

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 4 June 2009

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

### LOCAL GOVERNMENT (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

**Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop) (10:32):** I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

This bill has come from the upper house. It was introduced into the upper house by the Leader of the Opposition (Hon. David Ridgway) and, obviously, gained the support of that chamber. The bill is quite a simple bill in itself but its ramifications are quite significant, and I will argue that it should be supported by this place and enacted as law for the state of South Australia.

The bill seeks to give local councils the power to make bylaws to ban smoking in certain public places. The bill specifically precludes local councils from making such bylaws which would pertain to a public place that is subject to a licence under the Liquor Licensing Act 1997. In essence, what the bill would do is give local councils the power to ban smoking in specified public places, such as a particular beach, parks, Rundle Mall, or places where significant events are being held, particularly those which are going to be attended by children.

We have three levels of government in Australia, principally so that individual levels of government can make rules and laws and decisions about areas which pertain to those levels of government. Local government, by its very name and nature, is about making laws and decisions which we might consider to be the order of minutiae, rather than in a general sense. I say that because from time to time this parliament has made laws about smoking, including banning smoking inside hotels and, previous to that, banning it in restaurants where people eat. More recently we banned smoking in cars when children are present. These things are done all for good reasons, and they are reasonable things for us to do. However, I do not think that the state parliament would ever ban smoking at a particular event where children were present, although it may be a very wise thing to do. The reality is that this parliament does not concern itself at that level; and that is why it is important to give this power to local councils.

There would be very good reasons for local councils to make a by-law, for instance, that bans smoking at a popular beach. Obviously the rules about making by-laws put certain obligations on the councils and with this particular bill, which has come from the other place, if a council made a by-law to ban smoking in a particular area it would be obliged to erect the necessary signage to notify the general public of the by-law and the smoking ban in that area. The bill also sets out that the council must fix penalties for breaches of the by-law, with a maximum fine of \$200. Councils would also be required to set an expiation fee of \$20 for a breach of the by-law.

That is the essence of what the bill will do. I have explained that from time to time we as a state parliament have, in an incremental fashion, introduced measures to curb smoking, but they have all been of a generic nature—that is, banning smoking across the board. The bill before us now would extend that power so that councils could go to specific areas, small locations, and ban smoking.

There are at least two reasons why we should give this power to local councils. The first is that there is obviously a significant health issue related to smoking. It was interesting to note that an article in the *Sunday Mail* last weekend claimed that South Australia was the ashtray of the nation, and South Australia seems to have performed very poorly in the last 12 months with regard to doing something about curbing smoking and addressing the attendant health issues. A number of people were quoted lamenting that South Australia seemed to have dropped the ball.

The South Australian division of the AMA noted some 12 months ago, in one of its publications, that the South Australian government, as part of its Strategic Plan, has a target to reduce smoking in South Australia. In fact, it noted that South Australia's Strategic Plan set a target of reducing the number of cigarette smokers in the age bracket of between 15 and 29 by 10 percentage points—down from 27.9 per cent to 17.9 per cent—by 2014. The AMA goes on to lament that that is a fine target, but the state government has done very little or nothing to try to achieve it.

The bill before us recognises the target in the state's Strategic Plan with particular reference to smoking among young people, because I would envisage that local government would be more likely to make a by-law concerning a site where young people are likely to congregate, such as a playground.

It seems to me that it is ludicrous to establish a playground where children can go to exercise and enjoy the open air if you also allow adults to be there—maybe supervising the children—but smoking. It sets a bad example. That does not even account for the fact that children are probably becoming passive smokers in the meantime. This will give local councils the opportunity to recognise that certain areas within their jurisdiction should have smoking bans in place.

The other issue is the environmental one. An individual cigarette butt seems a small piece of litter when we see it, but the cumulative effect of disposed cigarette butts which are disposed of wantonly by smokers—not necessarily in general—is that there are tens of thousands of them deposited all across this state every day and they form a formidable part of the litter stream. We have recently passed legislation in this state banning single-use shopping bags because we, as a parliament, decided that they cause a significant problem to our environment when they enter the litter stream.

Cigarette butts are just as toxic to the environment (even more so) as plastic shopping bags. Their longevity in the environment would be at least as long. However, because they are quite small individually they quite often go unnoticed. I am informed by my colleague in the other place that the city council has a significant issue with cigarette butts clogging up stormwater drains in the city. The number of cigarette butts that wash off places like the mall number tens of thousands, and they are entering the litter stream and staying there.

I am informed that, in addition to the synthetic material that cigarette butts are made from, there are significant chemicals, and that, after a cigarette is consumed, those chemicals then flow into our stormwater drainage system and from there into the environment. So, there are at least two very sound and significant reasons why we should be giving this power to local councils.

I urge the house to support this bill. I could read out all of the countries around the world who have legislated to move against smoking or tried to curb people's appetite for smoking, but those countries are already recorded in the *Hansard* of the other place and I draw members' attention to that. This particular power has been given to councils in other jurisdictions. I understand, that in New South Wales local councils have such powers and that in places like Bondi Beach smoking is banned.

I commend the bill to the house and, in closing, I will just point out that when I was touring in New South Wales quite recently looking at matters to do with irrigation and our dying but great river system, I stopped in Temora to get some lunch and my wife picked up a little personalised ashtray which people can slip into their pockets. I understand that local councils produce these and give them to places like delis and service stations to hand out to travellers. Again, that is to encourage people to dispose of their butts in a responsible manner rather than discarding them onto the ground.

**The Hon. R.B. Such:** Wouldn't it better to give up smoking?

**Mr WILLIAMS:** The member for Fisher said it would be better to give up smoking, and I heartily agree with him. As a reformed smoker, I heartily agree with him. Again, as a reformed smoker, I do not purport to suggest that everybody should immediately give up smoking, but I think we should allow councils the ability to protect citizens in their individual council areas. As with the other measures that have been taken from time to time by governments here in South Australia and in other places, this is a part of the incremental move against smoking in our community.

**Mr BIGNELL (Mawson) (10:45):** The government cannot support this bill on a number of grounds, and these reasons have previously been put on the record in another place. To reiterate, the government wants to strike an appropriate balance between the legitimate interests of both smokers and non-smokers. To strike that balance it is necessary to consider how, when and where any new restrictions on smoking might be imposed and enforced: whether it should be local government alone that enforces any such restrictions, the extent to which any exemptions should be allowed, the level of penalties that might be applied, the cost of enforcement so that enforcement is financially practical, and the possible effect upon businesses that may cater for both smokers and non-smokers.

Unfortunately, this bill has been prepared without fully considering these matters. This bill will permit a council to make a by-law to prohibit smoking in any defined public place. The term 'public place' is defined in section 4 of the act to include private land to which the public has access. A private function centre may have an outdoor area which may be considered a public place because it is private land to which the public has access.

This government has rightly banned indoor smoking where side stream smoke can have negative health impacts on non-smokers. Because some businesses have planned this and are catering for smokers in a way that does not have the same health risks, it would be inappropriate for councils to be given a broad power to override their decision.

While not detailed in the bill, the Hon. David Ridgway has specifically raised the issue of making the Tour Down Under and other South Australian events smoke free. I would like to assure the honourable member that, while his crusade is noble, it is unnecessary and misguided.

The Tour Down Under is an event I have covered and attended at most stages since its inception in 1999 and I have never seen smoking as a real problem at the event. Because this bill was introduced before this year's Tour Down Under, I specifically took notice. I saw one person at the start of the Norwood stage who was smoking, but I do not think he had anything to do with the race, he just happened to be walking along the footpath. I saw someone on the oval at Willunga who was smoking.

I rode the 97 kilometre stage 5 from Mount Pleasant to Angaston and, if there is ever a time you are going to smell smoke, it is when your lungs are at maximum workout rate as you are inhaling and trying to get some fuel to your heart. I did not smell any tobacco smoke on that ride either. I think the leader in another place may simply be after a cheap headline, rather than being serious about curbing smoking and stopping smoking at events where it is not seen as a major problem.

The member for MacKillop says that by giving these councils the power to fine someone \$20 for smoking where they are not meant to smoke will improve the situation. He says that it will help clean up our streets, our gutters and those little cracks in the pavement. Yes, cigarette butts are annoying. When you see people drop a butt on the ground or throw it out of the car window, it is annoying. When you see them stacked up on the side of the road or in the gutters, there is nothing worse because it looks terrible and it is terrible for our environment. These butts are going down the stormwater channels and out to sea. It is terrible, but there is already an act there and there is a fine. Local councils can fine people \$200 or so—

**Mr Williams:** \$350.

**Mr BIGNELL:** Well, \$350—they can fine them. How often do they do it? Very seldom, indeed. You already have a law there that councils can use to help curb the rate of smoking, yet it is not taken up by councils, so why give them another one that they are not going to enforce?

It is also interesting to note the disunity in the Liberal Party on this matter. I say this because on 12 November 2008 when this bill was voted on in the upper house, *Hansard* reports that Liberal members the Hons Caroline Schaefer and Rob Lucas voted with the Labor government.

You have to question the strength of the Liberals' upper house leader, the Hon. David Ridgway, when on the same day in a media release he said, 'I look forward to this bill passing with the full support of the South Australian parliament.' Prior to seeking the support of the entire parliament, a good starting point would have been with your own political party. So, the government opposes this bill.

**Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder) (10:50):** I must admit I am rather surprised by the comments by the member for Mawson on this. I think, firstly, he demonstrates the complete lack of support that exists within the Labor Party for local government as a complete industry when he says—and this is what I took the member's comments to mean—that local government would make frivolous decisions without considering the impact upon the community or businesses that might be in the area. I can tell you from personal experience that that is not how it works.

**Mr Bignell:** Since when is local government an industry?

**Mr GRIFFITHS:** Well, it is. It employs 7,000 people in this state, member for Mawson, so if that is not an industry, I do not know what is. The member for Mawson has actually criticised the intent of this bill, which was moved by the Hon. David Ridgway in another place and has now been

brought into the House of Assembly. I can tell you that this bill is sincere; it is not just a political opportunity to grab media headline, it is a real position that the Hon. David Ridgway has taken. He has quite often debated in our party room his concerns about smoking in our community and any efforts that we can make as an opposition to improve the health of South Australians and the environment of South Australia.

I think this bill is a good one. I rise in support of it today, because it provides an opportunity—where it is deemed appropriate—for local government, after consulting with communities and engaging business people who might be around the area, to look at what opportunities exist. I consider it to be no different from alcohol-free zones, which are supported under exactly the same principle. In certain cases, councils are entitled to create (via a by-law) an alcohol-free zone. I have never heard the honourable member talk negatively about that. This is exactly the same principle.

These are not frivolous decisions made by council. Quite often communities come to local government and suggest that there is an area that they would like to support for the nature and the quality of that zone. They suggest that, if alcohol is a problem, the removal of the ability to consume alcohol legally within that area improves it for the whole community. I see this bill as being no different to that. It makes sure opportunities exist to ensure that there is a healthy environment.

The member for MacKillop talked about playgrounds as being a classic example. Some of our playgrounds around the state have hundreds of people there at the same time. I have been to the playground on the northern side of the Adelaide Aquatic Centre, which is quite busy on a lot of days, and I think that is one example of a playground where we should not allow smoking.

It is true that parents are responsible these days. They are very concerned about the health of their children, and that is why the parliament has supported legislation restricting smoking in vehicles in which children up to the age of 16 are passengers. We took a bipartisan approach, we recognised that that was an opportunity to improve health, and we supported that.

That is why I am very surprised that the member for Mawson (on behalf of the government) does not support this bill, which is designed only to improve the health of South Australians. It is important that we have some debate about this. I can assure members that we on this side of the house all want to ensure that South Australia has a healthy future, not one where the risk is posed to us of an increasing number of people suffering from very severe health problems brought about by smoking. If this is a small initiative that can help in some way, it is one that this parliament should support.

I hope that most members on this side of the chamber rise to speak to this bill and make some comments about some of the remarks that the member for Mawson has put forward on behalf of the government.

**Mr VENNING (Schubert) (10:53):** I have been in this place for many years. I am quite amazed at the member for Mawson's approach on behalf of the government. I just cannot believe it, because it has been a big issue in this parliament for many years.

This bill was first proposed in another form: the Tobacco Products Regulation (A Smoke-Free Adelaide) Amendment Bill. However, after discussion with the stakeholders involved, particularly councils, it was deemed unworkable given councils' current lack of powers to enforce smoking bans.

I commend the mover of this motion in the first instance, the Hon. David Ridgway in another place (our leader in that house), the shadow minister (the member for MacKillop) and also the member for Goyder, who just made a very appropriate speech on this matter. We are very proud of our party's record on this issue—very proud indeed.

This bill rectifies the situation by affording councils the power to make by-laws prohibiting smoking in specified public places and, in turn, the power to make such laws. I have no problem at all with giving councils these powers. We have a couple of ex-mayors in this chamber, and I would have thought they would have been supportive, particularly the member for Light. I am amazed that he would sit back quietly and allow comments like that to be made. I am confident that each individual council can make appropriate laws such as this, and let them be the judge and jury in relation to this sort of matter.

We are all aware of the dangers of smoking, however, it seems that here in South Australia the message is not quite getting through yet. Obviously not in the member for Mawson's case. Just

a few days ago the Australian Medical Association rated South Australia as being one of the worst in the nation at giving up smoking. In fact, we were given the undignified title of the Ashtray Award in Australia—and the member makes speeches like that! Our deficiencies were listed as smoking outdoors in public places (as outlined by both the member for Mackillop and Goyder, which problem this bill seeks to deal with); smoke-free workplaces; and restrictions on tobacco marketing.

I think this legislation will be very useful for all councils. In the Schubert electorate we have many family events—family fun days, the vintage festival and other wine events—geared to families with activities such as face painting, jumping castles, the Tour Down Under, and the list goes on. That is without mentioning the fantastic restaurants we have, and many members have been there and many have chosen to get married in the Barossa. It is lovely to be in a beautiful restaurant and not have to put up with second-hand smoke. I think at events such as these there should be some restrictions on smoking.

Some people still smoke, and it is their choice, but I think that in this day and age people who do not smoke have some right to feel they can go to public places and events and not have to breathe other people's second-hand smoke. There was nothing worse than going out into public places and going home smelling like an ashtray. Even your clothes next day you would hang out to air because they stank because you had sat near a smoker the night before. That is a thing of the past. There is nothing worse than being a passive smoker, and today we know that passive smoking is as big a risk as doing the smoking, in many cases.

I remind the house that this parliament was one of the first in Australia to put restrictions on smoking, and I pay tribute to the previous Liberal government, in particular the Hon. Michael Armitage. Members should read and see what was done. At the time, he waged a very strong campaign against the then powerful tobacco lobby, and he stuck to a very strong campaign. Some of us were a little bit startled at what he was doing because he was a bit before his time, but we were one of the first parliaments in Australia to move on this. It is all there to read, and it is all dated, of course. In particular, we were the first in Australia to have the messages on the cigarette boxes. We did all that then, but what has been done since? Since this government has come into power we have gone soft on this.

**The Hon. L. Stevens:** What? You are joking!

**Mr VENNING:** I know the member for Little Para is over there, and I understand that there was some activity, but you have to give the Hon. Michael Armitage the kudos—

*The Hon. L. Stevens interjecting:*

**Mr VENNING:** Yes, you do—for first seizing on this. We have heard the stories about civil liberties and everything else but, when it is people's health that you are discussing, I think it is very important. I do not believe we have done enough in recent times, because we need to do all we can.

As a youngster I used to smoke. I was not ever a committed smoker, but a lot of my friends are. There is nothing worse than going out with smokers. There were several of my friends who smoked, and one was a minister in this place. I said to her, 'Dorothy, I just wish you would stop smoking because in my after-life I still want to be friends with you and not attend your funeral.' There are many people like that still in this place who have to go down into the fresh air. However, I will say, sir, that over the years, bit by bit, we have forced the smokers out of this place, out of Botany Bay and onto the extremes of this place. We are enforcing a message. We are thinking of people's health and we are thinking of public health, and I think we should do this.

