consumer and Business Affairs investigations. Release of the report may prejudice those investigations and any proceedings that may flow from those investigations. The police have recommended against the release of the report.

In a minute dated 19 March 2009, Acting Deputy Commissioner Mr Graeme Barton stated the following:

I advise that SAPOL is of the view that tabling in parliament of the Lipman Karas report into the South Australian Jockey Club would potentially compromise current investigations being conducted by the joint taskforce, comprising SAPOL and the Office of Consumer and Business Affairs, and any future prosecution proceedings. For these reasons, it is recommended that the report not be tabled until the investigations are complete.

Apart from respecting TRSA's own interest in maintaining legal professional privilege, to table a document over which TRSA continues to maintain such privilege would not be appropriate on my part. To publish the report would involve disclosing personal information—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: —and would be an invasion of privacy and unfair to the persons named within it—from the point of view of any criminal charges being laid in the future but also for the persons who are totally innocent of any criminal or inappropriate conduct themselves but were merely third parties in events allegedly arranged or instigated by others.

Aside from issues of fairness, privacy and the disclosure of personal information, the findings of fact made in the report have not yet been fully investigated or tested in proceedings.

I am informed that under the government's own Information Privacy Principles, the entire report contains personal information, the disclosure of which, I am told, would contravene these privacy principles.

Given that the report is already with SAPOL and the Independent Gambling Authority, the public interest in accountability of having appropriate bodies investigate and take action has been satisfied.

The formation of the joint taskforce and the commencement of investigations is the most appropriate way of ensuring these allegations are fully and transparently investigated. I have full confidence that SAPOL and OCBA will carry out their investigations thoroughly and in their usual professional manner. Therefore, on advice, I do not intend to table the Lipman Karas report in parliament.

While this has been a very unfortunate and difficult time for the thoroughbred racing industry, it is now time to move forward. Fresh elections overseen by the Electoral Commissioner provide an opportunity for a fresh start.

A new board and a new CEO overseeing the regeneration of a much more controlled and professional business will allow members, stakeholders and the industry in general to look forward to a very positive future for the SAJC and thoroughbred racing.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE

Ms CICCARELLO (Norwood) (14:20): I bring up the 327th report of the committee on the Goolwa Channel Water Level Management Project.

Report received and ordered to be published.

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: I draw the attention of honourable members to the presence in the gallery today of students from Thebarton Senior College who are guests of the member for West Torrens.

QUESTION TIME**SOUTH AUSTRALIAN JOCKEY CLUB**

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite—Leader of the Opposition) (14:20): When was the Premier first informed of concerns relating to memberships, financial dealings and commercial relationships involving the South Australian Jockey Club, and by whom was he informed? What discussion has he had with Mr Philip Bentley relating to these matters?

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) (14:21): A number of things have been said which have not been true. People have said that Mr Bentley was appointed by the government to this position. He was elected by the horse racing industry to this position. People would well know that my knowledge of horse racing has not been as renowned as in other areas of public policy.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: What did you say?

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: If people are talking about vote stacking then no-one could go further than the Christopher Pyne faction of the South Australian Liberal Party. Thoroughbred Racing South Australia is the controlling body of thoroughbred horse racing in this state but, as we know, the Leader of the Opposition has a distinguished record as a lieutenant-colonel in the Australian Army, but we all know that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition believes that she has a field marshal's baton in her handbag.

The board of TRSA is drawn from and appointed by the metropolitan, regional and country horse racing clubs from around the state. The board is not appointed by the government. The board of TRSA appoints its own chair. The chair is currently Mr Philip Bentley, who has had extensive direct experience in the horse racing industry.

Decisions by the TRSA about the handling of complaints and allegations arising from elections held for the board of the South Australia Jockey Club in 2008 and other governance issues were matters for the TRSA chair and board. The government has a real interest in the matter being conducted properly because, amongst other things, the TRSA holds certain licences under the Authorised Betting Operations Act. However, the government has not intervened in the way in which these matters have been resolved, other than to ensure that the matter was referred to the South Australian police.

The Independent Gambling Authority (IGA), which has been given powers akin to a royal commission by this parliament, has the direct oversight of the activities of the TRSA and the SAJC in connection with their licences to conduct betting operations. Of course, the police ultimately have the power to investigate and act on any matters requiring criminal investigation. The matters are also subject to investigation by the Office of Consumer and Business Affairs (OCBA).

In relation to the allegations that have been made against Mr Bentley by the former chief executive of the SAJC, I understand that they were disclosed to the TRSA board and to the Independent Gambling Authority, which has powers akin to a royal commission. If there is anything in the allegation that warrants further investigation or action I am confident that the Independent Gambling Authority and the police will do their duty.

It had been suggested that I had read the report by this company, which I think is called Lipman Karas, but when I said that I had not—because I had not—I was criticised for not doing so. When the minister received this report he did exactly the right and proper thing, which was immediately to refer it to the South Australia Police and the Independent Gambling Authority. I have no interest in reading this report.

Mr Pengilly interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, the member for Finnis!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: If there is wrongdoing by others, then let it be exposed. Can I just say this—

Ms Chapman: When did you know?

The SPEAKER: Order, the deputy leader!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: When did I know? I have been reading about it in the paper. I reckon a lot of people are not that much interested—except those who practise vote stacking on the other side of this parliament. We know about it. You know what to believe. If someone wants to change their own name, how can you believe them when they come to seven different sites and three different designs for a hospital?

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN JOCKEY CLUB

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite—Leader of the Opposition) (14:25): I have a supplementary question. I again ask the Premier: when was he first informed, and what discussions has he had with Mr Bentley relating to the matter?

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) (14:26): Mr Bentley mentioned this to me in a conversation which probably lasted seconds and in which he said that he was going to be investigating some matters in the horseracing industry and that obviously he would do the right and proper thing with legal advice, which I imagine would be the correct thing.

Mr Hamilton-Smith interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I can find out. I can look through the diary to see whether I can find a day when a 30 second conversation took place. Can I say this: it is very interesting to me that the racing industry elected Mr Bentley to reform the racing industry, to clean up the racing industry, but members of the Liberal Party involve themselves in branch stacking and do not want corruption weeded out anywhere.

TRANSPORT ASSISTANCE

Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens) (14:27): My question is to the Premier. Will he inform the house how the state government is helping pensioners and self-funded retirees?

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) (14:27): I hope that there will be bipartisan support for what I am about to announce to this parliament, but they are shaking their heads already. Last week, we heard one of their gimmicks; now you are going to see real policy in action, and you can ask a supplementary question about it if you like.

The fact is that today we have announced totally free public transport for older South Australians—275,000 of them will be eligible—in off-peak times (between 9.30am and 3pm) on buses, trams and trains in this state from 1 July during weekdays. At the weekend and on public holidays, it will be all the time. This is where the Liberal Party, obsessed with branch stacking—and we know what is going on out in the north-eastern suburbs—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: —and Unley. We know what goes on. The point of the matter is that, whilst you are interested in vote stacking against each other (remember the Mayo by-election and everything else), we are interested in doing things that are right by the people of this state. So, we have made this decision now, in difficult times financially for the government and for every government in the world.

What we recognise is that elderly South Australians are doing it tough, and I would like to see an increase in the pension. It is not just pensioners but also self-funded retirees who are under real stress at the moment, so what we wanted to do was to make sure that a scheme was in place for totally free public transport in off-peak times as a way of saying 'thank you' to those who have made a contribution.

In recognition of the growing hardship being felt by pensioners and self-funded retirees, we have decided to give free public transport during off-peak periods for holders of a state Seniors Card. Free public transport on Adelaide's metropolitan trains, buses and trams from 9.30 in the

morning to 3pm on weekdays, all weekend and on public holidays, will begin on 1 July this year. I hope that members opposite will write to their constituents informing them of this initiative and also inviting those who perhaps are eligible for a state Seniors Card, but do not use one, to apply. All 275,000 holders of a state Seniors Card will be eligible to access the free travel on Adelaide Metro system trams, trains and buses.

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: Why can't they be happier—

The Hon. M.D. RANN: They don't look happy. The only time they are happy is when unemployment goes up, because they put their party before their state. We know that the elderly are being hit hard during this time of global economic downturn, especially self-funded retirees, whose investments are returning very little as interest rates drop and so much has been wiped off the value of shares and stocks. Unfortunately, one of the first things that happen to older people with a shortage of money is that they stop going out. This leads to isolation and often depression, which brings with it all kinds of associated problems. We want older people to keep moving, and this scheme offers a good incentive to help them do so.

We have been looking at introducing the scheme for some time, and I have no doubt that it will be welcomed by the tens of thousands of pensioners who use our public transport system every day. At present, self-funded retirees and pensioners receive on average between \$300 and \$870 a year in state government concessions, paid on council rates, water, sewerage, energy, emergency services levy, vehicle registration fees, driver's licence fees and so on. Concessions from the state government that directly assist South Australians, including the elderly, cost about \$145 million annually.

This new scheme will cost about \$10 million a year. This plan will help us to reach South Australia's Strategic Plan targets of increasing public transport use to 10 per cent of weekday passenger vehicle kilometres travelled by 2018 and reduce our greenhouse gas emissions. The current 50 per cent ticket concession available to state Seniors Card holders and other concession groups for peak hour travel will be maintained. When the scheme begins on 1 July, senior South Australians will be able to receive their free public transport by showing their state Seniors Card.

CHELTENHAM PARK

Mrs REDMOND (Heysen) (14:32): My question is to the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing. Has the minister had dealings with former Labor senator and SAJC lobbyist Nick Bolkus in relation to the sale of Cheltenham racecourse and what was the substance and purpose of those discussions?

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mrs REDMOND: Mr Bolkus was appointed by the government as the presiding member of the Stormwater Management Authority and was concurrently a lobbyist for the SAJC. Mr Bolkus also heads the Australian Labor Party's fundraising arm, Progressive Business SA.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Elder—Minister for Transport, Minister for Infrastructure, Minister for Energy) (14:33): Stay there, mate. This is a bloke who is confused about the mysteries of the preferential system. He is also very concerned about where the steps disappear to at the top of the escalator. He has never worked out that one either. I am not going to take advice from the man who misplaced Frome.

The reason why I am answering this is because I was told earlier today that the opposition would ask a question about Nick Bolkus and the SAJC and tie it in with the stormwater authority, which makes it a lot easier to prepare an answer in advance. I do thank that kind person (who shall not be named) who told me this: it was very generous of them.

The Hon. K.O. Foley: Go on, tell us.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: No, no. The allegation, I am told, is going to be that Bolkus was improperly appointed by the SAJC and was also acting on the stormwater authority—something to do with Cheltenham—at the time. I am advised that the senator was appointed in writing by the SAJC and advised that that had been passed through what I think it calls its finance subcommittee, agreeing his rates and all of that.

As to the matter of the stormwater at Cheltenham, he did sit on the stormwater authority, at the recommendation, I have to say, of local government. They send in their nominations and who they think should chair it, and he was their recommendation. On only one occasion (I am advised by the secretary of that committee) was Cheltenham ever raised during other business in February—that was in February 2008—from which he absented himself. He subsequently resigned from the board, I think, on 20 February. He never had any dealings whatever with Cheltenham on that authority, but it was very helpful of you people to let me know the question was coming so I could check it in advance.

As always, they are so helpful to each other, because what is happening now with the Liberal Party is the friends of Nick versus the friends of Dorothy, and the fight has opened up again—and I am sure that, if they were from Sydney, they would know precisely what I am talking about.

An honourable member: Name them.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I don't think you'd want that to happen. The truth is this: we knew in advance that they were coming in with smear and innuendo because they cannot stand Labor people and they do not like Nick Bolkus, but I can say there are other people who had faith in Nick Bolkus—

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Who?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Ian Smith—do you remember Ian Smith (I think he was an adviser to Jeff Kennett)—and some other fellow called Alexander Downer, both of whom are in business with him, but I am sure we will not hear any reflections upon those people, only upon Bolkus.

Ms CHAPMAN: Mr Speaker, I rise on a point of order. This is completely irrelevant to the question, of which, he claimed to the house, he had had notice and had the answer, and he still has not answered the question.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is no point of order.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: We were advised of the smear against Nick. I will tell you this: he is appointed by the SAJC and we met the SAJC to discuss the sale of Cheltenham. I do not control who they appoint, nor would I seek to, but I will tell you this. That process of discussion on the sale of Cheltenham involves the SAJC's being regularly disappointed in the position of government because we imposed an open space requirement of 30 per cent, which, of course, was criticised by those on the other side—we were too hard on the SAJC.

In fact, at an earlier time, they wanted to allow them to sell the whole of Cheltenham for industrial purposes. Do you remember that—industrial purposes. The SAJC got a much harder deal out of us than it would ever have got out of the opposition and, of course, the other smear was going to be that, somehow, he had a conflict of interest, which can be demonstrated by the records of that body to which his appointment was recommended by local government.

Isobel does not often get a question from them because she is a bit smarter than the leader, so they do not like her doing that, but you notice that, when he is a bit worried about it, down it goes to Isobel, she gets her question. We know who is behind it: it is the Leader of the Opposition. If he really wants to take on Nick Bolkus's character, let us do it outside the house and let it be tested at law on the proper burden of proof, where he can call witnesses and where he can also demand the production of documents.

I am sure I can speak for the former senator. I have not raised it with him, but I am sure he would love to have the smears tested in a proper court with proper standards of proof. I am sure he would love that. However, I am sure of this: we will not hear any opposition member utter a murmur about this outside of this house.

CHELTHENHAM PARK

Mrs REDMOND (Heysen) (14:38): I have a supplementary question. Will the minister explain on whose behalf Mr Bolkus was making representations when he made representations about the SAJC to the minister? Was it the stormwater authority or some other party?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Elder—Minister for Transport, Minister for Infrastructure, Minister for Energy) (14:38): What this person has failed to understand I do not understand. He has never made representations on the part of the stormwater authority. The only small item ever

on the stormwater authority board, he absented himself and resigned shortly afterwards. He was employed by the SAJC and, lo and behold, he came on behalf of the SAJC with the SAJC and spoke about the SAJC's interest. That is what I would expect someone to do if I was paying them as well.