I think this bill goes a long way. I am sorry the member for Mawson has made that speech. I think it is inappropriate. I am happy to give these powers to local government and let them be the judge and jury, because this is an issue we still have to confront. I certainly support the motion.

**The Hon. L. STEVENS (Little Para) (10:59):** First, I congratulate any effort that is made in the legislatures and in government policy to reduce smoking in our community. I know it is true that at this point in time we have seen in Australia a significant decrease in the levels of smoking over recent years. That has come about in no small measure because of the concerted efforts by all the states in Australia to address levels of smoking by various measures.

As a former Minister for Health, and one who brought in a whole tranche of measures some three or four years ago, I must put on the record some matters in relation to this, in particular, some of the statements that have been made in the house by members opposite. First, I think the fight against tobacco smoking has been a concerted effort by people on both sides—all sides—of

the political spectrum, and it has been one of those issues that have had to fight very, very powerful stakeholders. As such, as in any battles of this sort, you get incremental changes occurring at various times across the whole jurisdiction and the whole of Australia so that one state moves out in front of the others and the others catch up; then the commonwealth and eventually the whole box and dice moves forward.

I think that, if we are looking at the history of activity against tobacco smoking in South Australia, we must start with John Cornwall on the Labor side. Let us put the whole perspective on the table. The Hon. John Cornwall in the South Australian upper house brought the first tranche of tobacco legislation to South Australia. Certainly, the Hon. Michael Armitage as minister for health in the Brown-Olsen governments brought in legislation, and it was the first of the smoke-free dining legislation, but it had exemptions to that measure built in. Okay; that was all that he was able to get through at that time. Unfortunately, under the stewardship of the next health minister, the Hon. Dean Brown, nothing happened at all; the whole thing stopped in relation to tobacco control.

When the Rann Labor government came to power we moved forward again with a whole tranche of—

*Mr Williams interjecting:*

**The Hon. L. STEVENS:** Just to correct the member for MacKillop, I know this very well: the Hon. Dean Brown did not move the agenda forward one iota in this area. When the Rann government came to power, another tranche of legislation, the smoke-free workplaces, went through; the hotel and club bans went through; there were issues in relation to advertising; the removal of the exemptions that existed under the Michael Armitage bill occurred; and there were changes to retail obligations in relation to the sale of tobacco products and other measures. Since that time, in the second term of the Rann government, some other measures have been added. So, let us put the whole thing on the table.

I notice also last week the Dirty Ashtray Award that was given to South Australia and I think the Northern Territory by the lobby group ASH. I would like to say that I think that was fairly churlish. I think great strides have been made. I know that, when we announced the final abolition of tobacco smoking in all workplaces, including pubs, we led the nation in that direction ahead of all the other states and caused the rest of the country to move towards that position. So, I think that label for South Australia on two very tiny points was a fairly churlish one by ASH. With those comments, I would say the war on tobacco smoking has proceeded well; we need to continue the efforts.

**Mr PENGILLY (Finniss) (11:05):** I recognise the member for Little Para's contribution, and I recall her efforts towards the abolition of smoking and smoking related illnesses, and I strongly support the member for MacKillop's opening remarks and others on this side. We seem to have somewhat of a buggers' muddle here, because the member for Mawson's contribution 15 or 20 minutes ago indicated that the government is opposed to the honourable member's bill, and I have some problem coming to grips with that. I think that anything that stops people smoking or reduces the impact of smoking or increases people's chances of living longer through not smoking or absorbing smoke needs to be commended.

Also, having watched my father die from a smoking related illness, it is never far from the front of my mind to do anything I can to support any efforts to reduce the disgusting and insidious habit. It is a disease and an addiction, and I believe the contribution from the member for MacKillop from the Hon. David Ridgway in the upper house is a step in the right direction.

I am concerned that the Rann Labor government does not seem to have the courage to allow local government to get on with its business; it does not seem to support local government or have the confidence in it to allow this bill to have right of passage. I was at a function in the member for Mawson's electorate on Sunday night that was attended by about 120 people, and I had to fight my way through a sea of smoke to get through into the room before it commenced. I find the whole thing quite offensive. What the Hon. Michael Armitage did when in government in the nineties was a step in the right direction.

If this is truly an indication of where the government is coming from, perhaps the Minister for Health would like to put in his two bob's worth. I cannot believe that, having sat through the affairs of last night on the equal opportunity bill, the government comes in today on something as simple as the member for MacKillop introduced from the upper house and will not support it. I find that quite bizarre. Where is the direction of this government coming from? Is it from the member for

Mawson, is it from the Premier or is it from the Minister for Health? Obviously, I clearly support the member for MacKillop.

**Mr PICCOLO (Light) (11:08):** I rise briefly on this matter to clarify some matters raised by people who pretend to know local government when clearly they do not. First of all, one of the reasons that was mentioned for introducing this bill was to protect kids in playgrounds, etc. The reality is that at the moment local government has the power to make rules about the use of any land or building under its control. So, councils have existing power over any public building or public lands they own. If they are not doing it now, the question one has to ask is: why is local government not banning smoking in those areas when it has the existing power to do so?

It is unfortunate that members opposite have not done their homework because those powers do exist. By all means, trust local government to do the right thing, but talk to them and find out why they are not banning smoking on some reserves. In fact, some councils already do ban smoking in public places. For example, in some playgrounds there are signs that clearly indicate that you cannot smoke. That is a power that local government is currently exercising in some areas; the fact that they all do not is a relevant question. However, you do not need this bill to protect children in reserves, playgrounds or public buildings.

Another issue raised was that we do not trust local government and that is why we are not supporting the bill. That is very interesting because, only a few weeks ago, I heard debate in the upper house on a very good bill that passed through this place. The reason the Liberals opposed it was that they could not trust local government to enforce or apply the proposed law.

It is interesting that their upper house colleagues do not support local government and oppose bills because they cannot trust it to do the right thing. That bill was about improving the environment, so it is interesting that, according to the member for Goyder, some things in the environment are important but other things are not.

The alcohol-free zone is a very good example, and involves issues around not only behaviour but also safety. Clearly, this is not the same as smoking, which is an offensive habit, and I accept that. I am a nonsmoker and always have been. I do not like the habit, and I do not particularly like going to people's homes where they smoke. Having said that, to put this in the same category as alcohol-free zones is a nonsense. In addition, alcohol-free zones can be implemented only with the concurrence of the commissioner for liquor licensing to ensure that alcohol-free zones are not used for political purposes, and that is a check and balance. So, that legislation is quite different.

The member for Finnis said that we should do anything to reduce the take-up of smoking, and I could not agree more: we should do everything we can to make sure that people do not take up smoking. The only area of growth in smoking is amongst young people and, according to him, we should do anything: we should either ban it or do what his colleagues suggested last week, that is, we should fine young people who smoke. If, according to his criteria, we should do everything, perhaps we should do that as well.

When you look at the reasons the Liberals have given for this measure, clearly it is clouded in smoke because it has not been thought through. If they are sincere about doing something about smoking, they would support education programs and support the things we have done on this side of the house about advertising, etc. and would not bring in these sorts of things to the chamber that really do not achieve much because, on the important issue of young people in public places, over which local government has care and control, local government already has the power to act. The Liberals should make sure that the councils in their area exercise those powers now.

Debate adjourned on motion of Dr McFetridge.

#### **TOBACCO PRODUCTS REGULATION (BAN ON CHILDREN SMOKING) AMENDMENT BILL**

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (11:12):** Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Tobacco Products Regulation Act 1997. Read a first time.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (11:13):** I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

I bring to the attention of the house the purpose of this bill: it amends the appropriate act in regard to the control of tobacco to introduce a fine for minors who smoke. The reason I do this is very simple. The current legislation essentially provides that those who sell cigarettes to minors are fined quite heavily; in fact, in some cases they can lose their licence.

Those who give cigarettes to minors, including parents, also suffer a fine. It seems to me a loophole in the law that those 15, 16 and 17 year olds (and those are the people the law targets) who sit around and smoke suffer absolutely no penalty. Minors are fined for all sorts of things, such as littering, evading paying their bus fare to school and speeding. They can also be dealt with for under-age drinking.

It seems to me that, if we are serious about sending young people a message—I note that the member for Light talked about the level of smoking in young people—it is an appropriate mechanism to have the capacity to fine them. I am not particularly fussed about the level of the fine. The member for MacKillop introduced a bill in which the fine was \$20; I picked the same level of fine for littering, which is \$315. My theory was that if you were getting fined \$315 for dropping a cigarette butt, it seems a bit unusual to be fined a lesser amount for actually using it. I am relaxed about the level of the fine. The principle that I am trying to introduce is the principle of sending a message to young people that smoking is really a no-go zone.

I pick up the government's own stats. The Minister for Substance Abuse issued a press release in March, or May, which stated that there is about a 23 per cent take-up rate of smoking between 15 and 29 year olds and that half of those teenagers who take up smoking will die of smoking-related diseases.

I, personally, do not have a problem with saying to a young person that they are going to get fined for underage smoking, because underage drinking is an offence and, if we are serious about smoking then I do not see why the seller or the giver to underage people should be penalised but those 15, 16 and 17 years olds who want to smoke suffer no penalty.

I do not care if someone amends this bill to make the fine \$50, \$70, or whatever the amount may be. It is not the level of the fine that I am necessarily arguing, it is the principle that the authority should have the chance to fine people who are under age.

I know that some people will say, 'Where are young people going to get \$100, \$200, or \$300?', whatever the level of the fine is. My argument to that is very simple. Where do they get the \$100 or \$200 for the speeding fine, the underage drinking fine, the littering fine or the fare evasion fine? They get it from exactly the same source. Many kids at 15, 16 and 17 have part-time jobs, and the system allows them to make part payments, so they can pay \$10 or \$15 a week or fortnight.

The system is flexible enough to allow the payment to be made. If they do get a fine then they may sit down with their parents and explain to their parents why they are smoking. It can give parents an opportunity to explain to their children exactly what they are doing to themselves long term. That is the essence of the bill. I look forward to the debate in due course.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mrs Geraghty.

#### **TOBACCO PRODUCTS REGULATION (PRESCRIBED SMOKING AGE) AMENDMENT BILL**

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (11:17):** Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Tobacco Products Regulation Act 1997. Read a first time.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (11:18):** I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

I should make the point that the preceding bill and this bill are private members' bills and not necessarily the policy of the Liberal Party. I make that clear. This particular bill is somewhat more controversial. I am really putting it out for public discussion, almost like a white paper, if you like. I am doing this because I want to create community debate about the level of smoking.

My theory is this: the public, the press and the parliament spend a lot of time talking about the road toll. The road toll in South Australia is about 100 people a year and, naturally, we all think that is still too high and we have all sorts of policies to reduce that. For every one person who is killed on the roads in South Australia, 12 are dying from smoking and smoking-related diseases. In South Australia, according to the government's own figures, 1,200 people a year die of smoking and smoking-related diseases, and about 14,900 die in Australia every year.

It seems to me that, the way parliaments all around Australia are heading, we are slowly restricting people's capacity to smoke. There was another bill today about whether councils should be able to restrict smoking in public areas like beaches and reserves. What we are heading down



the path of is having, essentially, a community that will have no smoking and smoking areas, but I do not think that is going to reduce smoking a lot further than it already has.

I think the parliaments have picked off the low hanging fruit in relation to smoking, through the enclosed areas type legislation where we have prohibited smoking, but the next step has become a lot harder because you are talking about not smoking in public areas—and we see that the government is opposing the matter that the member for MacKillop raised earlier.

It seems to me that if a company came to the government today and said, 'We have a product that you can tax; it will only kill 15,000 people a year but you can tax it,' I do not think that the government would licence it. I do not think that the government today would licence that product for sale. Every year we have product recall because of health reasons: poisoned meats or products that are out of date that are going to cause health issues—they are withdrawn because of the health impact. So, I do not think that a government would licence another type of product that would kill 15,000 a year.

What this bill provides is that if that is the view then it should be phased out. Let us draw a line in the sand and say this: 'All existing smokers can still smoke,' subject to whatever the laws are, as in you cannot smoke in dining areas and those sorts of things. So we are not taking away their right to smoke, but we can say to the next generation: 'We are actually going to have a smoking age that lifts every year so that, in effect, the next generation cannot smoke.' They do not get a criminal conviction, they simply get an expiation notice, and so it is phased out over 70 to 100 years.

In this particular bill I have picked a date so that anyone born after 1 January 1993 cannot smoke. I am not so naive as to say that there would not be a black market, but if we could reduce the level of smoking to the same level of illegal drug use that exists today, then you would reduce the number of deaths by 1,100 a year in South Australia. About 100 people a year die from a drug overdose: heroin, cocaine, amphetamines, etc. If you could reduce smoking to the same level of illegal drug use you would save 1,100 lives a year in South Australia, accepting that there would be a black market.

I know that when the smoking age is, say, 20 the 18 year olds would probably still get away with it to some degree, but when the smoking age is 30 the 18 year olds would not get away with it, when the smoking age is 40 the 25 year olds would not get away with it, and when the smoking age is 60 the 40 year olds would not get away with it. Slowly, over 100 years it could be phased out. I just do not accept that a government would license another product that kills 15,000 people a year.

I think the parliament, over 20 years, has done a great job on the road toll, reducing it from about 370 deaths a year when I was young to about 100. Now, let us say that the level of smoking has reduced and that the level of deaths has dropped by half—it is a long tail of deaths, so the level of deaths will drop over a period of time—from 1,200 a year in South Australia to 600 a year. We still have 600 people being killed by smoking as against 100 being killed in road deaths. The impact is still significant.

Smoking in this country costs Australia about \$31.5 billion a year, according to the federal government's 2004 report; the costs of tobacco, alcohol and illicit drug abuse to Australian society costs about \$56 billion a year. John Hill, our current health minister, has told the parliament that at the current rate of expansion of the health services—which is 8 or 9 per cent growth in real funding every year—the entire state budget will be sucked up by the health budget by 2032. Clearly, that is unsustainable.

There are three drivers of health costs: the ageing population, obesity and diabetes, and smoking. We cannot do a lot about ageing, and obesity and diabetes are very difficult to deal with because there are so many different issues that cause them, but smoking involves only one aspect, and that is the use of one product. This bill does not take away anyone's existing right to smoke—everyone who currently smokes can still smoke—however, it says to the next generation that we actually got it wrong, and phases it out. Parliaments around the world have phased out all sorts of things because of health impacts—Agent Orange, a whole range of pesticides and other things have been phased out over time because they have been found to have unhealthy impacts. Smoking is the only product I know that, if used to the manufacturer's instructions, will kill you.

This bill is put out really to create discussion. I am not so naive as to expect that it will actually be passed by the parliament, but I put it out in the form, if you like, of a discussion paper or white paper so that the community has the opportunity of greater debate on the issue of smoking

and on where we go next on smoking policy. We are killing 1,200 South Australians a year; that is 12 times the road toll. The community is extraordinarily focused on the road toll, and I am trying to apply as much focus in relation to the issue of smoking. With those words, I look forward to hearing comments from the house, and seek leave to have the remainder of my second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

The 2004 federal government report shows that, interestingly, for Australians alcohol cost \$15.3 billion (27.3 per cent) and all illicit drugs combined totalled \$8.2 billion (14.6 per cent). Tobacco tax revenue in 2004-05 exceeded tobacco-attributable costs borne by the public sector by more than \$3.5 billion. Of this surplus, \$2.7 billion went to the commonwealth and around \$800 million to the states. This is another reason to phase it out over 100 years as it gives the budget a long time to adjust to the impact.

Some people will argue that prohibition does not work. People will still smoke. To some degree this would be right. However, all illicit drug use combined in total cost Australia in 2004-05 \$8.2 billion with 872 deaths nationally or about 70 deaths in South Australia. It took up 199,706 hospital bed days nationally or 16,476 bed days in South Australia. If we achieved a reduction in smoking to the same level as all other illicit drugs combined we would achieve:

- a reduction in costs to society of \$46 billion per year;
- a saving of over 14,000 lives per year nationally or 1,100 lives annually in South Australia;
- a freeing up of hospital bed days of 554,000 per year nationally or 44,320 in South Australia.