Can I say that this is not an unusual outcome for people involved in that sort of industry. In fact, a demonstration of the quality of his work was how Mr Smith and Mr Downer sought him out as such a worthy partner. Forget your smears and your innuendo. If you have something you want to say, have the courage, go outside. This is why they want an ICAC. They want an ICAC so they have another vehicle for a smear, because that is all they do. They do not want to talk about polls; they do not want to talk about Frome; they do not want to talk about the fact that South Australia is going better than it has ever gone and the Liberals are going worse. They do not want to talk about that, but when the going gets tough, they get smeary—and that is all there is to it.

SUPER SCHOOLS

Mr PICCOLO (Light) (14:40): Can the Treasurer advise the house of recent progress in the public-private partnership process for the six new super schools?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Port Adelaide—Deputy Premier, Treasurer, Minister for Industry and Trade, Minister for Federal/State Relations) (14:40): I thank the member for his very important question. From the outset, can I say that I have my father with me today. It is his 84th birthday and he believes, quite rightly, that he has raised a well-mannered, well-behaved, intelligent son, and I would appreciate if you would treat me with the respect I deserve and show nothing that would make my father think he has probably raised someone less well-behaved than he may like. Sorry, Dad. Don't interject; just make me feel important today, please. Dad will like it.

Ms Chapman: It's an easy question on your side. All you've got to do is answer it.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: It's my dad's birthday. Come on, Vic. Come on, don't be harsh.

Ms Chapman: Happy birthday.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Yes, he's over there. Happy birthday from the deputy leader, Dad. In the 2006-07 state budget, the government announced it was building six new super schools to be procured under the public-private partnership model. These schools are to be located at Taperoo—within my electorate, in case anybody wants to make anything of that—Blair Athol, Gepps Cross, Woodville Gardens, Smithfield Plains and Munno Para West.

To manage the procurement, a unit within the Department of Treasury and Finance, called Partnerships SA, was established. An executive steering committee within government, with membership of the chief executive officers of Treasury and Finance, department of education and Department for Transport, Energy and Infrastructure, was formed to oversee the process.

The expressions of interest were released to the market in December 2007. Market sounding events and consultation forums were held over the following months; responses were received and bidders shortlisted in April 2008. A request for proposal was released in May 2008. Final bids were received on 13 February 2009.

Since the government received these bids, the executive steering committee has worked through each of these proposals. Significant time and effort has been spent with each of the bidding consortia to determine which of the bids best suited the requirements of the project.

The government has now considered these bids and, on advice from the executive steering committee, the cabinet has endorsed the recommendation that the selected preferred bidder to continue negotiations with the government is Pinnacle Education Consortium. The consortium includes Commonwealth Bank Investments Ltd, Hansen Yuncken Pty Ltd and HJB Investments Pty Ltd, and I think the Allied Irish Bank but I will need to confirm that. Pinnacle Education will partner with Spotless Pty Ltd for the delivery of facilities management services—the FM contract.

It should be noted that Babcock & Brown Investments were originally the major equity financier of this consortium but, as members may be aware, Babcock & Brown no longer exists.

An honourable member: They haven't had a good year.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: They haven't had a good year. I am advised that this role of financing has been assumed by Commonwealth Bank Investments Ltd, along with Hansen Yuncken and HJB Investments Pty Ltd. The other two shortlisted bidders were deemed not to meet the project requirements as closely as Pinnacle Education. The government will now work through

various technical and financial issues with the consortium so that the government can determine that the project meets the public sector comparator test and delivers, importantly, value for money to the public.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Sorry?

Ms Chapman: For three years.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Public-private partnerships are a longer process than direct builds for obvious reasons. If these negotiations are successful, the government expects to reach contractual close in June this year. This will enable construction of the schools to commence around the middle of the year, and today's announcement by the government shows that there is still a market—and I will say a bit more on that at the conclusion of this piece on the schools—for projects such as the government's new schools PPP and, at this end of the market, we will continue to attract significant interest and commitment from the private sector. However, I have to say that there are clearly issues with credit market volatility, and with available capital becoming more scarce for larger projects there have been concerns that infrastructure funded by private sector debt may not be viable.

My main concern, ultimately, as we have said from the outset, is that the test is best value for money for taxpayers. We are currently working through these issues and examining a range of options, as are all states around Australia, to see what will deliver best value for money for the state into the future. The government looks forward to concluding negotiations with Pinnacle Education.

A report in the paper today by a lobby group, Infrastructure Partnerships Australia—I am not overly aware of the entity other than they are a lobby organisation—suggests that the new Royal Adelaide Hospital may be in some doubt. That is not correct. That report is wrong. I am not aware of them contacting us for confirmation or advice. They may have, but I am not personally aware of it, from what I can recall.

We are in an incredibly capital restrained market. It is very difficult for the private market to raise capital. It is very expensive for the private market to raise capital, and I think the behaviour of, in main part, our domestic banks, as it relates to business financing, is less than satisfactory. However, in the particular issue of public-private partnerships, the ability of the private sector is acknowledged in relation to delivering a tranche of \$1.7 billion of private financing for projects, such as the hospital, and the same would occur for the \$1.4 billion proposal from the Liberal Party.

We are now examining, with some advice from the Royal Bank of Canada, the best way to go forward with this. We are looking at a complete PPP and seeing whether or not the market can deliver \$1.7 billion of private debt, bearing in mind that we want competitive tension; so that would have to be three individual organisations or consortia having to get their own \$1.7 billion. It is highly unlikely that you will get that amount of available capital in the market. So, what we are looking at is whether our financing authority plays a role in the capital provision, or, probably more likely, that we as a government may consider what contribution a government makes to lessen the capital requirement needed to be raised from the market.

However, there is no problem in the state government raising capital. There is little difficulty in private consortia raising capital, probably up to the half a billion plus mark, 700 million. It is obviously getting more difficult for the private sector to go much beyond that at present.

We are just seeing now, and I was very heartened overnight, that work by the Obama administration has been incredibly well received by—not that they are necessarily the greatest judges in the world—Wall Street, but the Dow jumped 6 per cent. So, there appears to be a strong view in the United States' financial markets that President Obama's decision to take the toxic assets out of the banking structures in America and put them into some form of nationalised or private-public partnership model has been well received.

If we can get some stability into the market and if we can start getting the banks behaving like banks it may well be a different story. It is an incredible time of disruption in the financial markets. Let's see what occurs. Importantly, there are two points I want to conclude on: the hospital will be delivered. Raising the capital of the government is not an issue. Secondly, we have got a way of PPP today that involves a significant, albeit much smaller, amount of private capital, and in this case we believe the PPP will provide value for money. To members opposite, thank you for showing respect to me in my answer, and, for that, I am appreciative.

CHELTENHAM PARK

Mrs REDMOND (Heysen) (14:49): My question is to the Minister for Infrastructure. Did the minister raise concerns with Mr Nick Bolkus about a potential conflict of interest relating to his role as presiding member of the government's Stormwater Management Authority? In light of the minister's previous answer about why he thinks it was not a conflict of interest, I think there potentially may have been a conflict of interest. Mr Bolkus was the presiding member of the Stormwater Management Authority from its inception in July 2007 until late February 2008, as the minister said in his previous answer.

His disclosure of interest statement, dated 11 September 2007, required under the legislation to be furnished to the Minister for Infrastructure, lists an indirect interest in a Buckland Park development but makes no mention of any role as a lobbyist for the SAJC in respect of developments at Cheltenham.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Elder—Minister for Transport, Minister for Infrastructure, Minister for Energy) (14:50): With great respect to the member who does not understand it, no-one at the SAJC was lobbying for wetlands. No-one was lobbying for stormwater. We imposed on them an obligation of 30 per cent open space and, subsequently, we imposed an obligation of 40 per cent. That came not from the stormwater authority or the SAJC; it came from us.

So, what on earth does this feeble-minded person think the conflict was? What was the conflict? Please tell me: what was the conflict? It is not a conflict, it is just a smear. Nick Bolkus and the SAJC never had any ambition for stormwater. Zero! So, please assist me here. What in that feeble-minded strategic unit of the opposition is the conflict? For God's sake! With the greatest respect, Mr Speaker, this is an opposition whose one great contribution to policy debate this week was to go out and say, 'We've got three options for building a hospital on site. Someone please tell us what to do.' Can you tell us what your preferred option is? That is leadership?

You know you have a bad bureaucrat when they come to you and, instead of a recommendation, they have three options, and they ask you to pick one. Isn't that true? Who has been a minister? I know you worked as one for about a second and a half. What you want from someone is a recommendation, and what people want from the alternative government is a willingness to lead and someone who will tell them what they think they will do after the election.

Ms CHAPMAN: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, the minister should answer the question or sit down.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is no point of order.

GLENTHORNE FARM

Mr BIGNELL (Mawson) (14:53): Can the Premier please tell the house what the state government is doing to preserve open space in Adelaide's south?

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) (14:53): I am disappointed that not every member is here today. The state government has declined a request from the University of Adelaide to set aside a section of Glenthorne Farm for housing. The university had requested that some of the farm near O'Halloran Hill in Adelaide's south be redeveloped to fund its woodland recovery initiative.

I understand that previously there had been plans for a sort of working vineyard and then a climate change institute. We have declined this latest request and have instead offered to work with the university to find alternative sources of funding for its aim to reforest the property to create native woodland.

Glenthorne Farm holds a special place with the community in the southern suburbs, as well as the wine making industry at McLaren Vale. In 2001, Glenthorne Farm, the former CSIRO research facility at O'Halloran Hill, was handed over to Adelaide University by the state government for use as a vineyard and winemaking facility. The former state government (and I want to pay tribute to former premiers of the time), under, I think, former premier Olsen, purchased it from the commonwealth in 1998, after the CSIRO's decision to leave the site.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I understand they had monkeys there. The proposal put to the state government by the university failed to meet the terms of the deed and land management

agreement signed at the time of the transfer in 2001. Our view remains that the land was transferred to the university on the basis that there would be no housing on the site and that it would become a teaching and research centre for the wine industry.

The university proposes to reforest 150,000 hectares of woodlands in the Adelaide hills face, a concept which obviously would have considerable merit. We have written to the university's vice chancellor offering to work with his staff to identify alternative funding through research grants that can finance the woodland recovery initiative without requiring any of the land to be sold off for housing.

We strongly support the retention of open space within the metropolitan area. We remain committed to ensuring that the pressure to develop land within the urban growth boundary is balanced by the retention of sufficient public open space for community use.

I am delighted with this government's decision. That may surprise some, but I know that there has been considerable pressure and there is some support from some quarters to see portions of Glenthorne Farm's open space developed for public housing.

I do not support that and neither does this government. This is a stunning resource for the future. We as a state government are planting three million trees in a series of urban forests throughout the metropolitan area. I think that we have planted well over 1½ million trees, and we are on our way towards two million trees.

I think this would be a splendid site for one of our urban forests. I do not want to see this land carved up for housing, and I am sure that I will have the support of all members of parliament in saying this.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN JOCKEY CLUB

Mrs REDMOND (Heysen) (14:56): My question is for the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing. During or subsequent to the 2006-07 review of racing by Philip Bentley, did the minister receive information from Mr Bentley regarding claims made to Mr Bentley that there were corporate governance issues at the SAJC?

On 11 March this year, Mr Bentley stated publicly that during the course of his 2007 review of racing several people had made allegations to him regarding corporate governance issues at the SAJC. He stated:

All I will say is that they made allegations which could not be tested and could not be verified, and I stand by that, and it was right then and it is right now.

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT (Lee—Minister for Police, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:56): What the opposition fails to realise—although I am sure that the member for Davenport realises it—is that the racing industry has been corporatised. As a result of it being corporatised, we do not have day-to-day responsibility for the racing industry.

All this nonsense about what was known, when it was known and all that type of thing is irrelevant. Is the opposition suggesting that people were told by whomever about vote stacking, when all that would do would be to increase the chances of the people who were doing it to be caught out? Of course it is a nonsense.

What the opposition needs to appreciate is that the racing industry has been corporatised. As a result of that, Thoroughbred Racing SA has responsibility for the viability, for the future and for the strategic direction of the racing industry.

As the Premier has already outlined, the two major shareholders, SAJC and SARC, are responsible for putting in place the TRSA board. Once that board has been put in place the board elects the chair. Obviously, as minister, I meet from time to time with the SAJC, TRSA or with individuals when I go to the races, just as I would expect that the opposition does as well.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN JOCKEY CLUB

Mrs REDMOND (Heysen) (14:58): My question is again to the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing. Was the minister briefed on matters raised in a draft of TRSA's Lipman Karas review that were later removed in the production of the final report?

The minister informed the house on 4 March that he had not yet received a copy of the Lipman Karas report but had received a briefing by Mr Bentley and Mr Bolton, the chair and deputy

chair respectively of TRSA. At this time he told the parliament 'they might have talked a little about content'. Mr Bentley has since acknowledged publicly that an earlier draft of the report contained references to Cheltenham that were later expunged.

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT (Lee—Minister for Police, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:59): The member is correct. I remember what I said at the time, without having it in front of me, that the briefing was primarily about process, and it may have been that they might have touched on something with regard to content. I said that quite deliberately because I did not want to be accused of misleading the house. Since that question in the house that the member refers to, I have checked and the Director of Racing informs me that content was not covered in that meeting.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN JOCKEY CLUB

Mrs REDMOND (Heysen) (14:59): I have a supplementary question. Is the minister confirming that there were no discussions about the removal of references to the sale of Cheltenham that were in the draft report?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: With the greatest of respect, the member has left her previous occupation. Supplementary questions are not a means to rephrase a question in the manner of cross-examination.

The SPEAKER: Whether it was a supplementary question or not, the opposition have already had two supplementary questions. So, for the purposes of the number of questions that they have, this question counts as a question in its own right, in any case. I would need to have a close look at the supplementary and the original question to work out whether it was just a rephrasing of the original question. I will give the minister an opportunity to respond.

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT (Lee—Minister for Police, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (15:00): I can respond, and I am happy to do so; I will do so briefly. As I said in my previous answer, I was informed by the Director of Racing, Mr Denis Harvey, that content was not covered in that particular meeting where the chair and the deputy chair came and briefed me about the process.

The other aspect that I think the member was asking about is with regard to a draft report. To the best of my memory, I do not remember a draft report being raised with me and, as a consequence, I would not know what was in it or what was not in it. The first time I received the report I referred to in my ministerial statement today was the first opportunity that I had to read and digest the information in the Lipman Karas report.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

MOTORCYCLE GANGS

The Hon. L. STEVENS (Little Para) (15:01): My question is to the Minister for Police: is he aware of any fractures in the recent announcement that South Australian criminal bikie gangs have united to protest against the government's serious and organised crime legislation?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT (Lee—Minister for Police, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (15:01): It was just two weeks ago that we were being told that criminal bikie gangs had joined forces in an unprecedented display of solidarity against the government's serious and organised crime legislation. We were told that the Freedom of Association Protest Poker Run on 14 March was going to unite opposing club members in their fight against our anti-gang legislation.

The so-called Freedom Run had nothing to do with freedom or democracy. It had everything to do with criminal bikie gangs and those misguided few who support them in trying to preserve their crime-condoning lifestyle. The aim of the run was to try to convince the public that criminal bikie gangs are merely motorcycle enthusiasts being unfairly targeted by this government. For these criminal bikie gangs, freedom means freedom to manufacture and sell drugs to our kids, freedom to be involved in violence, freedom to use illegal firearms and freedom to extort.

Police Superintendent Des Bray accurately summed up the poker run when he declared, 'Nowhere else in the history of the state would you ever have so many criminals gathered together for any event.' It took just 72 hours for the so-called unity to end when an ex-president of the Gypsy

Jokers and an ex-member of the Hells Angels (who is currently a member of the recently formed street gang New Boys), were involved in a shoot-out at Blair Athol.

The Premier said before the run, 'This is nothing more than a public relations stunt and it wouldn't be long before the bikies reverted to their old ways.' The Premier was correct. With the brazen shooting just 72 hours later the honeymoon was over. Then, last Sunday, we saw what can only be described as an appalling incident when a violent brawl broke out between the Hells Angels City Crew and the Comancheros, in front of many innocent bystanders at Sydney Airport, resulting in a Hells Angels associate being bashed to death.

I am told that the Hells Angels City Crew was established in New South Wales by a member of the South Australian based Hells Angels outlaw motorcycle gang and some of his Adelaide associates about three years ago.

While some lawyers, who are paid highly by bikie gangs, want us to believe that motorcycle club members are misunderstood fathers, grandfathers, unionists and churchgoers who happen to like riding Harley-Davidsons, the reality is quite different. We know that most, if not all, are dangerous and serious criminals involved in organising, planning, facilitating, supporting and engaging in serious criminal activity. They have little regard for public safety. Shootings, bombings and violent brawls in public places have become the public persona of these gangs.

I welcome the interest from New South Wales in our groundbreaking, anti-criminal bikie gang laws. The Premier yesterday briefed the New South Wales Premier (Nathan Rees) on the finer details of those laws.

I also welcome Prime Minister Kevin Rudd's declaration from Washington earlier today that there be a zero tolerance approach towards bikies. The Prime Minister also announced that the country's top law officers, the Standing Committee of Attorneys-General, will meet to launch a national crackdown. Clearly, what we saw at Sydney's airport was an outrage, and we must all work together to stamp out this gang violence.

The Rann government has faced some criticism in recent times for our tough approach towards criminal bikie gangs. However, we will not now or ever apologise for giving the police the powers and resources they need to combat organised crime. We will continue to do whatever is necessary to keep the South Australian public as safe as possible.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN JOCKEY CLUB

Mrs REDMOND (Heysen) (15:05): Thank you, Mr Speaker. Anyone would think it was my birthday! My question is to the Attorney-General.

The Hon. K.O. Foley interjecting:

Mrs REDMOND: Your turn will come, Kevin. When did the Attorney-General first become aware of allegations relating to corporate governance issues at the SAJC? Who informed him, and what action did he take regarding the allegations?

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON (Croydon—Attorney-General, Minister for Justice, Minister for Multicultural Affairs, Minister for Veterans' Affairs) (15:06): I cannot recall. I probably read it in the paper.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN JOCKEY CLUB

Mrs REDMOND (Heysen) (15:06): My question is to the Treasurer. When did he first become aware of allegations relating to corporate governance at the SAJC? Who informed him, and what action did he take regarding the allegations?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Port Adelaide—Deputy Premier, Treasurer, Minister for Industry and Trade, Minister for Federal/State Relations) (15:06): I think I can say that the first time I read about it was in *The Advertiser* or the *Sunday Mail*, when there was a leaked copy of the report. I find this very interesting, this conflict of interest issue that has been raised here today. Are members opposite suggesting that Alexander Downer, who is the deputy chair of—

The Hon. M.D. Rann: Carnegie Mellon.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: —Carnegie Mellon. Is that a paid position?

The Hon. M.D. Rann: An advisory board.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: An advisory board. It doesn't matter; it is still a government board.

Mrs REDMOND: On a point of order, my question, which was quite straightforward, was answered very promptly by the Deputy Premier. I do not understand the relevance of any further comment.

The SPEAKER: Well, we will see.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: The wife of Mr Alexander Downer is on a number of government boards. Alexander is deputy chair of the state orchestra—a fine orchestra and the best I have ever seen.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: The best you have ever heard.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: The best I have ever heard and seen, but I have heard others. Are they suggesting that, because Alexander has those issues, he should not lobby government in his new business of Bespoke? Are you suggesting that? Are you suggesting that Dean Brown, who I think has probably received the most amount of money from this government for work undertaken by a former politician, should no longer lobby us on behalf of other people? Do you suggest that, with John Olsen returning to South Australia, I should not offer him a consultancy to advise the government on how to deal with the United States?

Are you suggesting that Graham Ingerson, who wants to bring people to see me from time to time, has a conflict of interest? Are you suggesting that I should say to Wayne Matthew, who has his own government relations consulting business and who is a member of Progressive Labour, 'No; you can no longer lobby me. You have a conflict of interest because you are a member of Progressive Labour'?

The most hypocritical response and interjection is from the deputy leader, who put together the most complicated, sneaky, tricky Catch Tim arrangement to hide donations from the public during the 1990s. I was in Hong Kong with my then wife (and it may well have been the beginning of the end) when we spent two days lining up to try to get company searches on Catch Tim, and they all went back to one Vickie Chapman.

For goodness sake, we have employed the best people to do the best job, whether they be Labor or Liberal. I have to say that probably a fair number of my colleagues on this side of the bench wonder why we have spent so much money on former Liberals to advise this government as former Labor members. I put my hand on my heart, and I reckon that, without even checking—

Mrs Redmond: It's on the other side.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: My heart moves around!

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: It moves around; it's trying to stay warm!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: This is the budget period, and I often take my heart out and leave it in the top drawer whilst I am putting the budget together. I have got the ticker—and if I have not I take the heart out. I would be confident in saying that former Liberal members of parliament have received greater remuneration from this government than former Labor members of parliament. So, if you really want—

Mrs Redmond interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Sorry?

Mrs Redmond: Of course; they're very talented!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: So, it is okay for Liberals to receive money from the Labor government, but not a Labor Party person. There can be no conflict of interest. I can say this with absolute confidence, because I have been involved in many meetings with former senator Nick Bolkus that have related to matters of commerce. He is highly regarded and highly respected and has added very real value to those people wanting to invest in this state. I can say through experience that major developments in this state have advanced and occurred because of Nick Bolkus's ability to bring commerce together with government.

Mr Pisoni interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: What would you know about business?

Mr Pisoni interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Yeah, rightio.

Mr Pisoni interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, the member for Unley!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Not only is former Labor senator and minister Nick Bolkus held in high regard by many commercial people, he is also held in the highest regard by no-one other than Alexander Downer and a great Tory conservative, Ian Smith, to form a relationship in that company. Is the member now suggesting Bespoke should be barred from negotiating with or lobbying this government? Is the member saying that?

Mrs Redmond interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Oh, right. So Bespoke, because Alexander and Ian Smith are involved, can lobby this government, but Nick Bolkus cannot. You are a hypocrite—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Treasurer will withdraw. For the information of the member for Schubert, he was named for refusing to comply with a direction of the chair.

Mr Venning: I haven't forgotten.

The SPEAKER: And I haven't forgotten either.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I withdraw, sir, and apologise to the member for using that. But I think that those here and the media understand the point I am making. I think I have made it rather—

Mrs Redmond interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Sorry, what did I call you?

Mrs Redmond interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: The member for Heysen. You very rarely ask me a question, whatever your electorate. I think I have made the point as best I can.

ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL

Ms SIMMONS (Morialta) (15:12): My question is to the Minister for Health. What is the government's reaction to the three recent proposals to redevelop the Royal Adelaide Hospital, which appear to neglect the need for major cancer services?

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Kaurana—Minister for Health, Minister for the Southern Suburbs, Minister Assisting the Premier in the Arts) (15:13): I thank the member for Morialta for her question, and I acknowledge her very strong interest in the health system. Linear accelerators are essential cancer radiotherapy machines that deliver doses of high energy radiotherapy to the tumour in a cancer patient's body to fight cancer cells. Linear accelerators, by their very nature, are not only important but are also dangerous equipment. These machines should be housed in purpose-built concrete bunkers that are several metres thick to protect people from radiation. They cannot be easily or cheaply placed in buildings that house patient accommodation.

Currently, at the Royal Adelaide Hospital, the East Wing contains a fortified building especially developed to house the accelerators and their bunkers (I think, from memory, there are five accelerators there). There will be a similar purpose-built building in the new RAH on the railway site, and we intend to expand the number of accelerators. The bunker is currently collocated with the RAH's cancer services.

Under all three of the Liberal options, the East and Hone wings are demolished, with no explanation of where the linear accelerators and their fortified bunker would go. The Liberals have either left these machines out or want to combine them with patient beds, creating a huge and difficult risk for patients.

Ms Chapman: Like at Flinders.

The Hon. J.D. HILL: The deputy leader intervenes, and she should have checked her facts before she did so. She said, 'Like at Flinders Medical Centre.' The facts are that Flinders Medical Centre receives its therapy support from the Flinders Private Hospital (an arrangement that I think was established by her side of government, but I would have to check), and the linear accelerator in the Flinders Private Hospital is in a separate building. It has some mechanical

engineering services, I am told, above it and is separate from patient care. Just be careful about what you claim because you should check the facts before you do.

The only other option, of course, if the Liberals have left this machinery out of their new development proposals, would be to take them off site by privatising them, and I suspect that is what is at the heart of what they are planning, because we know from their history in government that they privatise everything they can. They outsourced the management of the Modbury Hospital—we brought it back. They wanted to privatise the Queen Elizabeth Hospital as well.

We have checked across the country and very few hospitals locate these machines near patient beds because of the huge logistical problems and the huge cost involved in ensuring patients are properly protected, because, once you build these bunkers, it is very difficult to move the machines in and out, and they do have to be upgraded on a periodic basis. If the machines are to remain on site under the Liberals, it would appear that they would have to be collocated with patient beds. This is the only option from looking at the master plans that the Liberals have put out. Of course, this would create serious radiation risk to patients and staff in the hospital.

Mrs Redmond interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. HILL: I am not making this up.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.D. HILL: This is a huge blunder, exposed only one day after they released their options for the Royal Adelaide Hospital site. What this says is that the Liberals have failed to properly plan their options. They have come up with half-baked proposals that lack detail. Professor Dorothy Keefe, who is the Clinical Director of the Royal Adelaide Hospital Cancer Centre, was not consulted on the Liberals' plans. The head of cancer services at the RAH was not consulted by the Liberals about what should happen to cancer services at that hospital. She confirmed this morning in a media conference that it is far superior to locate linear accelerators separate to patient beds for both patient and staff safety. Professor Keefe also said that one of the best things about the new hospital is that it will enable us to plan cancer services in a way that lets the needs of patients dictate the layout.

In the new hospital we can design from the ground up and determine how much space services need, rather than the random way things have grown over decades without proper planning. The new hospital would give us the chance to completely redesign the hospital to make it not only a better place to work but also a much better place for all the patients. We will have sensible relationships between departments and the ability to bring in modern models of care, IT systems and electronic case records.

The government will go to the next election promising to build a brand new, state-of-the-art hospital that will cost less and be finished quicker than anything the Liberals would be able to do on the current site. What the opposition will be doing is going to the election with three options, none of which they will commit to, all of which they say they will consult with the public about after the election. They are saying to the electors of South Australia: 'Trust us. We will tell you what we are going to do after you have put us into office.' What a joke. This is a knife in the heart of the Liberal strategy for election in 2010. They cannot be trusted on health. We know that from their past experiences in government and they are going to the people saying, 'We might build one of these options. We will consult with you and then tell you.' We know what that is. That is code for doing nothing.

ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:19): My question is to the Minister for Health. Will the radioactive material currently stored in the basement of the Royal Adelaide Hospital be transferred with the staff and patients to the new rail yard hospital, if it is ever built?

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Kaurna—Minister for Health, Minister for the Southern Suburbs, Minister Assisting the Premier in the Arts) (15:19): It is good to see that the opposition still clings to the belief that we should have the national radioactive waste dump in South Australia. That was their platform; that was their strategy; that is what they want to do. What we want to do is to look after our own waste and to look after it safely.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN JOCKEY CLUB

Mrs REDMOND (Heysen) (15:20): What discussions, if any, has the Treasurer had with the former chief executive of SAJC, Steve Ploubidis, regarding Mr Ploubidis's possible role as manager of a permanent major events facility at Victoria Park?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Port Adelaide—Deputy Premier, Treasurer, Minister for Industry and Trade, Minister for Federal/State Relations) (15:20): The manager of a permanent major facility? Firstly, there isn't one there, and I cannot recall any discussion as such with Mr Ploubidis on that matter at all.