According to the 'State of Public and Environmental Health Report for South Australia 2007-2008' smoking rates remained stable from 2006 to 2007 among all age groups except the over 60s, which declined significantly. The smoking prevalence rate in 2007 was 20.6 per cent amongst adults.

According to Jane Lomax's press release of 27 March 2009:

'One in two people who start smoking as teenagers will eventually die from tobacco related diseases...23 per cent of young South Australians between 15 and 29 years old smoke...smoking remains the single biggest cause of premature death in our state with about three South Australian's dying each day from tobacco-related illness, or about 1,200 a year.'

According to Kidney Health Australia 'people who smoke are three times more likely to have reduced kidney function and have a 4 to 5 times greater risk of heart attack or stroke.'

Debate adjourned on motion of Mrs Geraghty.

## **ELECTRICITY (FEED-IN RATES) AMENDMENT BILL**

Second reading.

**Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop) (11:26):** I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

This bill, like the earlier matter, has come from the other place. In fact, I have great pleasure in sponsoring this bill through this house after it was moved in the other place by the Hon. Mark Parnell, representing the Greens. It is in consequence of legislation passed through the parliament that established a feed-in scheme to encourage people to put photovoltaic cells on their properties to produce electricity. The feed-in scheme principally ensures that those people get a price for the electrons they generate and feed back into the electricity grid, a premium price compared to the general price of electricity.

In reality, the scheme that was introduced by the government of South Australia is seriously flawed. It is a net feed-in scheme as opposed to what should be (as is generally argued by the industry) a gross feed-in scheme, and I will talk about that as I move on through the debate. The other problem with the feed-in scheme we have here in South Australia is that it was established not to promote a growth in the renewables industry but to promote the Premier and his so-called green credentials. The legislation we brought in had one motive behind it, and that was so that the Premier could stand up and claim—as he did in this house in Tuesday this week in a ministerial statement—that this is the first jurisdiction in Australia to have a feed-in scheme. That is the problem: the Premier, the man who says 'action now for the future', actually means 'action now for my benefit'.

This parliament passed legislation that allowed the Premier to promote himself rather than give a proper incentive to those who wish to do the right thing by the environment and invest money to install photovoltaic generators on their properties, utilise that electricity and feed it into the scheme but also achieve a reasonable pay-back time, one that is significantly less than the life

of the photovoltaic cells they install. Without a feed-in scheme that was the problem, the pay-back time for a photovoltaic system was probably in the order of 20 to 30 years and the actual life expectancy of photovoltaic cells that are available on the market today is a similar period—probably 25 to 30 years. So, there was no financial incentive at all for people to install photovoltaic generators.

Debate adjourned.

### **CHRONIC PAIN HEALTH CARE**

**The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher) (11:30):** I move:

That this house calls on the state government to review facilities and services available for those suffering from chronic pain with a view to further improving health care for South Australians.

Sir, I am sure there are other members here (I know the member for Frome is one) who have been contacted by constituents who are concerned about the issue of chronic pain and pain relief. As the motion states, I am not saying that the government and the current hospital medical system are not doing anything—they are; what I am suggesting is that perhaps the government, through the two ministers (minister Lomax-Smith and minister Hill), could have a look at the services and facilities available for dealing with chronic pain to see if they can be improved.

I understand that there is something like 6,000 South Australians who are receiving pain relief treatment involving the use of opiates or a similar type of medication. I appreciate that the issue of pain relief is not easy or simple. I have great sympathy for people who have chronic pain. I must say that I have been fortunate in my life in that I have caused pain to others but I have never experienced chronic pain myself.

I would like to put before the parliament some of the issues put by people who have contacted me regarding the matter of chronic pain relief. In doing so, I should say that I have spoken informally with both minister Hill and minister Lomax-Smith about this issue and alerted them to some of the issues and concerns raised with me by constituents about the matter of pain relief.

One of the central concerns put to me is that (about 18 months ago) the body regulating the use of drugs for pain relief has been moved to the Drug and Alcohol Services SA (DASSA). There has been concern expressed that it should not have been moved from SA Health to Drug and Alcohol Services SA. The argument put and the claim made is that DASSA is dealing with drug addicts and should not be the body dealing with people who require drug treatment in order to deal with chronic pain.

I am sure the minister or some other member in here will respond to these points and make a case which, obviously, will be different from what has been put to me. Constituents have made some claims which, as I say, I am raising on their behalf. I will be interested to hear what the minister or nominated MP puts in response. Constituents have put to me that it takes a long time to get approval for pain treatment for their patients. They spend a lot of time negotiating with DASSA and then wait many weeks for approval. Clearly, if someone is suffering from chronic pain then delay would obviously add to the burden that they are already carrying.

Another claim is that doctors are now choosing not to deal with pain patients because of the difficulties in getting approval and so on and that the treatment is excessively regulated and primitive. I guess we can all acknowledge, especially where you are using certain drugs, that the authorities have to be careful that they do not, in any way, promote the misuse of drugs. I am sure that will be one of the arguments that the minister will use in his response.

Constituents also say that DASSA (Drug and Alcohol Services SA) are controlling pain patients with mechanisms that are more appropriate for drug addicts, including sending non-addicted patients to a drug addiction centre (Waranilla), thereby denying them the doctor of their choice. That is a claim made and, once again, I will be interested to hear a response.

Furthermore, they suggest that decisions are made without examining the patient, taking their history or speaking to the treating doctor. It is stated also that the group Dignity For Pain Sufferers (DFPS) is aware of 100 people who are so traumatised that they have joined that organisation in order to lobby for support. They suggest that there could possibly be another 500 who are not being offered pain relief because their doctors are fearful to prescribe adequate medication as it may incur the wrath of the regulators.

Another issue they have raised is that, currently, there is no legal appeal against the regulator's decision. I would certainly endorse the fact (and I am sure the ministers would, too) that the wellbeing of patients and the treatment and alleviation of pain should be the main considerations in any scheme administered by the state government. I have to say from my dealings with the Royal Adelaide Hospital Pain Clinic in following up for constituents that I have been very impressed by the prompt response and attention given by the clinical nurse consultant who works in that area. There is no doubt that there is a commitment to the welfare of the patient. The question is: can the system be made better?

The thrust of this motion is really to ask the two ministers to have a look to see whether we have the best arrangements in place. I suppose there will always be some people for whom it is not possible to give 100 per cent satisfaction. We know that, with certain conditions, there is no total pain relief. We know that, sadly, this happens with certain cancers—some people cannot get 100 per cent pain relief. However, for most people the technology is there to provide adequate pain relief.

To conclude, a constituent I will call Mr M says that he is in constant pain. He has been assisted by the Royal Adelaide Hospital pain clinic. He has had implants that have not worked properly and other complications. I guess he is one of those who is in the category of feeling as though they would like more effective assistance and treatment. I have been contacted by at least one person who was specialising in pain relief who has expressed concern about the system. As I said earlier, the authorities are clearly trying to make sure that there is no misuse or abuse of some of the more powerful painkillers by people whose main purpose may not be simply pain relief.

We need—and I am asking the government—to have a look at the system and the arrangements to see whether this system can be better, because we do not want any South Australian unnecessarily enduring chronic ongoing pain when we could do something about it. I commend the motion to the house. I understand the opposition will be seeking to amend the motion. At the end of the day, this is not about trying to score points or votes: it is about trying to help our fellow South Australians to have a quality of life which, sadly, some currently miss out on. I commend the motion.

**Ms SIMMONS (Morialta) (11:39):** I move to amend the motion as follows:

That this house calls on the state government to continue to provide services to those suffering from chronic pain as part of the Health Care Plan, which aims to improve health care for South Australians.

**The Hon. R.B. SUCH:** I am happy to accept the amendment.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** I move to disallow the amendment.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I have not seen the amendment in writing yet. I need to see it in writing.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** Madam Deputy Speaker—

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! I do not need to hear debate. Having read the amendment, it is in order. It is not a direct negative and it is on the same topic as the original motion. Indeed, I think I heard the mover indicate that he was prepared to accept it. The member for Morialta.

**Ms SIMMONS:** Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker.

#### DEPUTY SPEAKER'S RULING, DISSENT

**Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (11:41):** I move:

That the Deputy Speaker's ruling be disagreed to.

Madam Deputy Speaker, I dissent from your ruling. I may not have heard it correctly but my understanding is that the mover of the amendment called on the state government to continue to provide services—it may have been 'and facilities'—consistent with the part of the Health Care Plan in respect of chronic pain, etc.

I wish to present to you, Madam Deputy Speaker, in dissenting from your ruling on this, that this current motion seeks a review of the facilities and services based on a whole lot of issues that the mover has raised. The mover of the amendment has proposed that we continue to proceed with the same services we have. Madam Deputy Speaker, I put to you that, in fact, that is in direct contradiction to the original motion because the mover has proposed that there be some inquiry

into a number of concerns raised but the amendment proposes an entirely different purport than the motion—that is, that everything we have is fine; let's just continue it. That is really not what is being asked by the mover of the original motion.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Member for Bragg, you need to provide the dissent in writing.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** May I have a copy of the amended motion which was also in writing and handed to you?

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Deputy leader, have you moved your motion of dissent?

**Ms CHAPMAN:** Yes.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Is that seconded?

**An honourable member:** Yes.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** In that case, one speaker is permitted to speak for 10 minutes in support of the motion of dissent and one speaker is permitted to speak for 10 minutes against the motion of dissent.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** The motion currently before the house is to call upon the state government to review facilities and services available for the clientele that we are talking about, that is, people in chronic pain. The amendment proposed by the member for Morialta (as I read it) calls upon the state government to continue to provide services to those suffering from chronic pain as part of the Health Care Plan, which aims to improve the health care of South Australians.

That is quite different from the purport of the first motion. The mover—to whom I am sure you listened attentively—presented to the house an argument (yet untested) that these are services currently provided by the state government. That is agreed. Everyone knows that. They are provided to people who suffer from chronic pain. What is being asked in the motion is that there be a review of those services, because he has outlined a number of bases upon which he says they are either inadequate, inappropriate or unacceptable. That is what the motion is about.

The amendment is to ask the house to continue to provide the service that is the subject of the motion, which is not in issue. We know that that is happening and that it will continue to happen. No action of substance is being sought in the motion. It does not seek that the service be discontinued or suspended in any way. It is a new motion to ask the house to endorse what the government should continue to do. It is doing that anyway; it is not in issue.

I put to the house that this is, in fact, an entirely different direction and completely removes from the motion the object of it, that is, to ask the house that there be a review. There is nothing specified in the motion of substance as to how that would occur, who should do it, or anything else; only that there are problems and that there needs to be a review. I do not foreshadow any motion in which the mover or I will, in any way, ask for the current operation to be suspended pending that review. If that was the case, it might invite the mover of the amendment to pursue the support of the house to continue the current program, but that is not in issue.

Whilst there is no dispute about the amendment to the motion, it should not be accepted as an amendment to the original motion, because it clearly goes in a completely different direction from the issue of those who suffer from chronic pain and are reliant on the government for the current services. So, I ask you to reject the amended motion. For the purpose of managing the debate, Madam Deputy Speaker, I foreshadow a further amendment to the current motion when this matter has been dealt with.

**Ms SIMMONS (Morialta) (11:50):** I would like to speak against the current motion. The amended motion that stands is a sensible way forward and was, in fact, endorsed by the mover of the original motion. I am sure that if we check *Hansard* we will see that it was supported by the member for Fisher.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** On a point of order, I note that, in speaking in opposition to me on the motion of dissent, the mover of the amendment has opened by addressing the subject matter with her intention to oppose the principal motion. That may be her choice, but—

**Ms Simmons:** No, it's your motion.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** Right; that's clear? I have moved a motion of dissent.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! Deputy leader, please take your seat. The motion before the chair is that the chair's ruling be dissented from. The member for Morialta quite clearly indicated that she was opposing that motion. The member for Morialta.

**Ms SIMMONS:** Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker, you are quite right. I am speaking here to oppose the dissent motion that is before the house at the moment. At no time have I suggested that I am going to oppose the motion of the original mover. I would like to say that the amended version was endorsed by the original mover of the motion, the member for Fisher. I think that, if we check *Hansard*, that interjection will be there, because he clearly said that he agreed to the amended version of this motion. So, I think that stands for itself. I think the deputy leader is really trying to mislead the house because SA Health continues to review and initiate strategies around chronic disease, and will continue to do so. If I had been given the opportunity to speak, that was one of the points that was going to come forward. However, the dissent that we have I believe should not be adhered to.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The reason for my ruling that the amendment was in order is that it was not a direct negative. It offered the house a choice of motions, not a negative of motions, and it was clearly on the same topic. The question is that the chair's ruling be dissented from.

The house divided on the motion:

AYES (15)

Brock, G.G.	Chapman, V.A. (teller)	Evans, I.F.
Goldsworthy, M.R.	Griffiths, S.P.	Gunn, G.M.
Hanna, K.	Pederick, A.S.	Penfold, E.M.
Pengilly, M.	Pisoni, D.G.	Redmond, I.M.
Such, R.B.	Venning, I.H.	Williams, M.R.

NOES (26)

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

PAIRS (4)

Hamilton-Smith, M.L.J.	Rann, M.D.
McFetridge, D.	Foley, K.O.

Majority of 11 for the noes.

Motion thus negatived.

**CHRONIC PAIN HEALTH CARE**

Debate resumed.

(Continued from page 3060.)

**Ms SIMMONS (Morialta) (11:59):** Epidemiological studies suggest that in Australia approximately 20 per cent of adults describe that they suffer from chronic disabling pain. This is generally associated with muscular, skeletal or neurological disease. Approximately half of these adults describe severe unrelieved pain for which they regularly receive help from medical or allied health providers.

It is extremely unfortunate that approximately 60 per cent of Australians receiving disability welfare or workers compensation payments cite chronically painful conditions as the main reason for their inability to participate in the workforce.

We know that chronically painful conditions represent the largest single group of conditions presenting to primary health care services. Of these, chronic back pain is the most common adult diagnostic presentation in general practice. It is reassuring that, fittingly, most chronic pain is able to be managed effectively in general practice. However, there remains a significant minority of patients with complex chronic pain whose conditions are difficult to manage without specialist help. Some of these patients require complex medication regimes that are outside the everyday experience of most general practitioners. Some require interventional treatments requiring specific technical skills. Many require the skills of a multidisciplinary team, with input from providers in medicine, nursing, physiotherapy, psychology and even psychiatry.

This group of patients requires specialist services that are generally only provided by multidisciplinary pain management services, and this is really where these patients need to be referred to from their general practitioner. There are three public hospitals that provide this service in South Australia: the Flinders Medical Centre, the Repatriation General Hospital and the Royal Adelaide Hospital.

Of course, SA Health continues to review and initiate strategies around chronic disease and self management support. That has never been in dispute, and they will continue to review and initiate these new strategies as they emerge. This may include holding forums and education sessions for organisations and individuals and the development of team based care plans, because often it is not medication that is the answer to all chronic pain conditions.

Self management support includes helping individuals form better partnerships with clinicians to provide better management of their chronic pain condition. For example, a regional back pain clinic has been set up by the Central Northern Adelaide Health Service to provide a physiotherapy led assessment clinic to improve back pain management. To date, the program has achieved quite considerable successes in this area. There have been out of this clinic extremely low conversion to surgery rates: only 2 per cent of clients are now requiring surgery.

There has been a reduction in waiting times for assessment or consultation from nine months to five months. Those patients who are classed as 'did not attends', which is apparently a category, were reduced from 20 per cent to 5 per cent, and 57 per cent of patients were discharged back to general practitioners with pain management plans compared with the previous figure of 26 per cent.

In addition, as part of the implementation of GP Plus Health Care services, which are being spread out across South Australia, a project is currently under way in the northern metropolitan Adelaide area to develop a model of care using general practitioners with a special interest in chronic pain. Not all GPs have that specialist knowledge, so it is really important that we have a cluster of GPs who have become experts in that area. I commend the amendment to the house.

**Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (12:04):** I may need your guidance as to how we deal with this, Madam Deputy Speaker, because I propose to speak against the amendment, and the rules indicate that the principal debate has to be dealt with here as there is no second opportunity. However, I foreshadow a further amendment to the motion, and I indicate, so that it is absolutely clear for the purpose of any negotiation in any subsequent adjournment of this debate, what we are seeking. We are seeking to have inserted in the amended amendment the words 'and further that the state government do review the practices of Drug and Alcohol Services South Australia, and in particular'—

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Deputy leader, you have the opportunity to move that amendment now. Do you have it in writing?

**Ms CHAPMAN:** I do.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Would you like to move that now, and then you can speak to your amendment?

**Ms CHAPMAN:** I am happy to do that. My understanding is that, after some discussion with the mover, this would be taken away to perhaps try to construct something people could agree to.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The most formal way of doing that is to have an amendment before the chair, and then it is the property of the house and it is then up to all members to develop a compromise if they wish to do so.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** I move:

After the words 'South Australians' add the words, 'and calls on the state government to review the practices of Drug and Alcohol Services South Australia, and in particular DASSA's involvement with chronic pain patients and patients legally prescribed drugs of dependence, with a view to further improving medical services available to such patients.'

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I will accept the amendment as being in order, although it does extend the subject of the original motion somewhat.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker. In speaking to the amended motion—

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** To clarify, it is the Chapman amendment you are speaking to. There is no amended motion.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** Did you indicate that you accepted the amendment?

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** There is a motion. There is one proposed amendment, and there is a second proposed amendment. Perhaps you would refer to them as your proposed amendment and the Morialta proposed amendment.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker. So that we are clear, my amended motion, which I read out, is to be in addition to the amendment proposed by the member for Morialta, not an alternative to it. So, the words are 'in addition to' her motion.

For the past two years, as the opposition spokesperson for mental health and substance abuse, I have been plagued by this issue, namely, patients who are in chronic pain and who are unable to access adequate or appropriate medication to manage their condition. This has been a very serious issue, and there have been deputations to the former minister in another place (Hon. Gail Gago) and to the current minister in this place.

This issue has been the subject of numerous very substantial television and print media articles about the plight, pain and misery of these people. It is a very serious situation. Repeatedly, the government and the minister, and spokespersons on their behalf, and Mr Keith Evans, as the Executive Director of DASSA, have said 'Look, we're managing this. Everything is okay. There has been no change of policy.' Hello; we are in the real world here. We have real people in real pain lining up to say that this is not satisfactory.

What has happened is that the drug dependency unit at the Royal Adelaide Hospital, under the Department of Health, has had this responsibility with qualified exempted doctors. I say 'exempted' doctors because there is a special provision to be a doctor to prescribe opiate-based medications, which are very dangerous drugs in the wrong hands, and we have a very strict legal regime which applies to qualified and experienced medical practitioners who administer them. The drug dependency unit used to do that, but it has now moved to DASSA's responsibility. In the past, it operated from Warinilla Clinic at Norwood and in Joslin, North Adelaide and various places around the South Australian metropolitan area, all of which are to be sold off and moved to the Glenside hospital site in the reform.

Irrespective of where they are, they now have the job to do that. Dr Ian Buttfeld, a senior medical practitioner who has now retired, was in the professional camp, if I can describe it is that, of those who say that these patients cannot be treated like all other drug addicts. They are drug dependent, and we have to understand and respect that and appreciate that these are not people who have gone in for medical treatment or surgery and become addicted to medications and need to be slowly weaned off them. They are not heroin addicts who need to go through a trial of morphine replacement to wean them off drug dependency.

These people have chronic pain, and they will probably have it for life. There are only a certain number of things that will work. Certainly, there are patients who have come to me, those with opiate-based medications, who have been able to sustain a reasonable lifestyle with a minimum of pain and have even been able to go to work; one is a police officer. He told me that he can actually carry out his duties as a police officer under this medication. Of course, he is at risk of having that prescribed medication removed.



However, under the new policy, which is clearly operating, they have to be taken off this medication and go onto alternative medication, therapies or programs mentioned by the member for Morialta. Those may be terrific for some patients. That is great, and I am happy to support them, but they are not adequate for everyone. I am not just talking about one or two people, there are tens of them. They have taken legal advice, and there is pending action for a group claim against the government.

We are not talking about Mickey Mouse issues: we are talking about people, one of whom I saw writhing in pain in a hospital in South Australia. Her medication had been removed, and she was crippled up with pain in a bed in a public hospital because she could not stay at home. A friend came in to sit with her to help manage the pain. A psychiatrist contacted me to say that the only way this person could get the medication they have had in the past, which was properly managed and monitored, was for them to declare that they were a suicide risk.

It is unacceptable that we have to take people to the brink of slashing their wrists, because they cannot live with this pain, and say that we are going to give them some other program. It does not work, and we have to understand that. At the very least, let us have a review and support the clear intent of the original motion, namely, undertake a review and find out what on earth is going wrong, identify what we can do for these people and not leave them out in the cold completely isolated from adequate care in circumstances that are cruel, inhumane and unacceptable.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Deputy leader, before I invite anyone else to speak, I need to ask you to give us a formal written version of your amendment. In the debate, you indicated that this was to be added to the proposed amendment of the member for Morialta. It needs to say that in your written amendment, and you might like to reconsider its introductory wording.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** I have the motion and the amendment, which, as I understand it, is a replacement amendment from the member for Morialta. It reads, 'This house calls on the state government to continue', etc. The wording you have in front of you is 'and the state government to review'.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The wording I have in front of me does not indicate whether this is a substitute motion or an addition to the amendment proposed by the member for Morialta. It says 'that this house calls on the state government'. Perhaps you might like to have a word with the Clerk.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** I am happy to. So that *Hansard* is clear, I am happy to read what I read out before, which you have there in writing, that is, to be added onto the words after the motion by the—

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Deputy leader, I understand that; I just need it in writing.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** I will hand it over.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I think you need to add some words to the written motion that you currently have.

**Mr BROCK (Frome) (12:15):** It has certainly been a learning experience today. First, let me make it quite clear that I am not in favour of drug addicts or anything like that, but I am certainly concerned, not only as a member of parliament but as a human being, about the constant chronic pain that people in our community are suffering.

People in my electorate have approached me regarding the system under the new DASSA requirements for continuation of medication. In one case a person has had 58 operations, and this person is only 39 years of age. You can imagine if you have an operation on one part of your body the amount of scar tissue that would be evident from that. Can you imagine the amount of scar tissue affecting this person who has had 58 operations in the same area?

She has that much scar tissue clinging to her bladder, or what is left of it, and she is in constant pain. This person is on medication, and what has happened now is that she has had written advice stating that as at 30 June her medication will be ceased. She is now at her wit's end. She is in fear that she is going to be in constant pain forever and a day.

I do not know if members of the house have been in constant pain, you may have. I want to relate back to six weeks ago when I was in constant pain with a suspected bowel issue. I was in constant pain for two days. I was lucky; I was admitted to hospital for a couple of days, I had intravenous medication and I got over it, but those two days were absolutely agonising. I was in so much pain, but it was only for two days.

I would hope that members of this house can imagine somebody being in constant pain for 24 hours a day, 365 days a year, and then all of a sudden you get this new advice stating that even though a medically approved doctor, or specialist, has prescribed certain medication, that medication will cease. That certainly does not sit very well with me.

As the Deputy Leader of the Opposition has indicated, there are some people out there, and there is one in Adelaide whom I have had contact with, and this particular person is basically indicating that he is at the suicidal stage. He does not know where he is going to go at this particular point. I am certainly not in favour of people continuing on drugs, but I believe that if a person has the need to have a suitable drug to keep constant pain under control then we need to ensure that there is the facility to keep that pain away.

I am also led to believe that you can go from South Australia into Victoria, and I have the occasion where a Victorian has come to South Australia and has asked for the same medication that he was having in Victoria. The new regulatory system states that he cannot have that drug any more. So, we need to get some clarity on this issue. This is one country; surely we can have the same rules for each of the states.

I understand that some time ago South Australia was the number one leading state in Australia for chronic pain relief. My information, and I stand to be corrected on this, is that at the moment we are about third in Australia.

The other thing is that there are no facilities in regional South Australia for any of these people to receive medication or assistance. At the moment, they have to come and make contact with somebody in Adelaide, and if they are attending somebody in regional South Australia who had the authority to do that, some of the doctors out there are a bit hesitant to even recommend it for fear of retaliation.

This is the information that I have been given. One thing that I would like to do is to ensure that when we go forward with this system we continue to review it. If we review something, that does not mean to say that our system is not working; we review it to ensure that we do not become complacent.

The whole idea of improving services is by reviewing them on a regular basis, and I think that is all that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition is asking here. That is what the member for Fisher and I are asking, to continue the services that are going at the moment but to review those services to ensure that, potentially, we have the best operation and facility in Australia. I commend the motion to the house.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mrs Geraghty.

### **MEN'S HEALTH POLICY**

**The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher) (12:21):** I move:

That this house welcomes the strong commitment of the federal and state governments in developing a men's health policy, but acknowledges that much more needs to be done in regard to men's health issues, including awareness, research and treatment.

As members would be aware, I am quite passionate about this issue, as I am about women's health, and have been for a long time. Back in 1992, I tried to get a men's health policy adopted in this very place—sadly, without success.

It is appropriate that we focus on men's health this month because this is Men's Health Month, and 15 to 21 June is Men's Health Week. When men's health was first discussed, many years ago, it was often thought that if you were for men's health then you must be against women's health, but nothing could be further from the truth. As I said earlier, I am passionate about women's health as well as men's health, and it saddens me when I hear of people experiencing trauma or dying unnecessarily and far too early—often because of a lack of proper diagnosis or lack of awareness, or lack of treatment. Only two weeks ago I farewelled a friend, a woman with breast cancer, at the age of 54—tragically, far too young. Sadly, she was not properly diagnosed when she was about 49; she was told that it was a muscle issue, and by the time it was properly diagnosed it was too late.

The same thing is happening with men. Too many men are dying far too early. We heard recently of the case of Richard Pratt who, sadly, died from prostate cancer. He was one of the wealthiest people in country but, tragically, that did not save him; unless you get onto these things early, and get them diagnosed and treated, all the money in the world will not save you. Bud

Tingwell also died recently from prostate cancer; people may say that he was getting on a bit, but he may well have lived quite a lot longer.

Men's health is not just about prostate cancer, important as that is, and I acknowledge the role of the Prostate Cancer Foundation of Australia and the federal government's Department of Health and Ageing and pay tribute to the federal Minister for Health, Nicola Roxon, as well as our local minister. However, crossing party lines, I recently made a submission to a senate Select Committee on Men's Health that was chaired by Cory Bernardi. I must say that I was very impressed not only by Mr Bernardi but also by the other members of that committee, which has, in the last few weeks, released its report. That report can be accessed through the web, and I commend it to members.

We are now seeing progress in terms of men's health awareness because of the important work of the Prostate Cancer Foundation and the federal Department of Health and Ageing, as well as the Freemason's Foundation. This foundation is based at the University of Adelaide but it also works in with other universities, and is generously supported by the Freemasons. It is a wonderful gesture on their part to support research and awareness into men's health.

A study on men's health was undertaken in Victoria not too long ago by Foundation 49, which specialises in men's health issues, and we know, from research done by the Freemasons Foundation Centre for Men's Health in the north-eastern suburbs here in South Australia, that the statistics are similar for this state. In the Victorian study, 35 per cent of men in the workplace had high blood pressure, 10 per cent had high cholesterol, 4 per cent had erectile issues, 11 per cent had mental health issues, and 6 per cent had high blood glucose readings—and so it went on. When you look at the statistics in detail you will also see that the health of country men is even worse than men in the city, which is appalling; when you look at Aboriginal men you will see that their average life expectancy is 51 years, and that is also an appalling statistic.

We have a long way to go in terms of addressing these issues as well as, as I said before, addressing issues that affect women. Cancer is not the biggest killer of men, nor is it the biggest killer of women; that place is taken by cardiovascular diseases. As I said at the start, while it is important to focus on prostate and other cancers in men and breast, ovarian, cervical cancer and so on in women, we should not overlook other key health issues, including things such as cardiovascular diseases.

Currently, an average of something like 2,900 men die from prostate cancer each year in Australia—in fact, in 2005 2,900 men died from prostate cancer and in 2006 it is estimated that there were 18,700 new cases diagnosed. It is important to remember that prostate cancer does not necessarily have any symptoms in the early stages, so people can have the disease and not know they have it. I mentioned the figures for rural and regional Australia earlier, and when you look at them you will see that country men have a 21 per cent higher mortality rate from prostate cancer than do men in capital cities. That is an outrageous situation, and it is because they often do not get the medical facilities or the awareness programs necessary for early detection and treatment.

As I said there are a lot of other issues relating to men's health, which also apply to women. Another huge issue—for not just older men but for men in general, as a result of accidents and other issues—is the problem of incontinence. That is being dealt with through significant resourcing from the federal Department of Health and Ageing.

It is not all gloom and doom; there are a lot of things that can be done. I have just had the privilege of being trained as a men's health ambassador, although I do not get a white flag in front of my car and I do not know whether or not the Speaker will give me morning tea here as he does the other ambassadors. As a men's health ambassador I have been trained to talk to Rotary and other groups like that to help spread the message. One of the interesting things in that training program—and this applies to women as well—are ways in which you can reduce the likelihood of cancer: aerobic exercise; strength and resistance training; obviously, regular check-ups from your GP; reduce negative stress; reduce red meat and animal fat intake; increase fish intake; increase fruit and vegetables.

One thing that is quite surprising is that people need to include selenium-rich foods in their diet. I do not know whether many people realise it but, in Australia, our soils tend to be deficient in selenium which means that the fruit and vegetables we eat here tend to be deficient in selenium. The advice, and this is from top experts in Australia commissioned by the Australian Department of Health and Ageing, is a recommendation to ensure that we have a proper intake of selenium. We do not want too much because it is toxic but we need some because it is a proven anti-cancer

agent. Likewise, men in particular should have lycopene, which is found in cooked tomatoes—cooked tomatoes are better for you than uncooked ones.

The other part of this program that I undertook recently strongly emphasised eating broccoli, green tea, and drinking—

*Mr Piccolo interjecting:*

**The Hon. R.B. SUCH:** My pronunciation of 'broccoli' has been corrected.

*Mr Piccolo interjecting:*

**The Hon. R.B. SUCH:** I would not describe you as that; you should be proud of your Italian heritage. The list also includes drinking green tea, increasing soy content in your diet and, as I said, talking to your GP and having regular check-ups. By doing that we can reduce the number of people who are getting illnesses of any kind and often not getting them treated promptly enough.

One of the statistics that really shattered me at this training program was the prevalence of incontinence in Australian men. It was estimated that up to 13 per cent of men have a problem with urinary incontinence and up to 20 per cent have a problem with faecal incontinence. They may not be dinner party topics but they are very important. The good news is that a lot of these problems can be treated.

One of the issues for men with prostate cancer is that they are fearful of becoming incontinent, and the other one they are even more fearful of is becoming impotent. With early intervention those issues can usually be treated in a way which certainly reduces the risk of either incontinence or impotence but, even where people may end up with those conditions, the treatments including implants that are designed now are fantastic.

At this conference there was a guy who admitted to us that he was impotent but he had had a penile implant and he said his sex life had never been better. Sexual dysfunction, in his case, was as a result of a medical condition. We take these things for granted. Men do not like talking about them but they should, because there are some fly-by-night people making a fortune from this. People have probably seen billboards and other ads for nasal sprays, which are just a con because there is no evidence that they work.

Another person on this training program had lost both testicles through testicular cancer but, with modern treatment, he is still able to lead a normal life by using a patch. Many people who cannot leave their homes because of an incontinence issue can be helped quite promptly and easily with some of the latest technology available. The point is that we need to tackle some of these issues. We need to tackle them with early intervention. I am a great advocate of workplace screening. I believe that, in schools, we should go back to screening children discreetly and appropriately for things like obesity, scoliosis and so on.