An honourable member: Why would you?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Why would I? If it was a permanent structure, the Motor Sport Board would run it. Do you really think Steve Ploubidis would want a job—is this prior to his dismissal or since?

Mrs Redmond: I am just asking whether there were any discussions.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I don't think so. My guess is that, if he was the CEO of SAJC, would he really want to manage a building? That does not seem like a big career move to me. I do not know where that has come from and I have no knowledge of that answer, but I will try to rack my brain and think what it could possibly have been referring to.

STREET SMART FORUM

The Hon. S.W. KEY (Ashford) (15:21): Can the Minister for Road Safety inform the house with regard to the Street Smart youth and road trauma forum that is being held today?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Road Safety, Minister for Gambling, Minister for Youth, Minister for Volunteers, Minister Assisting the Minister for Multicultural Affairs) (15:21): I thank the member for Ashford for her question. I know she has taken a keen interest in road safety, especially how it impacts on young people.

The Hon. K.O. Foley: And you, too.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Yes; me, too, Treasurer. I sat silently during your answer. I spent much of this morning attending a youth and road trauma forum hosted by the RAA called Street Smart 09, which was held at the Entertainment Centre. More than 3,500 students attended today. They were confronted with a crash scene scenario and heard at first-hand the devastating effect of road trauma on people's lives. I had the honour of meeting and introducing to the forum two of the guest speakers, Luke Rosenzweig and Eli Murn.

Both Luke and Eli have an acquired brain injury, and they were representatives of the Brain Injury Network Reconnect Program. They shared their stories in the hope that they might prevent another young person from the tragic consequences of road trauma. When they were speaking, you could hear a pin drop. Amongst 3,500 16 year olds, that is pretty rare.

The peer-to-peer support program involves trained volunteer mentors who have an acquired brain injury working and supporting program participants at the beginning of their recovery journey. The program, which is funded by the Motor Accident Commission, bridges the gap between formal rehabilitation and resuming home and community living. It gives those with a brain injury the best opportunity to readjust by enhancing recovery through improved confidence and independence.

As minister responsible for youth and road safety, I commend these young people and I admire their commitment to share their experiences and develop strategies to address the challenges they face when resuming and adapting to life after brain injury.

Today's event also involved a mock crash demonstration and a 25 minute education session on stopping distances and speeding, which was narrated by a representative from the Centre for Automotive Safety Research. There was also a wheelchair basketball game—students of the north versus students of the south—but I had to leave before that concluded, so I do not know who won. A young woman who has spinal injuries as a result of a vehicle trauma also shared her story.

Importantly, peer pressure and its associated risks were also analysed. Students were constantly reminded of the dangers of making the wrong decision. A looped DVD of television commercials was shown on the big screen and included the Motor Accident Commission and the state government's Everybody Hates Drink Drivers and Creepers campaigns.

Upon leaving, the students received drink-driving key rings, Creeper stickers and posters related to drink driving and drug driving—not celebrating it but condemning it. I am sure all members are aware that last year South Australia achieved a record low road toll of 99 fatalities, which is still too high.

Mrs Redmond: It's really bad this year.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: It is bad this year, but we think it will be better than last year. The state government always aims for zero, but if the State Strategic Plan can get it down to 90 we will be very pleased. I formally thank and acknowledge the Motor Accident Commission and the RAA for their dedication to improving the lives of South Australians through programs and events such as Street Smart and the Brain Injury Network Reconnect Program.

PARLIAMENTARY COMMITTEES

The SPEAKER (15:25): I advise the house that I have received the resignations of: the Minister for Correctional Services, the Hon. A. Koutsantonis, from the Parliamentary Committee on Occupational Safety, Rehabilitation and Compensation and the Publishing Committee; the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education, the Hon. M. O'Brien, from the Standing Orders Committee; the member for Bright from the Legislative Review Committee; and the member for Taylor from the Public Works Committee. I also advise that, pursuant to section 5(3) of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991, the Minister for Correctional Services is no longer eligible for appointment to the Economic and Finance Committee.

ECONOMIC AND FINANCE COMMITTEE

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Elder—Minister for Transport, Minister for Infrastructure, Minister for Energy) (15:26): I move:

That pursuant to section 5(3) of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991 the member for Taylor be appointed to the committee.

Motion carried.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Elder—Minister for Transport, Minister for Infrastructure, Minister for Energy) (15:26): I move:

That pursuant to section 21(3) of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991 the member for Morialta be appointed to the committee.

Motion carried.

LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Elder—Minister for Transport, Minister for Infrastructure, Minister for Energy) (15:26): I move:

That pursuant to section 21(3) of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991 the member for Newland be appointed to the committee.

Motion carried.

PARLIAMENTARY COMMITTEE ON OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY, REHABILITATION AND COMPENSATION

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Elder—Minister for Transport, Minister for Infrastructure, Minister for Energy) (15:26): I move:

That pursuant to section 21(3) of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991 the member for Little Para be appointed to the committee.

Motion carried.

STANDING ORDERS COMMITTEE

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Elder—Minister for Transport, Minister for Infrastructure, Minister for Energy) (15:27): I move:

That pursuant to standing order 349 the member for Morialta be appointed to the committee.

Motion carried.

PUBLISHING COMMITTEE

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Elder—Minister for Transport, Minister for Infrastructure, Minister for Energy) (15:27): I move:

That pursuant to standing order 349 the member for Giles be appointed to the committee.

Motion carried.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

RURAL COMMUNITY

The Hon. G.M. GUNN (Stuart) (15:27): The rural community is suffering in a number of ways. Commercial organisations which deal with them should be a little more sensitive and understanding and not put on them extra stress, or act unreasonably, unwisely or unfairly.

One fertiliser company, namely Incitec Pivot, has acted, in my view, in an unconscionable and unreasonable manner. I do not like naming them, but fertiliser companies have not endeared themselves to the rural community across Australia. My understanding is that they are currently being investigated by a Senate standing committee, along with other organisations, because there is a view that they have predatory pricing mechanisms in place. The charge levelled upon rural industry was, in the view of many people, excessive.

In relation to the case of a farmer at Cowell, I am raising this issue today because I want it to be a warning to other organisations which may have similar ideas. They have every right to expect to be reasonably paid for services they provide, but they also have a responsibility to give people adequate time and take into account the services they provide.

My understanding is that the farmer from Cowell owed approximately \$85,000 for fertiliser. He had negotiations and faced difficulties due to the poor seasonal conditions. He did offer to make a payment of approximately \$80,000, which was declined. The fertiliser company, Incitec Pivot, took action and put him into bankruptcy. They were unsecured creditors which meant, of course, that, the moment that was done, the bank involved had to step in because it was the secured creditor.

Thanks to this particular action, the gentleman suffered a heart attack because of the stress they had put on him, and they ought to be very proud about that. These people can really hold their head high. In addition to that, the person had an opportunity, I understand, for very good employment overseas but, because he was declared bankrupt, his passport was withdrawn. This was an unnecessary course of action by this company.

I would not have raised this in the house today, but I want to call on the Minister for Consumer Affairs and the Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries to have a thorough investigation put in place, and I am happy to pass on the name of the person involved. Many of these people are in a very difficult situation and, at the end of the day, many of them stand to lose everything after two or three generations of farming. In some cases, their parents could have their own homes, which may be in the local township, called into question because of guarantees that were given.

If this is the sort of society we are going to build, let us all understand clearly, and I say to this company: one unreasonable act always generates another. This company has got a mention in this house today because I am very unhappy about the way this particular person has been handled—and I am not the only one who holds that view. I know that throughout the community there are other organisations that are owed a lot of money, and that is fine.

What we have to be careful about in this particular case is that, because they took this action, this person could have been denied the ability to get an exit grant, which I think is something like \$150,000—it is like a redundancy, and that in itself is a scandal.

Bearing in mind how some of the CEOs look after themselves, you would think that they would have a little compassion and a little understanding for people who are in a very necessitous set of circumstances. As someone who has a heart for the rural sector and who believes we need a sound agricultural sector, I ask the minister to act.

Time expired.

CONFUCIUS INSTITUTE

The Hon. L. STEVENS (Little Para) (15:33): Last week, I was pleased to be invited to attend the signing of a memorandum of understanding between Professor James McWha, the Vice Chancellor of the University of Adelaide, and the Minister for Education, on behalf of the government, in relation to a cooperation between the Minister for Education for South Australia and the University of Adelaide, through its Confucius Institute. Members might remember that, as the ambassador for the institute, I have spoken about the Confucius Institute on a number of occasions.

It was good to be part of a very important milestone. This agreement sets down the understandings between the two parties in relation to the support of both Chinese and non-Chinese background students not only to learn and maintain Chinese language skills but also in terms of the promulgation of the culture and cultural understanding between China and Australia.

The MOU states that the institute will provide input into the implementation of DECS quality Chinese language and cultural studies programs for teachers, principals and school communities in South Australia, with a specific focus on developing language proficiency, cultural awareness and understanding, and language teaching methodologies of teachers of Chinese language.

The MOU indicates a number of areas where the institute will cooperate with DECS, including planning South Australian government school staff training and support; the facilitation of Chinese-related professional and community organisations being able to work cooperatively to support Chinese language and culture study in South Australian government schools and also to provide input on resources for teachers to support the teaching and learning of the Chinese language in South Australian government schools; and, finally, to identify and assist with the facilitation of other initiatives for the promotion and teaching of the Chinese language in South Australian government schools.

For her part, the minister agreed that DECS would have the responsibility for South Australian government school staff training and support with regard to Chinese language teaching methodologies. They agreed to promote and disseminate information provided by the institute regarding professional learning opportunities to South Australian government schools run by the institute, to facilitate mentoring arrangements in South Australian government schools for students from the University of Adelaide undertaking programs leading towards becoming Chinese language teachers, and they agreed to seek the institute's input on initiatives for the promotion and teaching of the Chinese language in South Australian government schools.

There are currently 5,960 students learning the Chinese language and culture in 50 state schools in South Australia, and there are, of course, more students learning in non-government schools. The importance of the agreement means that two very important players in all this have agreed to work together and to focus their energies jointly towards some very positive outcomes in terms of the teaching and understanding of the Chinese language and culture.

I congratulate both parties, and particularly Professor Mobo Gao, the director of the Confucius Institute, for coming to this point and for the work that they have done in their first year of operation. I look forward to some very interesting and innovative initiatives in the coming year.

KANGAROO ISLAND, COMMUNITY EVENTS

Mr PENGILLY (Finniss) (15:37): Across my electorate we have a number of public events, which are always well organised and pleasurable to attend. Recently on Kangaroo Island we have had two extremely good events for which I would like to pay credit to the organisers and everybody who was involved in them. One of those was the Kangaroo Island Cup Carnival, the annual racing carnival on Kangaroo Island.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: Hear, hear!

Mr PENGILLY: I did not see the Attorney there. He can come next year.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: I was at Cheltenham for the last meeting.

Mr PENGILLY: That is right, and the minister was on Kangaroo Island, Attorney. Some 3,500 people attended the Kangaroo Island Cup on Saturday. It was a terrific day, and it was made even better by the fact that Maximum Class, of which I am a very small part owner, won the second race by seven lengths.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: Seven lengths!

Mr PENGILLY: Seven lengths, Attorney.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: What were the odds?

Mr PENGILLY: Six to one. I pay tribute to the trainer, Mr James Bates, and the Bates family and his wife Sandra. On the racing carnival itself, I would pay tribute and gratitude to the president of the racing club, Mr Roger Williams, and his committee. They did a marvellous job in organising the carnival on the Thursday and the Saturday, and everything that goes with it.

It is certainly the event of the year for Kangaroo Island, and a small group of people with a small population base of 4,500 on the island certainly do a wonderful job. It brings large numbers of visitors to the island, which I will come back to in a minute, and it is a good time.

The other event that followed that a week or so later was the Kangaroo Island Agricultural Field Day held on the racecourse. They use the same facilities. The marquees are left there and the two organisations work well together.

Mr Rodney Bell, the chairman of the Agricultural Field Day on the island, also deserves special comment for what he has done, as does his hard working committee for its efforts in putting it on. The crowd at that field day I understand was around 1,500, principally local people.

The schools all shut for the day and the children attend. They have fashion parades, sheep catching competitions, sheep races and all sorts of things. It was really a good day and it is a wonderful way to see all the constituents on the island, that is for sure.

However, on a somewhat more tempered note, I do talk about the possibility of the island increasing its numbers of visitors and, more to the point, increasing equity for the agricultural and primary industry sector on the island (and for the tourism sector, as well) with the cost of travel to the island.

I have spoken before in this place about this matter. It is not the fault of the SeaLink company. It offers substantial discounts to islanders and it does the best it can to keep its costs down. However, the absolute inequity of the cost of transport backwards and forwards across to the mainland is totally wrong. This year I understand that the price to move grain from Kangaroo Island to the mainland was around some \$70-odd a tonne which makes it totally uncompetitive in the current pricing mechanism, with grain prices down.

The reality is that the island has the ability to provide vast amounts of grain, for example, to the Fleurieu Peninsula for the dairy industry. The island is a food producer, along with the Fleurieu, for the state of South Australia, Australia and the world. Things cannot go on as they are at the moment. The government has failed to come to grips with this. It has been put on notice several times about the inequity that occurs on the freight link and the sea lane to the island. Visitor numbers to the island could be boosted dramatically if it was cheaper to get there.

The member for Goyder knows this only too well. I recently organised for him to come to the island to attend a function and, when I gave him the account for some \$304 (for the car, himself and his wife), he nearly fell over. I said, 'Welcome to reality, Steven. I do this trip three or four times a month and I pay full tote odds.'

Time expired.

DENTAL PLAN FOR NURSING HOMES

Ms SIMMONS (Morialta) (15:42): I would like to talk today about the national rollout of a dental plan for nursing homes. This is an issue dear to my heart because between 2004 and 2006 I was very pleased to be a part of several research projects putting together an oral health assessment tool kit for GPs to utilise when undertaking a comprehensive medical assessment in residential aged care facilities, as well as other inquiries into the oral health of older people.