The same applies to women's health. We should be talking about girls' health and, if we are talking about men's health, we need to focus on boys' health, as well. For a lot of teenage boys, in particular, there are issues of depression—likewise for teenage girls. One of the great things which Jeff Kennett is involved in is the *beyondblue* program which targets men and women. Depression and other mental health issues are very serious in our community and need to be addressed.

I think the message is quite clear for men and women: have a regular checkup. A lot of men are reluctant to have a check for prostate cancer because they do not like the idea of a digital rectal examination. Well, get over it—it is not all that difficult or uncomfortable. If it saves your life, it is well worth doing.

The point I touched on earlier was that people believe prostate cancer is an old man's disease. Some men in their 30s, although they are in the minority, suffer from prostate cancer. Certainly, by the age of 40, if someone has a family history of prostate cancer, they should see their doctor. Every male by the age of 50 should have a proper prostate check and that involves a digital rectal examination, a prostate-specific antigen blood test and further investigation if necessary. The symptoms can be hidden and you can have prostate cancer without being aware of it.

The message is for men and women is to get a check-up. Get a check-up early, be vigilant in terms of your health, and it may well save your life because a lot of these health issues that befall us need not be life threatening if you get onto them early and deal with them appropriately. I

commend that message to all members and suggest that through their newsletter they communicate this to their electors.

**Mr PICCOLO (Light) (12:37):** I rise to speak in partial support this motion in the sense that I wish to move an amendment to the motion, as follows:

That this house welcomes the strong commitment of the federal and state governments in developing a men's health policy and acknowledges the need to continue working on men's health issues, including awareness, research and treatment.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** That amendment is in order.

**Mr PICCOLO:** In speaking in support of my amended motion, as a society, it is good to see that we are becoming increasingly aware of the importance of raising the profile of men's health and men's health issues. I am pleased to be able to report on the strong commitment from both the state and federal governments in this area. In fact, last week the federal parliament handed down its Senate report into men's health policy, and I will speak about that a little later.

Having said that, it is fair to say that, in comparison to other people in the world, men in our society are generally in good health, but that is not to say that improvements cannot be made. In some areas, we can make significant improvements. As I said, there are variations in health outcomes depending on the work you do, where you live and also a range of other factors; for example, Aboriginal men in society are faring the poorest when compared with the rest of the male population.

Heart disease, lung cancer and suicide were the three leading causes of premature death among men in South Australia between 2004 and 2006. The leading three contributors to health loss—that is, premature death and illness—among males in South Australia between 2004 and 2006 were heart disease, type 2 diabetes, and anxiety and depression, which are slowly getting more attention with *beyondblue* and other programs.

South Australia has become increasingly proactive in addressing men's health issues. For South Australia, the South Australian Men's Health Strategic Framework (the 2008-2012 plan), which was published last year in June, provides some policy and planning framework to respond to men's health needs in the planning and delivery of health services.

The framework supports the development and coordination of research to develop our understanding of men's health and health service issues, as well as the development of programs and health services that are appropriate for men. The framework recognises that the increasing awareness of men's health needs is consistent with the recognition of the need to address preventable illnesses and injuries across all sectors.

South Australian Health is also involved in a number of men's health initiatives, including providing funding to the Freemasons Foundation Centre for Men's Health, a centre established by the Freemasons Foundation in conjunction with the University of Adelaide. I am proud to say that I am a member of the foundation's Patrons Board along with my colleague here, and I have attended some of their local events in Gawler. The Freemasons are doing a wonderful job in promoting men's health right across the country.

One of the centre's aims is to build a pool of researchers and practitioners with an interest in various aspects of men's health to generate knowledge related to men's health and wellbeing. Again, it is important that, if we introduce new programs, they are based on research and are effective.

SA Health is also currently funding or contributing to the funding of several men's health projects, including the Florey Adelaide Male Ageing Study, which is a longitudinal study of chronic disease among 1,200 men aged between 35 and 80 and living in the northwest regions of Adelaide. If my memory serves me correctly, this is the first longitudinal study of men's health in this state. SA Health is also involved in the development of a training resource for primary health care workers working with men and it also provides research around improving men's access to primary health care, in particular, investigating men's use of health call centres.

As I have mentioned, the federal parliament established a Senate select committee to look at men's health. This has provided our state government with an excellent opportunity to put forward our position on areas of interest to the inquiry, including: the level of funding to address men's health; the adequacy of existing education and awareness programs; the prevailing attitudes of men towards their own health and sense of wellbeing; the adequacy of treatment services; and general support programs for men's health in metropolitan, rural, regional and remote areas.

The Select Committee on Men's Health handed down its report last Thursday, I think. I will highlight a couple of the recommendations and findings, because I think it is relevant to the particular motion before us. Recommendation 2 of the committee states:

The committee recommends that legislative drafting instructions and administrative procedures applying in all commonwealth government departments and agencies include a mandatory requirement that they consider the impact of legislation and policies on men as well as women.

This recommendation supports the comments made by the member for Fisher. More importantly, there is a growing awareness that, in trying to improve men's health, you do not have to do it at the expense of addressing men's health issues. Both can and should be addressed. Another finding in the report states:

There is a common perception that men are either not interested in their health or careless in managing it. The committee does not accept this. Men do in fact use health services in high numbers and respond positively to education and awareness campaigns. However services need to be provided in ways that acknowledge men's social and economic circumstances and take account of their distinctive attitudes.

I would add to that their distinctive circumstances and situations because of work and a whole range of other factors. The report continues, 'In addition, boys should be informed about healthy behaviours at an early age.' I could not agree more. The final recommendation that I would like to draw to the house's attention deals with depression. The report states:

Depression and other mental illnesses are significant and often poorly recognised problems in Australia. Overcoming the stigma which still attaches to mental illness is a major issue. Depression is a significant problem in its own right.

I would like to acknowledge the work done by *beyondblue* to improve that. The report continues:

It is also closely linked to alcohol and drug abuse and can also be present as a co-morbidity with major physical health problems such as prostate cancer. It is important that this interconnectedness be recognised in the provision and conduct of treatment services.

That supports the position of this government. SA Health and the government are doing research to make sure that our policies are appropriate.

The Australian government has also undertaken an extensive consultation process for the development of a national men's policy, which is continuing. The national men's health policy forums held in South Australia were valuable in informing and providing representatives from South Australian men's health groups and those individuals with an interest in the area of men's health with an opportunity to have an input in the development of a national policy. South Australia has long recognised the need for improvement in the area of men's health and applauds the federal government's national consultation in the development of its national men's health policy. The government looks forward to the outcomes of that national policy to improve men's health.

At this point I acknowledge the contribution of a number of people in my own community in addressing men's health issues. I was involved in a men's health group in Gawler which has led to the creation of a men's shed, and the men's shed is one of those vehicles where men can meet and discuss a whole range of health and related issues and, through the local health service, is very proactive in promoting men's health. With those comments, I ask the house to support my amendment.

**Mr PENGILLY (Finniss) (12:46):** I am pleased to support this motion. It is an important motion because it is critical that we get men's health further up on the agenda and restore some of the balance after what has happened over the last few years. I do not criticise the fact that women's health has been to the fore. However, I think that men's health programs have suffered as a result of women pushing their health issues more successfully than have men, Australian men in particular being rather reticent about getting too involved in looking after their own health.

My generation of baby boomers was of the view that we were going to live forever and not have anything wrong with us. There are a fair few of us around the place at the moment who know that is not correct, and the fact is that we need to promote the issue of men's health and to get men responsible for looking after their own issues. I know the member for Fisher shares my views on that. We only have to look at the veterans, particularly the Vietnam veterans, and their health issues, and I see a lot of them regularly. If I go into my own career of farming, there is a number of farmers of my generation who have neglected to look after their health and have now been caught up with by things such as prostate cancer, smoking-related illnesses, high blood pressure and cholesterol—all those things that none of us were ever going to have happen to us—and we need to do a lot more to promote health issues.

I had a number of years on the regional health board and the KI health board, and I was always very pleased to support some of these issues. In particular, one of the things that has been widely adopted across regional South Australia is the pit stops at field days where you encourage men to go in and have a check-up and get all sorts of things checked out. It has been most successful. Some men are a bit reticent to go in but, with a bit of encouragement from their peers, they go in.

However, the reality is that, through government (whether it be federal, state or even local government), we must do much more to push men's health matters and to get them further up on the agenda. This side of the house is very much aware that it needs pushing, and I know the shadow minister for health wants to keep her man alive as long as possible, so she will be putting forward some very good policies on that particular aspect of health.

So, I am pleased to support this motion. I do not want to see any male particularly suffer as a result of neglecting their health. I encourage my friends to go regularly. I tell people as young as their late 30s to get their prostate, cholesterol and blood pressure checked—the whole gamut of these things—and get in and get it done. I had it a few years ago and had the daylight frightened out of me, and it did me the world of good, and look at me now. I am going to live forever (so I think). I support the motion and I encourage the house to get behind it.

**Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (12:50):** I rise to welcome the motion moved by the member for Fisher. I congratulate him on his appointment as a men's health ambassador. I look forward to his new svelte figure, and I suppose lycra pants will be given out in his new role. There is no question that many governments, in this case both the state and federal governments, are considering the development of men's health policies, and that is to be welcomed. Even with the foreshadowed amendment, which shows a little churlishness on behalf of the member of this government who is anxious about the word 'but' and has to add in 'and', we will not take issue.

The most important thing here is that the work is done to ensure that there is a men's health policy. We have had one for women for decades. It has translated into better health services and understanding for women, who have the more peculiar aspects in relation to child bearing and, further, ensured that areas such as breast cancer have received attention for research and understanding, awareness and ultimately treatment. That has been a fantastic initiative, and it is time men's health followed, so we welcome that.

The identification of the importance of men coming forward to recognise their own health issues is part of this. Women, perhaps, are used to being prescribed for, poked at and exposed to health procedures early in life and, because of child-bearing responsibilities, seem to have more than their fair share than the other sex. However, it does not mean that men should escape or in some way be quarantined from an understanding of their own health needs. Obviously, the development of wellbeing policies to promote an understanding that we need to eat, drink and smoke less and walk, run and swim more are obviously important initiatives but, unless men understand that they are exposed to risk of serious maladies and even death if they do not have regular check-ups and do not take the initiative, that will continue.

The stats have been referred to this morning. Life expectancy for men is 4.8 years less than for women; men represent 78 per cent of suicides in Australia and 73 per cent of road deaths; one in nine men in Australia will develop prostate cancer during their lifetime; and already 3,000 men a year in this country die from prostate cancer. My husband died at the age of 50 from cancer—not prostate cancer. Perhaps if he had had regular check-ups he would be with us today, but it is a sobering reminder of the importance of coming forward.

An early program that I remember Dean Brown established when he was minister for health was to have men's health conferences out in the regional parts of South Australia. They did bring men out of the woodwork, so to speak, and they were able to be informed. One of the contributors here this morning referred to the importance of men's health initiatives at rural field days, but now even at metropolitan occasions, such as one at Unley I attended recently, charitable service groups provide for testing men's blood pressure and the like. It is all part of the process of raising awareness, but I say this: we can call for more research, and that is clearly happening, but treatment is also important.

Much has been said today about indigenous men also having access to health services. Just this week I had a call from a former employee of my family who is in his 80s and who is indigenous. He is in an aged care facility near the member for Light's electorate, and he has had a

disability since he was the age of 12. He is now in his 80s and is obviously mature aged. He has been given the Order of Australia for his services to the indigenous community, and he is seeking access to an electric wheelchair. They say that he is going blind, he is losing his sight and that it may be a danger to put someone in operation of an electric wheelchair while they are blind. Here is someone who has come forward and said, 'I'm not blind yet. I might have deteriorating eyesight, but in the meantime surely I need access to services to support my disability, ill health and aged circumstances.'

Let us not just talk about pamphlets, awareness, programs, conferences and advertisements in the newspaper: let us talk about understanding that when men come forward we have to be prepared with treatments, resources, support, understanding and preparedness to accept that a level of treatment will need to be undertaken to ensure that, as men have the courage to come forward, they are actually diagnosed and assessed and that they have facilities for treatment. There is little to be achieved in being told that it is important to check regularly if there is nothing to ensure that they have attention to the condition that is identified.

So, I remind the house that the last words of the motion are an important addition—identification, education and assessment. They are all great things, and they all have to be in place as a preliminary. However, we have to understand that we must make a commitment if we want men to live and not be sentenced to some malady. We must also provide the treatment and the resources.

**Mr GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel) (12:56):** I, too, would like to make some comments on the motion moved by the member for Fisher, particularly in relation to the latter part, which states 'that much more needs to be done in regard to men's health issues, including awareness, research and treatment'. I have listened to the debate and to the contributions, particularly to that of the member for Fisher. He gave some quite comprehensive statistics on some of the different illnesses and diseases that can be suffered by the male population of our community.

It is important that men are really aware of their health needs. There has been an increased level of campaigning and public awareness with respect to prostate cancer. I have some personal experience of that cancer, as my father suffered from it but, fortunately, he was able to receive treatment fairly early on after diagnosis and was cured. Unfortunately, I cannot say the same for my grandfather, who was diagnosed fairly late after its onset; eventually, he passed away as a consequence of prostate cancer, and the same set of circumstances prevailed in relation to my uncle's death

So, I have a pretty clear understanding of prostate cancer, and the statistics show us that its prevalence is about the same as breast cancer in women. We are all certainly very aware of and keenly campaign for breast cancer to be dealt with as a very serious health issue in our community. Prostate cancer is not the only serious condition or disease faced by men; obviously there is a whole range of health conditions and problems, such as heart disease brought on by high cholesterol levels and blood pressure, cerebral haemorrhage and strokes.

The need for awareness, diagnosis and treatment is very important because a certain percentage of men may feel unwell or have symptoms they tend to brush off and disregard. Unfortunately, in some instances, those symptoms develop into something far more serious, so it is important that we deal with these issues at what is referred to as a 'primary' level of health care, where those conditions are diagnosed and treatment is implemented.

Debated adjourned.

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

#### **HARBORS AND NAVIGATION (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT 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.

#### **STATUTES AMENDMENT (ENERGY EFFICIENCY SHORTFALLS) BILL**

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

#### **CROWN LAND MANAGEMENT BILL**

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.



**MARITIME SERVICES (ACCESS) (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL**

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

**PAYROLL TAX BILL**

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

**PETROLEUM PRODUCTS SUBSIDY ACT REPEAL BILL**

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

**STAMP DUTIES (TAX REFORM) AMENDMENT BILL**

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

**SUPPLY BILL**

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

**PAPERS**

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Premier (Hon. M.D. Rann)—

Remuneration Tribunal, Determination and Report—No. 3 of 2009—Ministers of the Crown and Officers and Members of Parliament

**ECONOMIC AND FINANCE COMMITTEE**

**The Hon. P.L. WHITE (Taylor) (14:05)** I bring up the 69<sup>th</sup> report of the committee entitled Emergency Services Levy 2009-10.

Report received and ordered to be published.

**NATURAL RESOURCES COMMITTEE**

**Mr RAU (Enfield) (14:06):** I bring up the 28<sup>th</sup> report of the committee entitled Adelaide and Mount Lofty Ranges Natural Resources Management Board Levy Proposal 2009-10.

Report received and ordered to be published.

**VISITORS**

**The SPEAKER:** I advise members of the presence in the gallery today of students from Our Lady of the Sacred Heart College, who are guests of the member for Enfield.

**QUESTION TIME****POINT STURT AND HINDMARSH ISLAND WATER SUPPLY**

**Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (14:07):** My question is to the Minister for Water Security. Why will the government not make a decision on the piping of water for critical human needs to Point Sturt and Hindmarsh Island? The cost of these projects is \$3.4 million and \$3.9 million respectively. The water is required for the critical human needs of residents and landowners of these places. Residents have been told that the decision hangs on available funds from the federal government and whether there is enough left over from other projects.