I am delighted to be able to advise the house that the Australian government has recently announced the national rollout of a dental plan for nursing homes. This is particularly exciting as the plan is based on the work undertaken for the Australian government by the South Australian Dental Services Aged Care Team and the Australian Research Centre for Population Oral Health from the University of Adelaide.

This announcement is the outcome of a number of years of research and program development by SADS and I would particularly like to pay tribute to Martin Dooland, Anne Pak-Poy, Anne Fricker and John Spencer. In 2004 the National Oral Health Plan pointed to the poor oral health of people in residential aged care and made a number of recommendations. These included

action to ensure that oral assessment is carried out on admission to residential aged care; the development of a simple oral health plan for residents; and support for implementation of the oral health plan, including maintenance of oral hygiene and timely dental treatment.

In 2005 a consortium led by the South Australian Dental Service and the Australian Research Centre for Population Oral Health of the University of Adelaide was awarded a contract with the Australian government to develop and test an oral health assessment and care planning tool for use by GPs in residential aged care facilities. This tool was developed and evaluation showed that it was well accepted by the doctors who were able to accurately identify oral conditions and develop appropriate oral health care plans for residents. These plans included maintenance of oral hygiene as well as referral for dental treatment when necessary. However, this project was not designed to assess the implementation of the care plan.

In 2007 South Australian Dental Service led a new consortium that successfully applied for \$1.3 million funding from the Australian government's Encouraging Best Practice in Residential Aged Care. Its members are from DHS in Victoria, the Centre for Oral Health Strategy in New South Wales, the Australian Research Centre for Population Oral Health and six diverse aged care homes across the three states.

This new project tests the ability of registered nurses to use the assessment and care planning toolkit, as well as the impact of implementing the care plan. This includes the maintenance of oral hygiene for residents by care workers and the provision of priority dental treatment by the public dental services. Training staff at the nursing homes involved in the project is a key part of the project to ensure sustainability.

On 1 March 2009, the Minister for Ageing (Hon. Justine Elliot MP) announced details of the nursing home oral and dental healthcare plan, which include: \$3 million over three years to establish a nationally consistent approach to dental assessment in the aged care assessment team process for the first time; a specially developed national training package for aged care workers, which covers oral hygiene, care and cleaning of dentures, desensitisation and responding to dry mouth; distraction techniques for people with dementia; and, of course, referral for dental treatment.

This initiative has the potential dramatically to improve the oral health of people in the residential aged care setting, with its emphasis on prevention. The \$3 million funding for the dental plan does not support dental treatment flowing from the oral health assessment; however, many residents will be eligible for the Medicare chronic disease dental program. Furthermore, the eventual implementation of the Commonwealth Dental Health Program will also allow this treatment to be provided.

I offer my congratulations to all those involved in the development of the oral health assessment and care planning tool and its implementation in the aged care setting. I also mention the high level of expertise in South Australia provided by the project's steering committee, chaired by Dr Chris Pazios from the Australian Dental Association, and comprising, amongst others, Dr Helena Williams, from the Adelaide Southern Division of General Practice; Ms Megan Corlis, from Aged and Community Services; and Joy Murch, from Aged Care Association Australia.

PLASTIC SHOPPING BAGS

Mr VENNING (Schubert) (15:47): Today, I wish to speak about the upcoming ban on plastic shopping bags that will take effect on 1 May. I urge the state Rann Labor government to review its decision totally to ban these bags. I have been contacted by many constituents, some are shop owners and some are not, who have many concerns regarding the ban, and these range from shoplifting to health fears, in relation to putting meat products into the bags, and environmental concerns, in regard to the green bags breaking down. These issues, amongst others, have been discussed with me.

Drake Foodmarkets has said that it now has huge problems with shoplifters, as professional thieves use the plastic bags to fit in with other shoppers. The owner, Mr Roger Drake, said that it has created a shoplifting nightmare. Food microbiologist, Dr Connor Thomas, also warned that the green bags, which many shoppers are already using, could be bad for health because of the bacteria they can carry. A green bag may be used to carry meat and poultry, such as chicken or beef, and then used to carry raw vegetables, and this could lead to causing gastrointestinal illnesses, such as salmonella.

We all reacted quite negatively to the impact plastic bags were having on the environment, and the issue needed to be addressed. Banning these bags totally is an overreaction; rather, I think an educational process should be undertaken to promote alternatives and responsible disposal of the bags. Plastic bags are very convenient, and they are a product of modern technology. They are very light, very strong and very convenient; often, there is no alternative to use and certainly not a convenient one.

Many people, including me, use plastic bags as bin liners. I find it very handy to pull the plastic bag out of the bin and deposit it without having to handle any of the refuse inside. It is a very clean way of handling it. They can also be used to clean up the mess made by pets and to put wet towels in after visiting the pool or the beach, and the list goes on. We would all have a million uses for these plastic bags, and most of the time we use them several times over.

For those who do not reuse their plastic shopping bags in their home, unwanted bags can be disposed off in the recycle bin located at the front of many supermarkets or dropped at the local opportunity shop. Many reuse the bags, and I am sure that they would always be grateful for more. Some 4.5 million plastic bags are used by customers in Australia every year, of which 75 per cent are reused. Also, plastic makes up only 5 per cent of the landfill, and 50 per cent of that is plastic packaging, not bags. It makes the state Rann Labor government's current policy look like enormous overkill. I only wonder how much taxpayer revenue has been spent on implementing this ban and the policy that is out there.

I believe that people are reacting by stockpiling the soon-to-be illegal plastic bags. We in this house and the various committees all got carried away with the problem that plastic bags were creating in the waste stream. I was involved with the ERD Committee at the time, as was, I think, the minister for water resources. We undertook a waste management inquiry and saw the problems we were having with these plastic bags. So, there was a reaction, and this is the result of it.

Why did we not firstly try to solve the problem by making it illegal to put loose, unrestrained plastic bags into bins so that they would not blow around the countryside or into the sea and pose a threat to seals, dolphins and other sea creatures. I believe that we can now see what we have done. We are going to saddle members of the community with an inconvenience that they do not wish to have. I realised that we have only a few more days left to use these bags, and I have been to the supermarket and made other arrangements.

Like half the Australian adult population, I have also kept them all because I know that they will become illegal. I will be using them. I will certainly miss them, and I think that we have overreacted. I do not think it is too late: I believe that we should be able to bring back these bags and handle the problem in a different way. I hope that the government will listen to this, because we were all a part of this reaction. I think it is time for us to say, 'Hang on, we really haven't handled this very well.' Let us fix it up and put in place a common-sense measure so that people will not be so inconvenienced.

ADVANCED MEDICAL INSTITUTE

The Hon. S.W. KEY (Ashford) (15:52): Today I would like to raise concerns that I have, first of all, as a television watcher but, more seriously, with respect to complaints that I have received from constituents. My concerns are centred around an organisation called the Advanced Medical Institute. This organisation has a number of advertisements on television (particularly SBS, and I think late night television on a commercial station), which claim that it is able to provide treatments for men with erectile dysfunction. It does not say this in the advertisements but, after conducting investigations, I am told that AMI has had a number of complaints made about it because it provides and prescribes drugs over the telephone without meeting the people who have rung up for assistance.

Obviously, this is a very serious issue. Some of the men to whom I have spoken have complained that they have signed a contract for a 12 month supply of drugs, sometimes at a cost of between \$2,000 and \$3,500 a year. When the drugs have not worked they have complained to the Advanced Medical Institute and have been advised that they have a contract and will have to pay.

I think the advertisements are in bad taste, and I always switch channels when they come on. I think it is a really important issue, but I dislike the way in which it is portrayed. Now I have noticed that ads are talking about assisting women with sexual dysfunction. Having received information via constituents about what is being offered, I was very surprised to learn that pharmaceutical treatments were being offered, once again over the telephone, and these women were told that no doctor was employed by AMI in Adelaide and therefore they had to consult one of

the AMI doctors based interstate via the telephone. The consultations occurred and each of the women to whom I spoke signed up for a 12 month contract, at \$4,000 per contract, with a supply of treatments for sexual dysfunction.

Having had the opportunity to see the ads, I can understand why a number of people, young women in particular, who are feeling insecure about their sex life or potential sex life, could be taken in by these particular ads, because, quite frankly, to begin with, I did not understand why women would contact AMI. The ads probably make women feel quite insecure about their sexuality and also their sex lives in general.

The women involved in this process were supplied with apomorphine lozenges and also glycerol trinitrate transdermal gel, and obviously were promised that these different chemicals would assist their sex life. The main concerns I have are that pharmaceutical products are being supplied to men and women based on telephone consultation and I am not sure whether any of these consultations or services are available under Medicare or any medical benefits services. This is a question that I will be taking up with the federal minister. I am really concerned that such services do exist and that people are reporting that the services do not assist them in the problems that they have identified with AMI. We need to warn our constituents to be very careful about this particular product. As I said, I will be taking this up with the federal minister to ensure that there is some action.

GLENTHORNE FARM

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON (Croydon—Attorney-General, Minister for Justice, Minister for Multicultural Affairs, Minister for Veterans' Affairs) (15:58): I table a copy of a ministerial statement relating to Glenthorne Farm made earlier today in another place by my colleague the Minister for Urban Development and Planning.

REMARK IRRIGATION TRUST BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading (resumed on motion).

(Continued from page 1961.)

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (15:58): In relation to comments made by people connected to the trust but who were not consulted, they indicated that uneconomic infrastructure cannot necessarily be removed as there may still be a few people requiring it now or later when the quarantine period expires. It has been indicated that these people have tried to discuss these matters with Senator Wong at the federal level, but she regards these changes as very good and will not hear of changing things to take the above problems into account. They believe that the federal minister and her department do not trust irrigators not to cheat the system. I guess that depends on an individual's particular reading of the issue.

I will make a few remarks regarding the history of the Renmark Irrigation Trust. Renmark is a town which was transformed by Australia's first irrigation scheme. I believe it was irrigation scheme No. 1 for this country. The Chaffey brothers were the founders of Australia's first irrigation settlement in Renmark in 1887. This made Renmark the first irrigation colony in Australia. The Chaffey brothers were invited by the South Australian government to establish their fruit colony, and the brothers quickly accepted. On 14 February 1887, an agreement was signed for the establishment at Renmark for the first irrigation settlement in Australia.

The early days provided high hopes, generous early harvests, rapidly increasing land values and a general fever of excitement despite the difficult conditions. Such difficulties included issues over water rights—they do not seem to go away—destruction of irrigation channels and the first signs of salinity encountered in irrigation.

The original act governing irrigation in the Renmark region was the Chaffey Brothers Irrigation Works Act 1887 and, as I indicated earlier, this was the first irrigation act anywhere in Australia. It was changed and repealed 15 times before the act as it now stands (the Renmark Irrigation Trust Act 1936) was established which, if this new bill passes, will be repealed.

The opposition supports the passage of this bill. We think it is absolutely necessary to make sure that water trade can be conducted in an orderly manner and also for South Australians to comply with the different federal legislation coming into play. It is a very sad time for the river, as everyone knows, when you consider that exit grants, which were announced last October, are even part of the equation.

We have a government in this state that has presided over a river that is very quickly dying. I acknowledge the water purchased for permanent plantings that was leased in, because that is something the Liberals had pushed. Also, as to the exit grants, it has taken a long time to get the structures in place so that people can make the right decisions about whether to stay or go.

It has been very sad to see the issues right up and down the river. In the Riverland over the past couple of years, before the advent of carryover water, people paid millions of dollars to purchase temporary water to keep their crops alive. It has placed many stresses on people throughout the Riverland, down through mid-Murray and the Lower Murray. Further down the river we have seen the issues that those involved in horticulture are facing; they obviously do not qualify for the permanent plantings money. This has made people move their irrigation into areas like the southern Mallee and the South-East.

Also, we have seen the total demise of an irrigation sector down at Narrung. Langhorne Creek and Currency Creek have problems with salinity and, obviously, Goolwa's tourism industry is on its knees due to lack of water. It seems ironic that the government is presiding over engineering works down here when perhaps there needs to be more effort made at a higher level, and I acknowledge that the Premier announced that he would lease in some water for the Lower Lakes. It will be interesting to know how much water is earmarked for that program. We have also heard about a High Court challenge against what Victoria is doing as far as its reticence on moving on the 4 per cent cap is concerned. We have seen Victoria swing too much weight in this whole issue of water.

Mr Venning: Far too much.

Mr PEDERICK: Far too much weight, as the member for Schubert acknowledges, and we have seen far too many issues right throughout. It is just ridiculous that the River Murray is basically on its deathbed. I will probably say more in the debate on the irrigation bill, but with those few words I commend the Renmark irrigation bill.

I reiterate that the opposition supports it. It is absolutely vital that this goes through and I acknowledge the level of consultation that has gone on with this bill with all parties. It seems odd that there has actually been some consultation on a government bill. I am told that, when issues were brought up, the government listened. You wonder why the same action could not have been taken in regard to issues like Mobilong Prison, country health, marine parks and the houseboat strategy. It is a pity that the same sort of consultation could not be put into play to get more work done on protecting such an iconic resource as the River Murray, not only for this state but for the nation. With those few words, I commend the bill.

Mr VENNING (Schubert) (16:07): The Irrigation Bill 2009 is very relevant and important, even though it will not get a huge amount of time before this house, because we do not disagree with it. Noting this, the bill replaces the Irrigation Act 1994 and the Renmark Irrigation Trust Act 1936, which is a long time ago, and here we are again—it has taken a long time.

The Irrigation Act 1994 is now at odds with the commonwealth water reform agenda, which seeks to remove the regulatory barriers to the trade of permanent water outside a given area of an irrigation district by separating water from the land. We have had a lot of debate about that—separating water from land—particularly over the last 10 years that I can recall, but we certainly have moved on in relation to all this.