I point out that the government has given a go-ahead, and work is well underway, for a major non-potable project nearby, despite the fact that its funding has not yet been finalised. It should also be noted that other lakes communities have had water piped for critical human needs at far greater expense, and residents at Point Sturt have not been offered any assistance to cart water, as they will have to do through another summer.

**The Hon. K.A. MAYWALD (Chaffey—Minister for the River Murray, Minister for Water Security) (14:08):** I am very happy to answer this question. The Point Sturt and Hindmarsh Island communities have been seeking to be included in the network of pipes that have been constructed around the Lower Lakes. Currently we have the federal government's support and approval to go ahead with the irrigation pipeline, which is a project managed by SA Water for the Creeks Pipeline Company, and the commonwealth has said that if any funds remain from that project, unused contingencies, it is happy for those funds to be transferred over to the Point Sturt and Hindmarsh

Island community pipeline projects, should a business case stack up. It is not prepared to consider a business case until it is known what funds will be available from that project.

**Mr Pederick:** So they'll just go thirsty unless that happens.

**The Hon. K.A. MAYWALD:** In relation to the issue of drought funding and water carting, there are many people around the state who are required to cart in water during drought circumstances. They are not alone in that instance.

*Mr Pederick interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Hammond has asked his question.

**The Hon. K.A. MAYWALD:** People who used to have water in their dams and their bores also used to have water from those sources. When there is a drought sometimes those resources dry up, and different people are required to cart in water. There is no difference in this instance, apart from the fact that a number of pipelines are being built in the vicinity of that area and we have sought commonwealth support to transfer funds to assist these communities with subsidies to build these pipelines.

*Ms Chapman interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The deputy leader will come to order!

**The Hon. K.A. MAYWALD:** The commonwealth has given us an undertaking that it will consider providing any residual funding towards those projects on the basis of a business case. We are monitoring the project carefully. We are determining whether the contingencies will be needed and, as soon as we have concluded the process of assessing the project and it is at a stage where we know whether we will need to use the contingencies or not, we will be able to further progress the process. Of course, any of these communities are quite able, as is anyone else, to access SA Water's pipeline network through the normal connection fees. However, in this instance, they are seeking subsidies so we will have to go through the process that the commonwealth has set out for us.

### CRIME STATISTICS

**Ms PORTOLESI (Hartley) (14:10):** Will the Minister for Police provide details of the latest ABS crime statistics?

**The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT (Lee—Minister for Police, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:10):** The latest report from the Australian Bureau of Statistics, issued today, shows that crime rates are continuing to fall in South Australia. According to the bureau's Recorded Crimes—Victims report 2008, SA's crime rate has fallen for the sixth year in a row, with latest figures revealing that crime has dropped by 6.7 per cent overall since 2007 and by a huge 38 per cent since 2002. This equates to 6,366 fewer offences committed in 2008 compared to 2007, and 54,522 fewer offences than in 2002.

Since 2007 South Australia has experienced drops in the following categories: attempted murder, down by 9.8 per cent; kidnapping/abduction, down by 10.4 per cent; sexual assault, down by 5.6 per cent; armed robbery, down by 4.3 per cent; unarmed robbery, down by 2.1 per cent; break-ins, down by 12.4 per cent; motor vehicle theft, down by 18.2 per cent; and other theft, down by 5.4 per cent. The report also shows massive decreases since 2002, with break-ins falling by 46.1 per cent; total robbery falling by 25 per cent; motor vehicle thefts falling by 43.6 per cent; and the murder rate falling by 13.8 per cent.

These reductions in our crime rate are no fluke; rather, they are the product of a well-resourced, professional and high-performing police force, coupled with tough new laws introduced by the Rann government. SAPOL's continued focus on reducing crime through clear priorities, advanced technology, problem-solving strategies, benchmarking and performance management of results at both a local and corporate level has ensured that these results could be achieved.

Without question, this government's tough approach to law and order means that South Australia is a safer place today. We have successfully managed to turn around the steadily growing crime experienced under the former Liberal government.

**CHELSEA CINEMA**

**Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:13):** My question is to the Premier. Will the state government now buy the Chelsea Cinema from the Burnside council? The Premier has spent \$2 million to purchase heritage listed buildings at the Glenside campus for his project, the South Australian Film and Sound Hub. He has further allocated \$43 million to build the film hub, but the Chelsea Cinema is much loved by local residents, and even the member for Hartley—and we agree on this—has joined local residents and us in supporting its retention as a public asset.

**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) (14:13):** I thank the honourable member for her question. I must say that the honourable member rightly pays tribute to the member for Hartley in relation to this issue because there she was, at a public meeting, leading the charge in relation to the struggle to ensure that this important asset remains in the hands of the community. Indeed, she has made representations to my office about matters concerning heritage questions in relation to this building. However, the Leader of the Opposition—the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, I should say—a Freudian slip there.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** That's right. Perhaps I have just been hearing voices in the corridor.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** That's right. This is a cause of interest for the government. I note that the council is deliberating on the question of the Chelsea Cinema and I pay tribute to the role that the member for Hartley has been playing on behalf of her constituents in this regard. Perhaps the Deputy Leader of the Opposition could join forces with the member for Hartley. I saw the member for Hartley being very vocal at the public meeting. I heard shrieks of silence from those opposite. I heard her get up and lead the community—

*Ms Portolesi interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** That's right. In fact, it was the Liberal candidate for Norwood, Steven Marshall, who was paying tribute to the member for Hartley for the role she played at that meeting, which I found confusing. I thank the honourable member for drawing attention to this important community campaign that seems to be led by the member for Hartley on behalf of her community. Indeed, this cinema is in her electorate, so it is a cause of some interest and concern to her.

**Ms Chapman:** So, what are you going to do about it?

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** Well, at the moment the council has a very big decision to take and all eyes are on the council at the moment about whether they get that decision right.

**PREMIER'S ANZAC SPIRIT SCHOOL PRIZE**

**Ms FOX (Bright) (14:16):** Can the Minister for Education provide information on the Premier's ANZAC School Prize?

**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) (14:17):** I thank the member for Bright for her question. I know she has taken a personal interest in the history teaching that occurs in our curriculum across our schools and is particularly enthusiastic about students knowing about our war history and our involvement in world wars.

Certainly, I have to say the Premier's ANZAC Spirit School Prize has been innovative and popular. It is one of the few prizes around Australia that involves more than just a trip and a few concerts but actually involves very serious research and involvement with historians, going to special sites around Europe to commemorate the ANZAC spirit and remind students of the sacrifice of their forebears, sometimes their grandparents and often individuals who lived in their communities.

The system works in that the government sponsors two-week study tours to Europe, and that requires the students' making application to make a submission describing the individual they

want to research and follow. The prize aims to connect young South Australians with the ANZAC spirit and allow them to retrace the steps of a fallen South Australian soldier as part of their study tour.

It is an extraordinary opportunity for young people not only to do research but to be involved in history and learn more about the sacrifices that Australians have made. We are now inviting year 9 and year 10 students to apply for the 2010 Premier's ANZAC Spirit School Prize. This prize will involve students writing a submission about their chosen soldier and five of them will have the opportunity to visit historic sites in both the British and French capitals as well as World War I battlefields in Belgium and France.

They will attend the ANZAC Day dawn service at Villers-Bretonneux and will be accompanied by trained historians who will explain the sites and significance of the battlefields. As ever, we will have two South Australian teachers selected to accompany the students, and that gives them the opportunity to continue teaching into the future, help the students and encourage them to appreciate this history as well.

The entries can be in a range of formats. They might be in a video, an essay or an artistic presentation. The entries close on 25 September 2009 with the recipients of the awards being announced on Remembrance Day this year. The Premier's ANZAC School Prize is a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity and, having met students who have been involved in this project, I have to say that, unanimously, they are deeply moved. They say it is a life-changing experience and it certainly gives them an insight into what happened to young men who were often little older than they were when they make the trip. The friendships made during these trips are extraordinary.

When I was in France, I was deeply moved by a historian from the Imperial War Museum when he said to me that South Australia should be proud of these young people because of their good behaviour, their camaraderie, their instincts and their good spirits. I was very proud of all of the students that I met on these tours.

I encourage members to get behind this project. Make sure your local high schools know about it, and encourage students you know. I know that the member for Light has been particularly successful in promoting this award, and I have met several students who have said that they applied for this award because of his encouragement. They have gone back and given presentations to their community about their experiences. So, I commend this project to all members. For those interested, the website is [www.decs.sa.gov.au/anzacschoolprize](http://www.decs.sa.gov.au/anzacschoolprize). It is a great opportunity for young South Australians.

#### **HOUSING TRUST, DISRUPTIVE TENANTS**

**The Hon. G.M. GUNN (Stuart) (14:21):** My question is directed to the Minister for Housing. What action is the government taking to tackle the problems caused by disruptive tenants in housing under the control of the state government?

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. G.M. GUNN:** Well, that's probably right. My office at Port Augusta is inundated with complaints about these disruptive tenants who have no appreciation of the rights of other people in the street, their privacy or their property. These tenants have engaged in noise or they have vandalised the houses. There have been intoxicated people abusing other residents and threatening them, and elderly people are very concerned about their safety. I ask the minister to change the law so that managers can get rid of these villains as soon as possible.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. G.M. GUNN:** Well, they are villains.

**The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Families and Communities, Minister for Northern Suburbs, Minister for Housing, Minister for Ageing, Minister for Disability) (14:22):** I thank the member for Stuart for his question. I think it was only this week that I received a letter from the member for Stuart and I have responded to him. He wrote to me expressing concern that there seems to be an increase in the number of disruptive tenants in Port Augusta.

This house would be well aware that there are a number of procedures that the Housing Trust undertakes in relation to dealing with disruptive tenants. It is a condition of people's tenancy that they do not disturb the peace, livelihood and amenity of people living next door to them, and we take these issues very seriously. In the first instance, obviously, those reports should go to housing managers, but there are processes in place if people continue with that behaviour. We

have a specific team set up to deal with those issues. There are certain cases where we take them directly to the Residential Tenancies Tribunal and apply for eviction and, in fact, that has been the case.

**Ms Chapman:** How many?

**The Hon. J.M. RANKINE:** Well, actually, I can give the member the numbers, if she likes. It has been quite considerable. But, certainly the—

**Ms Chapman:** How many, two?

**The Hon. J.M. RANKINE:** No, not about two; in fact, a considerable number. I am not going to just throw a number out there so that you can spin it right back.

*Ms Chapman interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order, the deputy leader!

*Ms Chapman interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.M. RANKINE:** Well, no.

**The SPEAKER:** The deputy leader!

**The Hon. J.M. RANKINE:** About 50 tenancies in about a year were terminated between February and April.

**An honourable member:** Terminated.

**The Hon. J.M. RANKINE:** Fifty terminated; 12 were evicted through the Residential Tenancies Tribunal; 20 voluntarily terminated; 18 transferred to an alternative property; and 45 modified their behaviour and kept their tenancy. The trust is about actually keeping people in housing. We will work with them—

*Ms Chapman interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The deputy leader is warned!

**The Hon. J.M. RANKINE:** We accept that there are people in Housing Trust homes who have problems. We are the largest landlord in the state. We have 45,000 properties. It is not unexpected that there would be the odd tenancy where there is a problem. We will work with those people. If we can help them to modify their behaviour and maintain their tenancy, we will do that; if they continue to misbehave and disrupt the people around them, we will take appropriate steps to have them evicted.

## DOORWAYS TO CONSTRUCTION

**The Hon. P.L. WHITE (Taylor) (14:25):** Can the Minister for Housing inform the house about the expansion of the Doorways to Construction program, which will deliver training skills to young South Australians on the far West Coast?

**The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Families and Communities, Minister for Northern Suburbs, Minister for Housing, Minister for Ageing, Minister for Disability) (14:25):** The Doorways to Construction program is an important training program which provides real opportunities for young people to gain skills in the construction industry. The project involves the refurbishment of Housing SA properties and has enjoyed considerable success in the northern suburbs. The course has been devised by the Construction Industry Training Board to skill future workers within the industry and give students hands-on experience. Students are taught on site by a program coordinator who is a qualified builder and tradesperson.

Housing SA provides the properties for refurbishment. It provides the requisite materials, the qualified tradespeople who supervise the students to carry out the renovation and a maintenance coordinator to overview each project. Once the upgrades are complete, the properties are returned to Housing SA for allocation to eligible tenants.

The Department for Families and Communities has recently made agreement with the Ceduna Area School to establish a Doorways to Construction project in Ceduna. Over 10 months students will gain skills and be exposed to all aspects of construction such as plumbing, electrical, concreting and carpentry as they undertake a comprehensive refurbishment project. The students are also required to complete four weeks of industry placement throughout the year, which reinforces what they learn on site each week.

The Doorways to Construction program combines practical skills with vocational qualifications. The course covers Certificate I in construction, which is a stepping stone to a wide variety of construction careers, as well as allowing students to gain units towards their SACE. Our government is proud of this initiative which provides students interested in a career in the construction industry with an opportunity to gain real experience, develop their skills and, for many, enter apprenticeships. At the same time, they are helping to improve the lives of disadvantaged South Australians.

### **GRAIN EXPORTS, PORT ACCESS**

**Mr VENNING (Schubert) (14:27):** My question is to the Minister for Infrastructure. Has the government considered the ramifications of the proposed merger between South Australia's ABB Grain and Canada's Viterra? Is it concerned about the operation of the Outer Harbor deep water grain terminal, considering the fact that the government put in resources to assist with deepening the harbour?

The merger of the two companies will create one of the largest grain trading companies in the world. ABB has a virtual monopoly on the handling and storage of grain here in South Australia, as well as being an international grain trader. The new port at Outer Harbor has had a large amount of government funds invested in it, especially to deepen the berth, which also benefits the adjoining container terminal.

Some commentators are saying that the port and its facilities should be excluded from the deal. This could be one of the largest company deals ever seen in our state, and there is concern and anxiety at what the final outcome will be and how it will affect our largest export industry. I declare my interest as a grain grower in this matter and, therefore, my inherent interest in the matter.

**The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Elder—Minister for Transport, Minister for Infrastructure, Minister for Energy) (14:29):** Plainly, when the infrastructure was created through work between this government and the private sector, there were always going to be concerns that access would be provided to any of those who had a legitimate interest to do so on an equitable and reasonable basis, which is not unusual in ports around the world.

As you would know, the number of parties seeking to ship grain are not that large, and the way it was dealt with and the way I always believe it should be dealt with in the first instance, if possible, is by reasonable agreement between the owners and other interested parties as to how access would be provided. That is what pertains at the moment, but I can indicate that there is clearly a capacity, were that not the case, and we prefer that, because the cheapest form of regulation is self-regulation, not regulation imposed by the government. There is plainly a capacity for us to regulate access to such a facility, and plainly that would be what we would seek to do, should the people operating the facility not provide fair access. In my view, that would cover the circumstances you raise. I am quite happy to look at it further, but in my view that would be the appropriate response at first look.

### **'COURAGE AND HUMANITY' REGIONAL TOUR**

**Mr RAU (Enfield) (14:31):** Will the Minister for Veterans Affairs update the house on the progress of the Badcoe VC/Burke and Wills breastplate tour of regional South Australia?

**The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON (Croydon—Attorney-General, Minister for Justice, Minister for Multicultural Affairs, Minister for Veterans' Affairs) (14:31):** I would like to take the opportunity presented by this question to alert the house to a significant event for the veterans community—indeed, a significant event for all Australians. Yesterday the last Great War digger passed away. He was Mr Jack Ross, and he passed away peacefully at his nursing home in Bendigo, aged 110. With the passing of Mr Ross our nation lost its last personal link with one of the defining events of the last century, the Great War. Mr Ross served in both world wars, but he did not serve overseas. He enlisted in the Great War aged 18 and trained as a morse code operator. He also enlisted for the Second World War. We owe much to men like Mr Ross. They represent a generation that showed resilience, courage and determination, and they were the bedrock upon which our nation was built. Subsequent generations must never forget the sacrifice they made for our nation and way of life. Lest we forget.