The Renmark Irrigation Trust Act 1936 gave irrigators no opportunity to transform a right into a licence; trade of water was not even mentioned. A second matter concerning the RIT relates to its structure, which has left it outside of other newer legislation. Well, things have certainly changed in this area. Water now has a high value and it is a tradeable product, and we therefore have to upgrade legislation to allow that trade.

I recall that, when we were in government, we gave out these water allocations. We know that there was a lot of business going on, and some of it was concerning because some people, who were not using water, took up licences, because they all sort of knew that it was going to become valuable. However, there was going to be a point in time when we had to do this.

I recall that the then minister Dale Baker raised the matter. We knew that a lot of people, who were not using the water were taking up licences. We tried to ensure that people who were sitting on licences were using the water, because we knew they had a value, but now, of course, they have a value which is many times the value when we created them.

In relation to this bill there are several objectives, notably, the need to take into account current management practices and policy directions and the need for compliance with federal policy directions. If only we had a single, independent, whole-of-basin management group with no responsibilities to individual states, we would then have full tradability across all borders and we would have a system managed as a river system. It is a damn shame.

I think that the whole commonwealth structure has fallen down when state boundaries can impede, like this, on a single river system. This is probably the biggest failing of the federation. I think we should be thinking a lot bigger and thinking outside the square.

If only John Howard had had his way. At that particular time, we all know, he put up the proposal and he put up \$10 billion to go with it as a carrot to make sure that we got in a single, whole-of-basin management group. However, we heard our Premier's trumpeting, saying that he was going to put his stamp on it for full independence. Well, he was so called successful; and what do we have today? We really have not received anything.

We are back in the same mess we were in prior to the whole thing, when the Victorians can almost veto everything we do, particularly for the time being, and, to make it worse, take water from the system for the city. When we are trying to wean Adelaide off the river, Melbourne is coming on the river. It makes you wonder. The whole debate has gone somewhere we never would have believed. I only wish that John Howard's wish had been successful.

We need to totally free up water trading across all state borders and then we will see true market forces come in to play. We really cannot have all the water being held upstream. I am sure there is enough water in the stream, in the rivers, in the whole catchment, to solve some of the problems—not all of them, but some of them—in relation to the Lower Lakes, the river and in relation to Adelaide's water supply. It is all held upstream.

I know the shadow minister, the member for Hammond, has flown over it. I will be visiting it next week and going down the river from Mannum to Murray Bridge in the *Marion*. It is a good way to see the river. There is water up there and it is being held in huge dams—Cubbie Station and others, and the government has bought one of them—which are held there basically for rice and cotton growing. Really, those sorts of activities ought to be restricted (I did not say banned) because it is not an efficient, economical use of the water.

I am sure that, if we allow the true market forces to react totally and allow trade across the borders, our grape growers in South Australia could afford to buy that water via the two schemes that we have—the BIL scheme, which I helped pioneer, and also the scheme in Clare. It would assure that water stays in the river. You can call it environmental flows—call it what you like you like—but it would solve a lot of the problems that we have now.

The member for Hammond is very much a warrior, a gladiator standing on his own on the weir. It is a tough fight for a member who has been in the house for three years. I tell you what, it has made him go grey overnight. It is a pretty serious matter. It is hard when we have a whole-of-river system in this state going from the Riverland down to the Lower Lakes and everybody has a totally different point of view.

It is very difficult, when we have three members representing that river, to have a common point of view, as we do. We support the member for Hammond in his campaign. I admire the guts and determination of the gentleman. Admittedly, he has the size to go with it—I do not think I would ever threaten him. He has certainly dug in, and I admire him for that. Many a weaker person would have asked whether it is worth the hassle, but he has stuck in there.

Back to the bill. In respect to the RIT, the bill's major function is to transform a member's existing water right into an owned and tradeable right. Until now, the Renmark Irrigation Trust members were not able to sell their rights separately as they remained with the trust. Subsequently, amongst other things, it was unable to access the federal government's exit packages.

With respect to the Renmark trust structure, the ratepayers have now become members, and members of the board have become directors, allowing definitions and other qualifications defining the new acts to cover participants of the Renmark Irrigation Trust. Also, directors will now be elected from the membership as opposed to being appointed by the board.

In closing, I indicate that we support the bill. It is a very difficult issue. I do not think I could name one other issue that has caused so much public concern in relation to the water in the river

and who is entitled to it, how we arrange our trading, and how we regulate it. It is a very difficult issue.

It was not an issue 10 years ago. When I first came into this place 18 years ago, it was not an issue at all. It was open slather. It was, 'Take as much water as you like. No problem.' Then, all of a sudden—boom—we are in this situation. The problem is that we have allowed this to happen. Water has been too cheap, and we have not been responsible. We should have done something about this problem five, eight or 10 years ago, but we did not and now we are paying the price.

In closing, I pay tribute to the former Liberal government because, over all the other states, it got rid of all the open drains in South Australia. People tend to forget that, although the member for Chaffey would know. We got rid of all our open drains, and we were an example to the rest of Australia.

The Hon. K.A. Maywald: Channels.

Mr VENNING: I thank the minister. We got rid of all our open channels, and we are one of the poorer states. So, why didn't the other states, particularly Victoria, do the same? They did not do anything. So, we can stand up with a lot of credibility in relation to this issue. We spent money doing that so that we did not lose water by way of evaporation or through the ground by way of leaking channels. However, the other states have done nothing. So, why are we being doubly penalised? We spent the money then, and we are now being penalised because other states are keeping back water.

Certainly, it is a very emotive and difficult issue for our state, and I commend both the minister and the shadow minister because it is tough. The Liberal opposition is concerned that the government did not do more earlier but, in this instance, we support the bill.

The Hon. K.A. MAYWALD (Chaffey—Minister for the River Murray, Minister for Water Security) (16:17): I thank members opposite for their contribution and also for their support for this bill. This bill will ensure that the Renmark Irrigation Trust is well equipped to meet current and future challenges in relation to the management and operation of shared irrigation and drainage infrastructure. It also recognises the special place that the Renmark Irrigation Trust holds in the Renmark community. I really do thank the Renmark Irrigation Trust for its engagement throughout the review of the legislation and the manner in which it has informed the process and embraced the changes.

The acceptance of this bill continues the state's commitment to water reform, ensuring that there are no restrictions to the permanent trade of water and providing for flexibility for the trust in the management of water licences and flexibility for individual members in regard to transforming their irrigation right.

Changes will also allow for the expansion of provision of water to areas previously outside irrigation district boundaries, which will be a major change in how Renmark Irrigation Trust can manage its business. Changes will ensure compliance with key government policy directions, including the National COAG Water Reform of 1994 and the National Water Initiative of 2004. It will also ensure compliance with the Inter-Governmental Agreement on Murray-Darling Basin Reform in 2008 and consistency with the Water Act 2007.

I thank all honourable members who have supported this important initiative and allowed its speedy passage through the house. In addition, I thank Stevie Austin and Julie Mrotek from the Department of Water, Land and Biodiversity Conservation, and Richard Dennis from the Office of Parliamentary Counsel for assisting in the preparation of the bill.

Bill read a second time.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER (16:20): This bill provides for the continuation of the Renmark Irrigation Trust for the purposes of management and operation of irrigation and drainage infrastructure in the area around Renmark. The bill repeals the Renmark Irrigation Trust Act 1936. That act provided for the continuation of the Renmark Irrigation Trust, which was established in 1893. The 1936 act was a consolidation of the provisions of the scheme detailed in a range of acts which have been passed by the parliament since 1887.

In 1893, speaker Coles noted that the bill was to create a body to deal with water rights within the Renmark settlement area and to provide it with necessary powers. He ruled:

...as private interests not held in common with the general public are affected by this bill, I think after its second reading it should be referred to a select committee, before whom any person whose property or rights may

be prejudicially affected by its provisions may be heard. In other words, the Bill appears to me to be within the spirit, if not the exact words of Joint Standing Order No 2, and should be dealt with as a hybrid or quasi private bill.

Subsequent bills amended the act in 1920 and 1933, and some 17 bills since the 1936 act were referred to a select committee in accordance with the practice of the house for the purpose outlined by speaker Coles.

The bill aligns the operations of the trust scheme with those of other irrigation schemes it is proposed to make subject to the Irrigation Bill, which is also before the house and which has the effect of negating its exclusive elements. However, the Renmark Irrigation Trust Bill does continue to promote the particular interests of the trust as a local body corporate. Therefore, in accordance with joint standing order 2, I rule the Renmark Irrigation Trust Bill 2009 to be a hybrid bill.

The Hon. K.A. MAYWALD (Chaffey—Minister for the River Murray, Minister for Water Security) (16:21): I move:

That this bill be referred to a select committee, pursuant to joint standing order 2.

Motion carried.

The house appointed a select committee consisting of Mr Kenyon, the Hon. S.W. Key, Mr Pederick, Mr Williams and the Hon. K.A. Maywald; the committee to have power to send for persons, papers and records, and to adjourn from place to place; and to report on 25 March 2009.

The Hon. K.A. MAYWALD (Chaffey—Minister for the River Murray, Minister for Water Security) (16:22): I move:

That the committee have leave to sit during the sitting of the house today, if necessary.

Motion carried.

IRRIGATION BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 4 March 2009. Page 1797.)

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (16:23): As the lead speaker for the opposition today, I advise the house that we support this bill, as we did the Renmark Irrigation Trust Bill 2009. Some of my comments will be a repeat of my introductory comments for the Renmark Irrigation Trust Bill. This just goes to show how closely aligned these two bills are, and it does stress the exclusivity of the Renmark Irrigation Trust Bill because of it being the first irrigation district in Australia.

This bill replaces the Irrigation Act 1994. The Irrigation Act 1994 is now at odds with the commonwealth water reform agenda, which seeks to remove the regulatory barriers to the trade of permanent water outside a given area or irrigation district by separating water from land.

There are several objectives in this bill, notably the need to take into account current management practices and policy directions and the need for compliance with federal policy directions.

Among other things, the bill removes references to government irrigation districts which no longer exist and delineates the function of the Irrigation Trust to that of service providers, rather than land tenants. Other important features relate to the federal requirement for there to be no impediment to trade of water outside irrigation districts.

In regard to consultation, we had extensive consultation up and down the river as this bill, obviously, controls irrigation on a far wider basis than the Renmark bill. We talked to people involved in the Central Irrigation Trust, the Lower Murray Irrigation Trust and people involved in private trusts, and also had communication with South Australian Murray irrigators.

We found, with our consultation, that it was determined that without exception all key personnel support the bill, and they have said that the changes are vital to allow irrigators access to water markets and also enable them to apply for exit packages, which is similar to the Renmark Irrigation Trust Bill.

It is noted, and I repeat again, that the people involved in the trusts and other areas of river management were actually quite pleased by the department's extensive and responsive consultation process. They made the observation that all suggestions and requests were noted, except for those matters outside state control. If only things could be so easy with so much more.

They all agreed that certain matters under federal jurisdiction, as I indicated with the earlier bill, were the cause of a lot of aggravation: for example, the failure of the recent COAG agreement to properly vest control of the Murray to a central independent body, the weakness of the federal government in managing to get a successful outcome in negotiating with Victoria and the resulting restrictions on trade out of that state, as well as the extended grace period, so to speak, granted to Victoria and Queensland that forestall any real positive action to restore reasonable flows in the Murray Darling for several years. These matters fall into the larger process of the COAG agreement throughout the other states and the federal COAG agreement, but will not impede the progress of this bill.

Irrigators and trusts do have some related concerns that are a consequence of the changes to the act. In disposing of a water right from the land within a trust district, the cost of providing and maintaining distribution services will be shared among fewer members with a consequent increase in per member costs. Nevertheless, all trusts are strongly supportive of the changes in these bills and are keen that they progress promptly. Obviously, in regards to exit packages, that is paramount.

There were comments made through our consultation that people believe that the state Labor government should do more to effect change in federal policy-makers' thinking. I will go through some of the consultation that we have had on the bills. There was a comment from someone involved with private irrigation trusts who has had involvement with the bills for three years.

All trusts were invited to contribute and were briefed by the department twice. As I have explained, questions and comments from the floor were explained or addressed in the final bill. As I have indicated earlier, their concern is, again, with matters of federal jurisdiction. No. 1 is that the transformation of irrigators' rights is potentially disruptive. If an irrigator takes his water and sells it to the natural resources management board it leaves a lot of confusing paperwork to be dealt with. The comment was made that Victoria and Queensland are quite willing to do their own thing. Another comment was that New South Wales is seen as the potential loser. It was also noted that it could not happen quick enough that 50 per cent of all water savings are to go back to the environment.

There were also concerns indicated through the consultation process about the cost of delivery of services as irrigators exit or sell. Another comment was made about the federal minister (minister Wong) hearing but not listening. There were comments that the exit strategy is clearly not working; too many constraints and add-ons, for example, exit fees, capital gains issues, etc.

The point was made, and I fully agree, that Murray Futures is probably not getting a fair go in South Australia as infrastructure upgrades were completed here years ago. I commend everyone involved in our irrigation districts. They have done a great job throughout the Riverland and then, later on, working through issues of transforming the Lower Murray Swamps. However, I fear that it may all have to happen again after the present drought—as far as the Lower Murray Swamps are concerned, anyway. There were more comments about the bill and the Lower Murray, such as: 'happy with the bills'; 'key industry people very satisfied with the result' and 'did not see the need to change the bills as they came through the house as they were listened to through the negotiation process.'

The federal issues remain. As someone indicated, they called it the Rudd-Brumby agreement, which was seriously flawed and gave everyone false hope that the transfer of power would be quick and effective. The comment has been made that, by the time the Victorian and Queensland grace periods expire, there might be no river left to fight for.

A common theme amongst people we talked to was that the bills had been progressed well in the consultation phase, that most of the problems still remain under federal jurisdiction and that the federal minister (minister Wong) is not listening. It was commented to us: 'So much for Labor governments working in tandem with each other for desirable outcomes.' There was also a comment made that the state minister (minister Maywald) could or should intervene to convince minister Wong that the resultant problems should be considered and dealt with.

I want to enlarge on the issue of the river in general and its management over the past few years. We at this end of the river seem to be managing the drought and over-allocation at one end of the system. It just goes to show that the Murray-Darling Basin now and into the future will not be controlled as it should be. There are too many unregulated rivers that do not come under management and too many state rights. We have seen what has recently happened with rains in

the north again, very similar to last year, flooding rains through Queensland where most of that water is captured, diverted, stored and not available to flow down the system as it once used to. We have seen an issue in the Macquarie marshes where thousands of kilometres of illegal banks were built in New South Wales. To this day I believe they still have not been pushed over as they should be.

There is a huge problem with the management of unregulated water. I believe it should come under some form of regulation. With the way the basin is operated, there is really only tradeable water in the southern basin and, as time goes on, the water falls in the north will need to be managed. If that is where we go there is nothing in place to support it. I do not agree with some commentators who say that we should forget about the northern basin; I firmly believe that we should not.

There are also issues, as we go down the system, with channels that are not metered. I have had reports from people travelling through Victoria about there being plenty of water in open channels. However, there are different levels of water restrictions in different towns. As we get further south it is ironic in a sense that, allegedly for salinity control, we hold the pool levels above Lock 1, and we saw water levels below Lock 1 dropping to almost two metres below, where they were normally at 0.75, when the barrages went in.

As I indicated earlier there are massive issues with slumping. I have been at site inspections when, all of a sudden, there is a great crash and another area of the river falls in. Essentially, the bank gives way and suddenly 20 metre trees are sitting out in the middle of the river. It has become a safety issue; it is a marina issue; it is a whole-of-river issue.

Obviously, we have salinity management issues. It is interesting to note that salinity issues were being discussed back in the late 1800s when the Renmark Trust was established. I have a major concern that the death by a thousand cuts of the Lower Murray is being presided over by this state government. I do not believe that it has fought hard enough to ensure that we get more water down to protect our icon sites, our Ramsar sites, the Coorong and the Lower Lakes. I think the fact that that it is even on the table to build a weir at Wellington will doom those lakes forever, especially if sea water is allowed in.

We have seen a weir built at Lake Bonney, allegedly to control salinity, and 10 gigalitres of water had to be purchased and quickly pumped over the top. We have seen a bund put in at Narrung, supposedly at a cost of \$6 million, but triple the amount of material was needed (from 12,000 cubic metres to 38,000 cubic metres), and dredging was undertaken just so that the ferry could get across.

I will never get over the picture I saw of the Narrung ferry, with an excavator dragging at each end trying to make a channel. Almost a gigalitre of water a day was being pumped to keep Lake Albert above acid sulphate levels and those pumps in water but, essentially, they were pumping silt. My guesstimate is that \$50 million has been spent down there, and the government could yet walk away from it.

For too long, Lake Alexandrina has been treated like a mine, and it will happen at Goolwa and Clayton and the regulator there. Another 30 gigalitres has been earmarked to go in to shore up the area around the bottom of Finniss and Currency creeks. We just cannot keep seeing Lake Alexandrina being treated like a mine; we need that water replaced, and we do not need a lot. It has been noted that over the next 18 months we may need a maximum of 220 gigalitres to get us through critical times. I believe that up to 400 gigalitres of tradeable water is in the southern basin, although it is hard to find out exactly what is there.

More action needs to be taken to acquire northern water. The current situation is that, as massive areas of the lake bed are exposed, there are now dust problems. Irrigation areas have been shut down, and plenty of centre pivots on the Narrung Peninsula will never work again, despite all the infrastructure that went in—the electrics, the piping, etc. The other day, I talked to a farmer and his wife who have a dryland exercise towards Langhorne Creek with a little pivot irrigation. Even with access to the irrigation pipe that is coming in under the Murray Futures scheme, they cannot afford anywhere near the water they need to keep going in the normal way by any manner or means. It is just too expensive.

All these projects have been undertaken, and we have seen stock and domestic water go into Narrung and Meningie. The irrigation pipe looks as though it will go ahead for Langhorne and Currency creeks, but I cannot get over the fact that we are taking all these stopgap, bandaid

measures when, on a larger scale, with proper compensation, water could be acquired out of the northern basin and the southern basin.

I think this state has sold itself short in the whole debate and that it is time to lobby to Kevin Rudd. Emergency action could be taken, as Bob Hawke did in 1983, to take over the system and ensure that the water gets where it needs to be, whether that be certain sites in New South Wales, Victoria or Queensland; however, as a parochial South Australian, I think that, as we see what I call the carnage all around us, we certainly need it in the Lower Lakes and the Lower Murray. It is indeed front of mind when your electorate is dominated by the River Murray and when the state is certainly heavily reliant on the river.

So, I call on the government and the minister to make more representation to the Prime Minister. In fact, if the minister thought it would help, in a bipartisan way I would go with her on a deputation to him because this is serious. It is a state of emergency in the Lower Lakes.

The Hon. K.A. Maywald interjecting:

Mr PEDERICK: The minister indicates something about a briefing: here we go, if we want to go down that path. There has been a lot of talk in the Lower Murray, and there has been a lot of talk in the Riverland. I have attended many meetings—

The Hon. K.A. Maywald: Have you ever asked for a briefing?

Mr PEDERICK: Yes; I have asked for a briefing, and I am just getting to that. I am very involved in river matters, and the briefing I wanted related to the Mount Bold reservoir. We had an initial briefing during the debate 18 months or two years ago, although I do not have the exact date in front of me. It is to be noted that the minister was at that meeting with her chief of staff, and I challenged her about how much water would have to be taken out of the River Murray for the alleged Mount Bold expansion. I was told by the minister that it was nowhere the 95 per cent I said would need to be pumped from the river for the extra 200 gegalitres, and I still believe that to this day. I was told that they had organised a briefing for me, but I have never heard back from the department or the minister. It works both ways, minister, I am afraid.

The Hon. K.A. Maywald interjecting:

Mr PEDERICK: No, you and your chief of staff were there, so—

The Hon. K.A. Maywald: Oh, Mount Bold. You never asked for one on the Lower Lakes—

Mr PEDERICK: No, I am just talking about briefings in general.

The Hon. K.A. Maywald: That was 18 months ago.

Mr PEDERICK: That is how long I have waited. The minister has admitted that it is 18 months. So, what is the point in keeping to ask for briefings? I have close contact with all my community. In fact, I am a member of the Lower River Murray Drought Task Force, which has Dean Brown on board, and I make regular representations right up and down the river. The minister would be well aware of that.

One thing I have learnt from briefings is that the government will only tell you what it wants you to hear. It will not tell you about its dismal record of managing the river in this state and how it has been so electorate focused, and the dismal record of Mike Rann especially, and the minister, who just seem to think that the Lower Lakes can go to the pack. Well, I do not stand by that. It is also a part of the dismal record that, when people from Western Australia put forward ideas on buyer remediation as long ago as last May, they were only listened to by the DWLBC department a couple of weeks ago. And that is a fact.

It is interesting to note (and the minister keeps interjecting) that representatives of the DEH, after years of drought, suddenly come to meetings and say, 'Now we are going to plan on how to fix the River Murray.' Where have they been? Have they been living under a rock? They are obviously living somewhere, but nowhere near the river.

I see the reactions of people in the local communities when these government people go there and expound their so-called virtues—and Prime Minister Rudd did the same thing. They stand on the shoreline of Lake Albert or at Milang on Lake Alexandrina and say, 'This is the effect of climate change.' People will just about throw them out of the room. They know what it is: it is drought and over-allocation. The river has been over-allocated. The whole river system has not been managed properly, and it could be done a lot better.

This government has been quite happy to preside over essentially the death of the River Murray (and more international media have been taking notice of what is going on), and this government should be held to account on that. It is just disgraceful. I have seen the mental health issues, the general health issues, families torn apart over what should happen with the river, businesses torn apart and people who have gone out of business. I firmly believe that the government will have more than enough to handle if it builds the Wellington weir, with respect to managing salinity above it, because of the volumes of salt that come into the river from groundwater below Lock 1.

I am quite happy to debate with the minister at any time. The government minister will only tell me what they want me to hear: one never hears the full facts. We were told once, early in the piece, that the pumps could never be lowered. Now we are told that they can access water to minus 3 on three of the pumps and Murray Bridge can go to minus 2.1 under sea level, and that is still disputed by the government. I think that there are people inside the government who want to build structures whatever happens, and will not manage the system appropriately.

To return to the substance of the bill, we support the Irrigation Bill 2009 and note that part of the reason why we are here today is to help people to exit the industry, which is a sad thing. However, I note that the bill needs to go through. I also note that there was good consultation. Let us see a speedy passage through the house.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN (Stuart) (16:49): I wish to speak only briefly; I am normally brief on my feet. This is an important measure. The irrigation industry in the Riverland, in particular, is exceptionally important and, as someone who represents sections of it, I am very aware of the excellent work that the Central Irrigation Trust has done in modernising the system and dealing with salt. I am also very much aware of the difficulties and hard times that many people who are reliant on the irrigation system and adequate supplies of water are having economically. I just want to place on the record that I appreciate the great challenges in which they are currently involved.

One of the things of which the NRM parliamentary committee is aware and which it has had made very clear to it is that there is an urgent need for work to be carried out at Menindee Lakes. Considerable savings could be made and more water could come through the system if those important irrigation projects were carried out. Obviously, it has probably not been in the interests of the New South Wales government to do it, but it certainly would be in the interests of people downstream in South Australia if those important engineering works were expedited and carried out.

My constituents, who have seen their allocations drastically cut and who have suffered from economic decline as a result of those decisions, want to see more water come into the system. They want a fair allocation. I think it is unfair that Victoria appears to have been looked after at the expense of South Australia. It is interesting that, when travelling in the area, wherever you go, you hear that it is always someone else's problem. If you go to New South Wales, it is the problem in Victoria. Victoria says that it is someone else, and then you get up to Queensland. All of them are very concerned, upright, good citizens and they have not done anything wrong. Well, someone has obviously taken a lot of water because it is not getting to South Australia.

I think that, if you look at the system fairly, we not only have an expectation but an absolute right to get a fair cut of the cake. One of my earliest experiences dealing with river systems happened many years ago. I remember going to Birdsville when the then minister told the council that, if it attempted to block the Cooper Creek, he would take it to the High Court because there was a very important principle involved. That clearly indicated to me the importance of ensuring that upstream people did not take more than their fair share.

I support the bill. I am very concerned about the plight of people living in the Riverland because they are very important to the economy of this state and this nation, and someone has to have the courage to make those tough decisions which are necessary to protect the river system not only short term but long term so that everyone in those regions has the ability to make a reasonable income and can produce for the benefit of their particular area. I support the bill.

Mr PENGILLY (Finniss) (16:53): I also rise to support the bill. Much has been said in the chamber this afternoon about the perils of a failure to move in the direction we are moving, particularly with this bill. I listened with interest to the member for Stuart just then. It is a symbol of what impact the River Murray system, the River Darling, etc., has on our country and particularly on our state. The Hon. Graham Gunn, who has been here for a long time, has made some very relevant points in relation to his constituents living along the river, but my constituents, who live

hundreds of kilometres away from his constituents at the bottom end around the Murray mouth and the Goolwa area, are facing equally tough conditions in dealing with the state of the river. The difference is that, at the top end, they still have water pooled up, but at the bottom end we have none.

It is a sad indictment on humanity, quite frankly, that this situation has been allowed to develop to where it is. I concur with the comments of my colleague the member for Hammond about the Prime Minister and various others running around talking about climate change—it is purely and simply drought. Drought has been a part of the Australian environment for a long time and it will be for a long time to come. I think the jury is still out on the other issues that the Prime Minister and others seem to raise from time to time.

I have followed this whole debate with a great deal of interest and I am still trying to get my head around who is telling the truth, who is telling porkies and who, in effect, really does not know what is going on. One of the questions to which I would dearly like to know the answer is: is there any water at the top end of the river? I would desperately like to know. I would like someone to tell me—and, in this case, perhaps it should be the minister who is sitting in the chamber now, the Minister for the River Murray—is there water further up the river? Audits have been called for and questions have been asked. I know the member for Mitchell has asked: what are the results of these audits? No-one seems to be able to come up with the right answer. I call on the minister to provide us with information about whether or not there is water up there—I do not know.

This bill today is a step in the right direction for irrigators and the river communities, particularly at that top end of the river in South Australia where irrigation is still taking place. Down our way irrigation is dead and buried. There is no irrigation left—none whatsoever. It is a tragedy. It is a tragedy in environmental terms and economic terms, and it is an immense tragedy to the people who have made their living around Lake Alexandrina, Lake Albert and the lower reaches of the Murray for so many decades.

I support the bill. I do hope that, as a parliament, we are heading in the right direction. There is bipartisan support for this bill. Although we have differences of opinion across the chamber and probably within groups on either side of the chamber, this is something that has grown out of a desire by the community to progress. I look forward to hearing some answers from the minister (hopefully) to some questions I asked a while ago, as I am sure do others. I support the bill.

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop) (16:58): We are addressing the Irrigation Bill with very similar effect to the previous bill, the Renmark Irrigation Trust Bill. It is a sad day when we are having to pass legislation to aid people to close down industry in South Australia, because that is basically what we are doing here. We are enabling the closure of irrigation blocks in the Riverland, and it is a very sad day. It is more sad because the government of South Australia, for some reason which is lost on me, has not done everything it could to support the people who have been forced to the wall. I know the government will argue that it has been diligent and that it has done everything it possibly can to support these people and that they will only get by when it rains.

It is not lost on me that, if you are an irrigator today between Menindee Lakes and Wentworth in New South Wales, if you have a high security water licence—and a considerable number of them have—you are getting 100 per cent of your allocation. So, if you are growing grapes, citrus, rice (God forbid) or some other irrigated crop in that area, you are getting 100 per cent of your allocation. You come down the river a little bit from Wentworth—and it is not very far from Wentworth to Renmark—and the people at Renmark are getting 18 per cent. I think every irrigator in South Australia has a right to ask: why is it so?