Members may recall that the Victoria Cross awarded to Major Peter Badcoe was purchased last year at public auction by the state government jointly with philanthropist Mr Kerry

Stokes. The Burke and Wills/Yandruwandha Breastplate was subsequently purchased by Mr Stokes and donated to the state of South Australia.

After the purchase, the Deputy Premier, who was then the acting premier, promised that both these items would tour regional South Australia to give as many people as possible the chance to see them. The items went on display at the South Australian Museum last July, and Mr Stokes and members of the Badcoe family were present when they were formally received by the state. Both of these items are of great historical interest and can teach us all about the characteristics of courage and humanity displayed by those who have served this nation in war and in peace.

Peter Badcoe was born in Malvern, South Australia, and joined the army after leaving school. He graduated from the Officer Cadet School at Portsea in Victoria in 1952. He served in Malaya in the early 1960s and then in the Vietnam War in 1966 and 1967. The Victoria Cross was awarded to him posthumously in recognition of his conspicuous courage and leadership under fire on three separate occasions in the Vietnam War. He was killed during the third action in 1967. Displayed along with his Victoria Cross are Major Badcoe's Vietnam Medal, US Silver Star, Republic of Vietnam Cross of Gallantry with Gold Star, and the Republic of Vietnam Campaign Medal.

The Burke and Wills/Yandruwandha Breastplate was presented to the Yandruwandha peoples of north-eastern South Australia for the humanity shown to the ill-fated members of the Burke and Wills expedition of 1861.

*The Hon. K.O. Foley interjecting:*

**The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON:** Yes, I did mention that, Deputy Premier, and I mentioned that you were acting premier at the time. During the expedition, Burke and Wills were left stranded without food and water at the expedition's Cooper Creek base camp. Other members of the party had left only a few hours earlier, having given up hope for the safe return of the explorers. Despite help given them by the Yandruwandha people, both Burke and Wills perished.

**The Hon. P.F. Conlon:** King didn't.

**The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON:** King, however, survived, as the Minister for Infrastructure interjects, and was found by a search party in September 1861. Having reviewed the history of both these items, it is most appropriate that Courage and Humanity was the name selected for the tour. True to the government's word, the tour began on 21 March, when both items were taken to Victor Harbor for the opening of the new clubrooms of the RSL.

*Mr Pengilly interjecting:*

**The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON:** I am advised that it was a most successful day, and the member for Finnis confirms that, and the presence of these items added to the atmosphere. Since being displayed at Victor Harbor, the items have been taken to Two Wells, Kingscote, Port Pirie and Port Augusta. In Port Pirie, the tour was hosted by the Port Pirie RSL Military Museum as part of the opening celebrations. The display was well received, with more than 450 visitors attending over two days.

I am advised that a cousin of Major Badcoe visited the display and was delighted that the medals of his cousin are in public ownership and on display in his home state. In Port Augusta, the display was hosted by the City of Port Augusta and held at the public library. Nearly 200 locals and tourists visited, including some Aboriginal residents and some Vietnam veterans. The display was well promoted in the local media, and a special viewing was held on 23 April.

The tour recommenced recently at Berri and then visited 12 other locations in the South-East. I am sorry if the member for Bragg has something else to do, other than attend question time. The tour then visited the Bublacowie Military Museum on Yorke Peninsula before touring towns in the Mid North. The tour opened in Broken Hill today. The final leg of the tour will include visits to towns on Eyre Peninsula. With ANZAC Day just over a month ago, the characteristics of courage and compassion are fresh in our minds.

*Ms Chapman interjecting:*

**The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON:** No, I mentioned that it went to Kingscote. This tour builds on those characteristics. It reinforces the importance we should place on the value of selfless courage—the putting of others before self. I am immensely pleased that the Badcoe Victoria Cross will be seen by so many South Australians. Likewise, I am pleased that such an interest is being

taken in the Burke and Wills/Yandruwandha Breastplate. These items are quite different, but both speak loudly of courage. I encourage every citizen of South Australia to make the effort to see both these items and to learn the story of each.

#### **VICTOR HARBOR WASTE WATER TREATMENT PLANT**

**Mr PENGILLY (Finniss) (14:39):** My question is to the Minister for Environment and Conservation. Will the minister advise the house why the Environment Protection Authority will not withdraw its licence to discharge water from the Victor Harbor Waste Water Treatment Plant into the Inman River, thereby forcing SA Water to find further alternative re-use options for the thousands of megalitres of water that are being produced each year?

For many years, the former effluent disposal dam and its successor, the Victor Harbor WasteWater Treatment Plant, have dumped treated effluent water into the Inman River. It is a matter of great concern to many Victor Harbor inhabitants. The organic levels in the river are high, and the community wish to know when the situation will be alleviated by further uses.

**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) (14:39):** I thank the honourable member for his question. I will obtain a report and bring it back to the house.

#### **WASTE MANAGEMENT**

**Mr PICCOLO (Light) (14:40):** My question is to the Minister for Environment and Conservation. The minister recently informed the house of the success of the newly implemented ban on plastic bags. What further progress has been made to reduce the amount of waste that goes to landfill here in South Australia?

**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) (14:40):** I thank the honourable member for his question and acknowledge his commitment to the environment. I know that he represents many of his electors with that commitment.

It is true that the South Australian community has embraced the plastic bag ban. The vast majority of people have done this in a way that demonstrates that they can see the environmental benefit of it. Despite the predictions of doom and gloom from members opposite, this small change in behaviour, which will have a very substantial effect, has gone by without any significant—

**The Hon. J.D. Hill:** Despite the naysayers.

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** Exactly. Despite the naysayers it has gone by without any moment at all. However, there is the fact that we still continue to send far too much waste to landfill. Perhaps nowhere is this more apparent than in the increasing quantities of e-waste (electronic waste) that we throw out.

Discarded, outdated or broken computers, televisions or other forms of electronic waste is a growing problem. We are considering banning e-waste from landfill here in South Australia. Indeed, we have an EPP presently being consulted in South Australia in recognition of the issues that it causes. We know that we cannot just ban materials from landfill without providing alternative disposal methods. I recently had the pleasure of opening a cathode ray tube recycling facility, the first in Australia and New Zealand. This facility will play an important role in recycling some of the 1.5 million television sets and 1.5 million computer screens that are discarded each year, and one can imagine that, with the changeover to digital television, that is likely to increase dramatically.

Whilst this and our plastic bag ban show that our state can successfully take the initiative on this issue, I am very keen to ensure that we have a national approach in relation to e-waste. That will maximise the effectiveness of anything that we seek to implement. In South Australia we try to seek a national approach before we go it alone; it is just that often it is difficult to achieve that. We have seen that with the container deposit legislation, which is an unambiguous success, yet it is difficult to encourage the other states to come on board, although I note with interest that the Northern Territory has announced its intention to come on board with container deposit legislation and other states are looking at it with interest.



I recently attended the Environment Protection Heritage Council meeting in Hobart where the disposal of e-waste was discussed. In this discussion a report was tabled showing what I think South Australians have known for some time, that is, that people are willing to go to some trouble, even expense, to manage their waste responsibly. This is not news here in South Australia, where not only the recent response to the plastic bag ban, but of course our iconic container deposit legislation, has demonstrated that we are more than willing to take action to help our environment.

There has been a tendency in the past for cost benefit analyses to look at recycling initiatives, such as CDL, and place a huge cost on inconvenience. So, they measure what they say are the costs and benefits of these schemes, but then they put in this massive cost alongside the column of 'inconvenience'. That does not take into account people's willingness, or indeed their enthusiasm, to recycle responsibly. So, it skews the cost benefit analysis in a way which means that the scheme is found, on that basis, not to stack up.

I think if you stopped any South Australian in the street and asked them what inconvenience the container deposit legislation caused them they would say none. In fact, they might even say that it is a benefit. So, it is on the wrong side of the column in terms of that analysis. In fact, if you are a scout you might say that it is a benefit.

**An honourable member:** Dob, dob, dob, dib, dib, dib.

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** That's right. I hope that there is no more talk at community cabinets of shooting scouts, because I think that was one of the really low points that we got to in a community cabinet when the former minister for the environment suggested that shooting scouts, or at least scout birds, to contain the corella situation was a possible option.

However, I return to the text. I was particularly pleased that discussions on recycling initiatives that were held at a national level now reflect that reality. An analysis that properly values people's keenness for environment initiatives is the best way to progress this much needed work across the country. What is exciting about this new analysis—which they called 'choice-based modelling', a catchy phrase—

**The Hon. P.F. Conlon:** Shall I tell you what my choice is?

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** That you want me to just stop talking? The choice-based modelling now allows us to effectively evaluate all these initiatives in a way that will mean many more of them will get up. At a national level, what has been happening is that the people who bring in these regulatory impact statements always say that these schemes never work, which means that on that level we have just been spinning wheels on product stewardship schemes that the rest of the world seems to be able to get itself organised to do, and which only South Australia seems to be able to embrace, but which are an obvious way that we can save waste in resources.

So, it is a great opportunity for all in Australia to follow South Australia's lead and the fantastic work of the former minister for the environment. The plastic bag ban championed by our very green Premier, who will probably go down in history as being one of the greenest premiers in the nation, leading on climate change legislation—

*The Hon. P.F. Conlon interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** That's right. I hear howls from those opposite saying that he is not one of the greenest, he is the greenest! He has led the country in climate change legislation, he was asked to chair the regional governments' forum at Poznam, and he has been invited back to Copenhagen to continue that performance. In fact, the state continues to lead the way in relation to environmental initiatives.

I would also like to pay tribute to my predecessor in the other place, the Hon. Gail Gago, who played an important role in progressing these initiatives. I look forward to the national implementation of better waste management practices.

#### **PATAWALONGA RIVER LOCK GATES**

**Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (14:47):** My question is to the Minister for Environment and Conservation. What progress has been made in developing plans to build new lock gates at the mouth of the Patawalonga at Glenelg? In May last year the Department of Water, Land and Biodiversity Conservation funded GHD Pty Ltd to carry out an investigation to replace the old vertical lift gates with centre pivot gates similar to those at the Barcoo Outlet.

**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) (14:48):** That is an excellent question, and I will bring back a report to the house.

#### **COFFIN BAY WATER LENS**

**Mrs PENFOLD (Flinders) (14:48):** My question is to the Minister for Water 'Insecurity'. Can the minister advise the house when the results of the aeromagnetic survey for Coffin Bay 'A' water lens, completed in September 2006, will be released, and the capacity of the lens revealed?

In October 2005 minister Wright advised that the Department of Water, Land and Biodiversity Conservation, SA Water and Eyre Peninsula Catchment Water Management Board were jointly involved in determining the extent of the Coffin Bay 'A' lens to assist in the long-term management of the water resources. In addition to the aeromagnetic survey, in November 2007 SA Water reported the successful drilling of monitoring bores at Coffin Bay. However, since then there has been no further mention of the outcome of the report or the findings.

**The Hon. K.A. MAYWALD (Chaffey—Minister for the River Murray, Minister for Water Security) (14:49):** First, I think the honourable member asked the question of a different minister; I am the Minister for Water Security. However, I think the question was referring to me. The issue the member refers to relates to the potential scope for the lens under the Coffin Bay area to be further utilised, and to determine the extent of that lens. There have been ongoing works by SA Water, and I understand that they are still continuing. I am not certain of the extent of those but I will get a full report and will get back to the member.

#### **EASLING, MR T.**

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (14:50):** My question is to the Minister for Families and Communities. Why did the government prevent young people, who were under the guardianship of the minister and who had been fostered by Tom Easling, from voluntarily giving statements in support of Easling? During the Easling investigation and trial young people who had been fostered by Mr Easling and who were under the guardianship of the minister wished to voluntarily give statements in support of Easling. The government refused them permission to do so.

**The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Families and Communities, Minister for Northern Suburbs, Minister for Housing, Minister for Ageing, Minister for Disability) (14:50):** As we know, the member for Davenport is very keen to have an inquiry into the issues surrounding the Tom Easling affair, the court case and investigation. The member has asked a number of questions in this house, over a period of time, and he creates perceptions that do not necessarily—

**Ms Chapman:** He just wants answers.

**The SPEAKER:** Order, Deputy Leader of the Opposition!

**The Hon. J.M. RANKINE:** What he has asked for is an inquiry, and I understand that is with the Crown Solicitor.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** Point of order, Mr Speaker: the minister is misleading the house. The question was not about an inquiry but—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Deputy Leader of the Opposition—

**Ms CHAPMAN:** —was why did he not let these children speak?

**The SPEAKER:** The deputy leader will take her seat. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition will not make allegations of that nature by means of a point of order. The Minister for Families and Communities.

**The Hon. J.M. RANKINE:** I am sure that the Crown Solicitor is looking very carefully at the issues around the Easling case. If anything has been done that is untoward or improper I am sure he will give that advice to the Attorney-General.

#### **DRYLAND FARMING RESEARCH**

**Ms BREUER (Giles) (14:52):** My question is to the Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries. What initiative has placed South Australia at the forefront of research into sustainable farming in dryland areas?

**The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton—Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Forests, Minister for Regional Development) (14:52):** This South Australian government acknowledges the vital contribution made by the farming sector to the wellbeing of our economy. I am pleased to report that the state government is investing in a new research focus on dryland farming on Eyre Peninsula that will put us at the head of the field in helping farmers to better adjust to climate variability and climate change.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. P. CAICA:** It has been there for a long while but if you listen you will know how we are doing things a little bit differently. I know you understand the importance of farming to our economy.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. P. CAICA:** Yes, all forms of farming but, in this case, we will talk about dryland farming.

An analysis of several robust low rainfall farming businesses on Eyre Peninsula, jointly funded by the commonwealth and state governments through SARDI, reported late last year about the importance of continued support for dryland farming systems, concluding that continued investment and low rainfall agricultural research, development and extension was a sound measure in terms of helping to deal with climate issues into the future.

The report found that, despite the difficult climate and weather conditions over the past five years, these businesses were not only economically viable but also engaged in modern farming practices that positively contributed to sustainable agricultural, environmental and natural resources management. I do remember some time ago—it might have been last year—where the member for Schubert alerted the house and raised with the house the matter of some of the outstanding yields that some farmers had achieved in very, very low rainfall areas. He was paying testament, of course, to the agricultural practices that were adopted by those particular farmers. I do know that the people opposite do know a little bit about this matter. The ability to innovate and adapt clearly enhanced those farmers' capacity to survive and prosper.

Recently, I announced the appointment of a low rainfall agronomy expert (Mr Roy Latta) to head up the Minnipa Agricultural Centre, where the SARDI dryland farming systems program is, indeed, a national leader. I am advised that Mr Latta has had over 20 years' experience in pasture and low rainfall mixed farming research. His team's work will build upon the existing knowledge of the needs that agricultural businesses in the lower rainfall areas have as they deal with climate variability and strive to maintain and improve sustainable levels of production.

Mr Latta has worked in South Australia, Western Australia and Victoria and was most recently science leader at the Victorian Department of Primary Industries Mallee Research Station at Walpeup. Importantly, Mr Latta maintains strong collaborations with international research groups, including a consultancy with a USA high plains farming systems project in association with Montana and Wyoming state universities and has supported pasture plant improvement projects in China.

Australia's dryland farming systems have achieved international recognition for optimising the use of available rainfall, and we can be confident in our ability to meet the challenges of climate variability and climate change in the future.

The Minnipa Agricultural Centre is highly regarded for its farmers and industry engagement. Some of the projects currently underway at the centre include: extending its Responsive Farming Systems Study, involving farmers through focus sites and group learning exercises; increasing profitability and reducing erosion with no tillage on Eyre Peninsula, which deals with the challenges of no-till farming; the Upper Eyre Peninsula crop improvement team aims to breed pulse, oilseeds and other cereal varieties that adapt to dry conditions; and developing robust and lower risk farming systems by understanding the impact of soil erosion, which aims to determine the impact of soil carbon on carbon and nutrient cycling to stimulate the disease suppression process. I know that every member of the house joins with me in welcoming the appointment of Mr Latta to his position.