Why are irrigators throughout New South Wales on the Murrumbidgee and the main channel on the upper reaches of the Murray getting 95 per cent of their allocation when in South Australia you get 18 per cent? How is it that the minister and the Premier can claim that they have achieved an historic agreement between the state premiers and the commonwealth government to have a national management regime for the River Murray?

How can they claim that they have achieved that, that this is a fantastic result for South Australia, when six months later we have to come into this place and pass legislation to allow long-suffering irrigators to walk off their properties and exit, to take a few dollars? A lot of them will walk away with only a few dollars after a lifetime of work. Not only have those very irrigators put in a lifetime of work but the product off their properties has supported the other industries in those communities in the Riverland.

During the term of the previous Liberal government between 1993 and 2001, the exports out of South Australia grew from some \$3 billion a year to just a tad over \$9 billion a year. Most of that growth was done on the back of the work we did in the food industry. Most of that export income was derived from value adding right across the food industries. Today, we see the closing down of irrigation blocks and the flow on from that will be the closing down of those value adding parts of the food industry that started to get this economy working again in South Australia.

South Australia needs exports. We need the revenues that come from outside of our borders, that come into South Australia to grow our economy, so that we can build new infrastructure and yet again become an economic force within this nation. Across the border, the Victorians are wont to call Adelaide and South Australia a backwater. They are getting away with calling us a backwater because that is the way they have been treating us for years.

Of course, we are a backwater because we allow this to happen. The Premier came in here a couple of weeks ago with a stunt, saying that he is going to mount a High Court challenge in order to challenge the very agreement that he signed off on only nine months ago on 3 July 2008. He said it was a stupendous agreement for South Australia.

Mr Goldsworthy: Historic.

Mr WILLIAMS: No, it wasn't historic; the adjective he used was even better than that. It was not 'stupendous' but it was very close to that, closer than 'historic'.

Mr Goldsworthy: World first.

Mr WILLIAMS: You know the Premier.

Mr Goldsworthy: Unfortunately.

Mr WILLIAMS: Unfortunately—Goldie, you have made me lose my train of thought altogether. The Premier signed off on this agreement and now he is saying that he wants to mount a High Court challenge to overturn that agreement. He should have been arguing—back when John Howard was the prime minister and Malcolm Turnbull was the federal water minister—that John Howard should have done what Bob Hawke did in the early 1980s in Tasmania.

Bob Hawke said, 'This is something we have to fix up. I am going to do it. I believe I have the power and, if Tasmania does not like it, they can fight me in the High Court.' That is what our Premier should have been saying to John Howard: 'you take it over, take the powers'. Instead, we have all this nonsense about negotiating, knowing full well that negotiations were not going to work because the Premier did not want them to work.

In question time today, the Premier accused the Liberal Party of putting its party before the state. Never more starkly has that happened than what happened over the sham negotiations between the states and the commonwealth when John Howard was prime minister of this country. The Labor governments collectively around the nation did not want a decent agreement out of this before that federal election 18 months ago, and that is part of the problem.

What is the result of that? We are now here passing legislation to close down more industry in South Australia. It is a great legacy of the Mike Rann Labor government. It is a great legacy, minister, of your time as the Minister for Water Security of South Australia. I certainly would not be proud to have this legacy associated with my name.

The South Australian government could have been doing and should have been doing a number of things. I congratulated the government back in September when it was dragged kicking and screaming to announce that it would underwrite the cost of providing water for permanent plantings. That was a great policy. The only problem with it was that it was 12 months too late. It should have happened the previous year, before this minister and this government kept driving water prices through the roof and driving these very farmers to the wall. That is one of the reasons why they have gone to the wall.

Ms Ciccarello interjecting:

Mr WILLIAMS: Is that ancient history or history?

The Hon. K.A. Maywald: You did not agree with the purchase of water at the time.

Mr WILLIAMS: I argued, minister, with you last year, that you should have been going into the market—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr WILLIAMS: —and buying water to support the permanent plantings. You and your colleague the minister for agriculture were aghast at the idea. You tried to tell me that the other states would not allow you to do it. Well, they would not allow you to do it last year, but now you are saying they will allow you to do it this year.

The Hon. K.A. Maywald: In 2006, what did you say, Mitch?

Mr WILLIAMS: I've said a lot of things, minister. But what I have not done is gone to my constituents and said, 'I'm going to do something for you. I'm going to pass legislation, which is going to allow you to get an exit package so you can walk away from the business you've been involved in for the last 30 years.' That is what I have not said to any of my constituents, and that is what we are doing here today. It is an absolute shame.

The Hon. K.A. Maywald: You haven't even read the bill yet.

Mr WILLIAMS: I have read the bill.

The Hon. K.A. Maywald: No, you haven't. If you had read the bill you would not be saying it; you would know what the bill is about.

Mr WILLIAMS: I do know what the bill is about.

The Hon. K.A. Maywald: You've got no idea, mate, no idea.

Mr WILLIAMS: The minister is an interesting character, Mr Speaker. She has not contributed to debate in this place all that often in the 11 or 12 years that she has been here, and now she shows that by not adhering to the standing orders and wanting to debate another member on their feet. I find it rather interesting that the minister—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr WILLIAMS: As my colleague says, the minister will get her opportunity. That is the thing about being in government—you get lots of opportunities, minister. The pity of it is that you keep stuffing it up. Here we are with a lot of these irrigators having to take the only option left to them. They have been failed by their government, they have been failed by their local member, and they are going to walk off what have been hereto viable properties, and they are going to further exacerbate the decline in the economy of this state by not providing raw materials for a range of industries which rely on their horticultural products. This is the sad reality.

The other interesting thing about the mixed messages that come out of this government is that the Premier came in here and ranted on about a High Court challenge over the 4 per cent cap in Victoria. I cannot for the life of me understand how he could do that before he had actually fixed up his own backyard through these two particular measures, because, obviously, there has been a trading cap in South Australia. I think it is sad that we have to remove that trading cap—but he is the Premier. He knows very little about what is going on, but he wants to mount a High Court challenge. What a joke.

The Hon. K.A. Maywald: Do you oppose that?

Mr WILLIAMS: Do I oppose the High Court challenge? I have told you what the role of the High Court in this matter should have been. The role of the High Court in this matter should have been that the commonwealth should have stepped in years ago, taken over—

The Hon. K.A. Maywald: The Liberal Party opposes it.

The SPEAKER: Order, the minister!

Mr WILLIAMS: Come on, minister; you will get your opportunity, and I hope that when you do you will actually use your words and talk about what is in your mind and stop trying to make out what is in other people's minds.

The Hon. K.A. Maywald: Grow up, Mitch!

Mr WILLIAMS: Stop trying to put words into my mouth, minister. I have already explained it, and I will go back over it for the minister's benefit. The role of the High Court in this matter should have been protecting the commonwealth when it walked in and took over the management of the river. That is what the role of the High Court should have been.

The Hon. K.A. Maywald interjecting:

Mr WILLIAMS: Because your Premier was playing games. The previous premier of Victoria kept telling Malcolm Turnbull and John Howard, 'Yes; give me a couple more weeks; I'm almost there.' You know what happened; you were there. He kept saying to then prime minister Howard and Malcolm Turnbull, 'Just give us a couple more weeks. I'll have them sorted out; we're almost there.' They were—

The Hon. K.A. Maywald: You have no idea, Mitch.

Mr WILLIAMS: I do; I've got a lot of idea. What I will not do, minister, is, like some of your colleagues, come in here and repeat private conversations, which I have had with people who were in the room. I will not do that; but I do know what happened, and I do know what has happened over a whole host of matters relating to water where you and your government have got it totally wrong, like the desal, and those sorts of things, with your Premier out there saying, 'Won't it look stupid when it rains.' He kept saying that for a couple of years.

Unfortunately, the opposition has been put into an unenviable position on this. We are forced to support this measure. I do not think we do that without great feelings of sadness. We do not do it with any eagerness whatsoever. We are forced to do this because we have had mismanagement in a gross way for a significant amount of time.

I would dearly love the minister to explain why irrigators in some parts of the system can get 100 per cent of their water allocation, and just around the corner, down the river a few kilometres, they get 18 per cent. I would dearly love the minister to explain that. At the time we passed the historic legislation, as it has been described in some quarters, we also adopted a new Murray-Darling Basin agreement.

Why was it not in that agreement (which I presume this minister negotiated on behalf of South Australia) that there was going to be some equity as we move forward? Why is it that our irrigators are struggling on 18 per cent? As the member for Finniss pointed out, a number of irrigators in his electorate, my electorate and the member for Hammond's electorate have not been able to irrigate for several years. Even though they have received 18 per cent, they have already had to walk. In a lot of cases, they have sold their water and moved on.

If the minister wants to explain something to this house, she can explain why South Australian irrigators have been treated as they have when irrigators in other parts of the system are getting 95 to 100 per cent of their water. I am sure that is what your constituents would like to know because that is the question the constituents I talk to keep asking me, that is, if we have an historic agreement, why is it that people upstream can do whatever they like, and we are stuck here on 18 per cent?

The Hon. K.A. MAYWALD (Chaffey—Minister for the River Murray, Minister for Water Security) (17:16): I thank the opposition for its support for this legislation and for the irrigation communities. I remind members that this bill came about as a result of intergovernmental agreements, starting with the COAG Water Reform of 1994 and the National Water Initiative of 2004, which required jurisdictions to unbundle their water products, which is what this bill does. A consequence of the unbundling of those products and changes to the Irrigation Act to meet the National Water Initiative components will be that people will be able to transform their licences to entitlements, which they will then be able to sell if they choose to do so.

The purpose of bringing these bills into the house is not primarily the focus of exiting irrigators, as the member for MacKillop would have us believe. Once again, the member for MacKillop did not reflect the true intent of the legislation in his second reading speech, which is a real travesty. The member for MacKillop did make some mention about the national reform that is occurring at the moment. That national reform is indeed historic, and it will result in the establishment of a new basin-wide plan. That basin-wide plan will be developed over the next two years, and it is due to come into effect in 2011. It is about new governance: new caps on surface water and new caps on groundwater.

As a consequence of the development of the new basin-wide plan, under the Water Act 2007, the Murray-Darling Agreement will be required to be consistent with that basin-wide plan, as will all other plans throughout the basin that are developed by each state in each regional area. It is a huge step forward, and it is disappointing that members opposite are not approaching this in a bipartisan manner to ensure that we can get the reform necessary.

We have seen incremental changes in the Murray-Darling Basin over many years. The most recent change before this historic change was the establishment of the first cap, back in

1996, at 1993-94 levels of development opportunity. Of course, everyone now knows that cap was set too high, but at the time it was the best that South Australia could achieve, and I commend the then premier Dean Brown, who was involved with those negotiations. Dean Brown has now chosen to work with the state government to ensure that we get the best outcome we can for our communities during this difficult time. What is needed at this difficult time is strong leadership. It is leadership that will help, not divide, our communities during this difficult time.

Information is available, and I will get the details for the member for Finnis about how much water is in the system. How much water is in Hume, Dartmouth, Menindee and Lake Victoria has been fully audited, and information is also available about the amount of water that is in the system in the audited dams. We are operating the system and, at this stage, at the end of this water year, we expect the dams will be at a lower level than they were at this time last year. So, we are moving forward into another very difficult period, and none of the decisions that any government makes during this time will be easy. However, we will work tirelessly with the community, as we have to date, to try to minimise the impacts.

The other issues raised by the member for Hammond related to the management of the weir pools in South Australia. We have a number of weirs above Lock 1 that are maintained at (or as near as we can to) pool level, specifically to manage salinity. The salt interception schemes in this state have been built above Lock 1, because that is where the majority of the salt naturally comes into the river system. In fact, 50 per cent of the salt that comes into the River Murray enters on our side of the border, and above Lock 1 is the critical area where most of that salt incursion occurs.

We have been able to arrest much of that through the salt interception schemes that we have developed over the years. However, by dropping the weir pools below weir pool level (normal operating level) for any period of time will substantially increase the salinity of the water as it flows down over Lock 1. We are doing everything we can to manage the salinity level as it goes over Lock 1 so that we can minimise the impacts on our major pump off-takes, including those at Murray Bridge, Tailem Bend, Swan Reach and Mannum. So, they are the reasons why we must maintain those weir pools.

It is important to note that even dropping those weir pools would not actually raise the level in the weir pool between Blanchetown and the barrages because the extent and size of that weir pool is so massive in comparison to the body of water that is held above Lock 1. If the member would like a full briefing on all of those details I would be happy to provide him with that information.

The bill is a very important piece of legislation. It is, of course, in line with what successive governments have committed to in the national water reform process. I commend the bill to the house and I thank members for the contribution that had relevance to the bill; the other I will not comment on.

Bill read a second time and taken through its remaining stages.

[Sitting suspended from 17:24 to 17:45]

SELECT COMMITTEE ON THE RENMARK IRRIGATION TRUST BILL

The Hon. K.A. MAYWALD (Chaffey—Minister for the River Murray, Minister for Water Security) (17:45): I bring up the final report of the select committee, together with minutes of proceedings and evidence.

Report received.

The Hon. K.A. MAYWALD (Chaffey—Minister for the River Murray, Minister for Water Security) (17:45): I move:

That the report be noted.

I take this opportunity to thank the members of the committee for the manner in which they dealt with this issue through the select committee process. I thank the secretary of the committee for the way in which he was able to pull this together very quickly for us so that we could get the bill through the house in a fashion that will ensure that the legislation will be passed as soon as possible.

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (17:46): I, too, acknowledge the speedy work of the committee and the work of the secretary of the committee. As far as we on this side of the house were concerned this bill did not need to be held up for any particular reason. Obviously, it needed to go through in order for people to access exit grants, and also for the trading of water, and to fit in with federal legislation. I do commend the work of the select committee.

Motion carried.

RENMARK IRRIGATION TRUST BILL

Bill read a third time and passed.

At 17:47 the house adjourned until Wednesday 25 March 2009 at 11:00.