#### **STRATTON, MS A.**

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (14:57):** Does the Attorney-General think it worth whoever is investigating the Audrey Stratton claim re the Victim Support Service to interview

Ms Stratton about her claim, and will she be interviewed as part of the investigation? On 5 February I raised the issue of whether any officer of the Attorney-General's Department put pressure on the Victim Support Service to have its employee, Audrey Stratton, not attend court in support of Tom Easling and/or to have her dismissed if she did attend court in support of Mr Easling. The Attorney said it would be investigated. It has now been four months since the Attorney-General promised an investigation and Ms Stratton has not been contacted.

**The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON (Croydon—Attorney-General, Minister for Justice, Minister for Multicultural Affairs, Minister for Veterans' Affairs) (14:57):** I will check the veracity of the member for Davenport's claim.

### COME OUT FESTIVAL

**Ms SIMMONS (Morialta) (14:57):** My question is to the Minister Assisting the Premier in the Arts. How successful was the 2009 Come Out Festival?

**The Hon. J.D. HILL (Kaurua—Minister for Health, Minister for the Southern Suburbs, Minister Assisting the Premier in the Arts) (14:58):** In short, the Come Out Festival was incredibly successful. Come Out is the biennial Australian Festival for Young People and the main theme this year was Colliding Worlds, which provoked lots of youthful curiosity and enjoyment. This year's festival program of diverse companies, stories and art forms was curated by artistic director, Jason Cross, and has won much critical acclaim. The commissioned work, *Children's Cheering Carpet—Saltbush*, brought together—

*Ms Fox interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.D. HILL:** —I am informed by the member for Bright that it was excellent—the Italian company, Compagnia TPO, and Australian Aboriginal artists. This work was created especially for children aged four to eight and was performed on a touch-sensitive carpet that triggered images and sound, creating a virtual landscape for performers. Children readily participated in the performance and, as I understand it, adults were entranced, as was the member for Bright.

There were many other fantastic shows from around Australia and the world. The Come Out program presented 63 projects and was well received by schools. Sales progressed strongly from the time it was launched in late 2008. Events were clustered in three hubs: North Terrace, the West End and Tandanya. I am pleased to inform the house that Come Out 2009 included some fabulous regional programs.

The festival management team secured 18 new corporate sponsorship partnerships for 2009 and achieved a 12 per cent increase in total cash sponsorship in comparison with the previous Come Out Festival. As members would know, given the current economic circumstances, that is a pretty fantastic achievement.

The state government supports Come Out through Arts SA, the Department of Education and Children's Services and the SA Youth Arts Board. The BHP Billiton Youth Arts Fund was the major partner for Come Out 2009. Once again, I congratulate and thank BHP Billiton for its commitment to youth arts in this state.

Other major sponsors and supporters were: Beach Petroleum, Adelaide Airport, the Adelaide City Council, SA Water, TAFE SA, the Samstag Museum, *The Advertiser*, Channel 10, ABC Local Radio, Nova 91.9, Adelaide's Child, *Lowdown Magazine*, the Adelaide Festival Centre, Tandanya and Carclew Youth Arts. I thank all those sponsors. The Australian government also supports Come Out through the Australia Council for the Arts and Festival Australia. Come Out successfully bid for a substantial increase (almost 50 per cent) in federal government funding, including a 2009-11 grant through the Program Presenter fund of the Australia Council.

This year's festival opening entitled 'Tarnda ganya ngga' (the place of red kangaroo and rocks) was held in Victoria Square and proved very popular with schools. The event included a welcome to country by the Taikurtinna Dance group, community sculpture making and performances by a number of youth arts companies. It attracted over 2,000 school children, including a group from the School of the Air.

Early indications are that Come Out has achieved 91 per cent of its total box office income target and has surpassed its box office target for the schools-in-theatre component of its budget by 8 per cent. The festival is recognised nationally and internationally as unique because of the level of artistic engagement that it has with its core audience of young people.

The level of planning and consultation with young people in the lead-up to Come Out, and then after the event through the provision of teachers' notes and education packs, makes the level of engagement with young people deep and enduring. The Come Out festival is the standard-bearer for best practice in arts for young people, and the government is very proud to support it. I once again congratulate Jane Cooper, the chair of the Come Out Festival, and Jason Cross, the artistic director, and all of the team at Come Out, for a fantastic festival.

#### **EASLING, MR T.**

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (15:01):** Does the Attorney-General accept that there was a lack of transparency in the Easling matter? On 24 May this year, the DPP Steve Pallaras wrote an opinion piece for the *Sunday Mail* in which he stated:

Transparency is an attribute demanded of all participants in the criminal justice system from beginning to end.

He stated further, 'At every stage of the criminal process, transparency is demanded.' In the Easling matter, no notes were kept of some interviews; notes of other interviews were taken and then shredded; the tape recorder was not turned on during some interviews; not all subpoenaed material was released by the government and was secretly withheld; children under the guardianship of the minister were prevented from giving statements in support of Mr Easling; and supporters of Mr Easling who were potential witnesses were threatened with dismissal.

**The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON (Croydon—Attorney-General, Minister for Justice, Minister for Multicultural Affairs, Minister for Veterans' Affairs) (15:02):** No. The Crown Solicitor will provide me with a report about the Easling matter shortly.

#### **MEMBER'S TRAVEL REPORT**

**The Hon. R.J. McEWEN (Mount Gambier) (15:02):** My question is to the member for Hammond. Can the member for Hammond please tell the house who travelled with him to—

**Mr VENNING:** Point of order, Mr Speaker.

**The SPEAKER:** I cannot make a ruling on whether the question is in order until I have heard it.

**Mr VENNING:** He is asking the member for Hammond a question. He is not a minister yet. He will be soon.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Any member can be asked a question if the Speaker thinks that the member has a responsibility to the house for the matter about which a question is asked.

**The Hon. R.J. McEWEN:** Thank you, Mr Speaker. To assist the member for Schubert, the member for Hammond tabled with the Support Services Office on 9 October 2008 this House of Assembly report, for which he is now accountable to the house. Therefore, I ask the member for Hammond three questions in relation to the central west New South Wales and southern Queensland visits of 6 to 11 June 2008: who travelled with him; was any financial assistance provided to any third party; and can he guarantee to the house that all photographic evidence provided in the report was legally obtained?

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Mount Gambier's question raises some interesting questions. The member for Hammond, I presume, has undertaken travel at public expense, and I would be loath to rule that he has no responsibility to the house for that. It is the first time such a question has been asked. The member for Hammond is obviously keen to take the question. I will allow it and perhaps reflect on it and come back to the house with a more—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I will come back to the house, when we return, with a more definitive ruling. The member for Hammond.

**Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (15:06):** In response to the member for Mount Gambier, I did undertake a trip last year, and observed all proper procedures and protocols and submitted my report as required.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The house will come to order. The Minister for Transport.

### BUDGET PAPERS

**The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Port Adelaide—Deputy Premier, Treasurer, Minister for Industry and Trade, Minister for Federal/State Relations) (15:08):** I lay on the table the following budget papers:

Budget Overview 2009-10—Budget Paper 1

Budget Speech 2009-10—Budget Paper 2

Budget Statement 2009-10—Budget Paper 3

Portfolio Statements 2009-10—Volumes 1, 2 and 3—Budget Paper 4

Capital Investment Statement 2009-10—Budget Paper 5

Regional Statement 2009-10—Budget Paper 6

I move:

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

Motion carried.

### APPROPRIATION BILL

**The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Port Adelaide—Deputy Premier, Treasurer, Minister for Industry and Trade, Minister for Federal/State Relations) (15:09):** Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act for the appropriation of money from the Consolidated Account for the year ending 30 June 2010, and for other purposes. Read a first time.

**The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Port Adelaide—Deputy Premier, Treasurer, Minister for Industry and Trade, Minister for Federal/State Relations) (15:10):** I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

Prior to the commencement of my speech, I advise the house that hopefully I will be in a position to make a very important ministerial statement immediately at the conclusion of my second reading speech that I would ask all members of the house to be present for.

Mr Speaker, over the past 12 months the global economy has faced unprecedented challenges.

It has been well documented how international economies including the United States, the United Kingdom and Japan, through to nations such as Ireland and Iceland, are wilting in the wake of the economic crisis.

The crisis has claimed international financial institutions and caused many others to be bailed out by central banks and governments at a cost of trillions of dollars.

Economists have described it as a virus—as having a contagion effect, and, as a result nearly every advanced economy in the world has been dragged into recession—albeit, as I noted yesterday, not yet in Australia.

In my recent trip to New York, I was advised that the immediate outlook for the United States was grim, to say the least.

Nominal house prices are down 30 per cent from their peak, with one commentator believing that the market would not bottom out until the middle of next year.

It is estimated that approximately 50 per cent of houses being sold are foreclosure transactions, and one commentator believes the foreclosure rate could grow as high as 40 per cent of all mortgaged homes as the financial crisis moves from the sub-prime mortgage market into the prime mortgage market.

The financial crisis will see not only depressed growth in the United States, but also a major restructure of their banking system, with some estimating that in excess of 1,000 banks will disappear from the landscape of the United States.

The International Monetary Fund issued their World Economy Growth Forecast in July last year, predicting robust growth of 3.9 per cent. Putting that in context, as of July last year we had a

\$500 million operating surplus, no state budget debt and none other than the pre-eminent financial body the IMF itself was predicting a year of robust economic growth globally.

But, in less than 12 months, in fact, within a matter of a few months, the world economy began to collapse, with the IMF now forecasting the world economy contracting by 1.3 per cent. I think I am right in saying that is the first time in post-war history that the entire global economy as one has indeed contracted.

Mr Speaker, while the outlook in Australia is not quite as grim, we of course are not immune.

Our national economy is suffering a double hit.

The financial crisis means lenders are reluctant to make capital available, and that is restricting growth. At the same time, economic difficulties being experienced by many of our trading partners have caused some of our export markets to dry up.

The Rann Labor Government has an enviable record of delivering budget surpluses and as a result is in a strong position to weather the economic storm.

Just a year ago, the state budget returned a surplus of \$464 million and all budget debt had been eradicated—in fact the budget had accrued over \$250 million in financial assets.

In addition, we have invested record sums in our key services of health, education, transport, police and the criminal justice system and in securing our water supplies.

The Rann Labor Government has also delivered billions of dollars in tax reforms, making South Australia a better place to do business and providing an economic environment in which more than 100,000 new jobs have been created—two-thirds of them full-time.

However the economic crisis has had a devastating impact on the state's revenue base.

Since the 2008-09 Budget, GST and state revenues have plunged by billions of dollars.

In the 2008-09 Mid-Year Budget Review, I outlined the government's actions to improve the state's fiscal outlook in response to the global financial crisis.

Mr Speaker, the fiscal outlook has continued to deteriorate—pushing the budget back into deficit.

Now the total fall in GST revenue since the 2008-09 Budget is projected to be \$2.9 billion over the forward estimates with state revenues plummeting a further \$882 million over the same period.

When I first began to frame this budget the government faced the prospect of an operating deficit well in excess of \$500 million and significant deficits of similar proportion across the forward estimates, virtually as far as the eye could see. The cabinet—and I take note of the decision of my colleagues, the Premier in particular, in accepting that that was an unsustainable position and that we had to take further corrective action.

I again want to put on the record how pleased I am that we have had such a responsible leader and cabinet when it has come to what is an incredibly difficult set of decisions, but they are the right decisions. As a result of that decision of cabinet, the government has made some very tough decisions, which I will detail later, in order to place this state on a path to surplus.

Net operating deficits will still be recorded this year and next. In 2010-11 and beyond, the Rann Labor Government will return South Australia to surplus once more.

In detail, the net operating results are:

- a \$265 million expected deficit in this budget year of 2008-09;
- a \$304 million budget deficit in budget year 2009-10;
- through actions of this budget, which I am about to outline, for 2010-11, the budget will be in surplus—a surplus of \$78 million;
- in 2011-12, the budget will again be in surplus at \$96 million;
- by 2012-13, the fourth year of the forward estimates, we will be booking a surplus of a \$304 million, not only in operating surplus but equally a net lending surplus in that year.

What I have done in the budget is that I have also included a projected fifth year of the forward estimates as Treasurer Wayne Swan has done at a national level, and it shows a surplus of just short of \$500 million. This government has set the path to recovery and the path to surplus.

General government net debt is expected to grow to \$3.2 billion by 30 June 2012, largely reflecting the government's record infrastructure spending, before beginning to decline by 30 June 2013.

As a percentage of GSP net debt is expected to be 3.4 per cent at 30 June 2013—a mere fraction of what it was in the 1990s and inherited by the then Liberal government.

Mr Speaker, the International Monetary Fund and the Commonwealth Government have sent a clear message.

The best response to this economic crisis is for governments to invest in, and where possible, bring forward job creation investment in key infrastructure.

It is a strategy to stimulate the economy and importantly to secure and sustain jobs in our economy.

This budget does just that.

This budget will continue its commitment to rebuilding critical infrastructure.

In partnership with the Commonwealth, we will bring forward projects such as the upgrade and electrification of the Gawler line—part of a record public transport infrastructure program worth in excess of \$2 billion. That project, incidentally, will be brought forward, I am advised, by some two years.

The Adelaide Desalination Plant will be expanded to a 100 gigalitre capacity—enough to produce about half—50 per cent—of South Australia's critical human water needs, with first water flowing from that plant in December 2010.

Mr Speaker, in the next financial year alone, our infrastructure program will support nearly 14,000 full-time equivalent jobs—providing a direct stimulus to the South Australian economy when it is needed most.

Over the next four years this government will deliver an infrastructure program totalling \$11.4 billion—continuing to support jobs and the economy.

The government's capital spending will grow from 1.8 per cent of GSP last year, to 3.0 per cent this year, and to 5.0 per cent of GSP next year—a clear demonstration of how this government is investing in stimulating the economy during this difficult period.

However, this expenditure program has to be delivered while keeping our state debt at manageable levels and the budget in a sustainable position. This is no time for fanciful new infrastructure projects such as billion-dollar inner city football stadiums.

Mr Speaker, the 2009-10 Budget is framed in the face of a significant plunge in revenue.

The significant weakening in property market conditions experienced in 2008-09 are anticipated to continue into 2009-10 and will have a major effect on property based revenue.

As a result, revenue from stamp duty on conveyances will decline by more than 20 per cent in 2008-09, costing the state budget more than \$180 million.

Even though there have also been significant reductions in interest rates, continued uncertainty and a modest economic outlook will continue to have a dampening influence on the property market and hence state revenues.

Mr Speaker, as I have already explained, the government's receipt of GST grants has declined markedly.

In 2008-09 GST revenue grants to South Australia are expected to be more than \$350 million lower than the original budget estimate.

Despite the revenue pressure, the 2009-10 Budget contains no new taxes, consolidating the significant tax relief provided in previous budgets.

Payroll tax reductions, announced in 2008-09, will take effect from 1 July 2009—this year.



The payroll tax rate will be reduced from 1 July this year from 5.0 per cent to 4.95 per cent and the payroll tax threshold will increase from \$552,000 to \$600,000.

This will be of significant assistance to business and will continue to support jobs in our economy.

It's estimated that 6,700 employers employing about 370,000 South Australians are expected to benefit from these reforms, including an estimated 180 employers who will no longer be liable for payroll tax when the tax-free threshold is increased to \$600,000.

From 1 July 2009, South Australia will have the second lowest payroll tax in Australia, equal to that of our major manufacturing competitor, the state of Victoria.

The payroll tax reforms delivered by this government will be worth more than a billion dollars since coming to office by the year 2012-13.

Mr Speaker, while I acknowledge land tax for some taxpayers is clearly a burden, general reform unfortunately cannot be afforded in this current economic climate.

However, from 1 July 2009, this budget will provide land tax relief for land that is used for residential aged care facilities approved under the Commonwealth Aged Care Act.

This measure will ensure that all Commonwealth accredited residential aged care facilities will not be required to pay land tax, regardless of whether they are run as a not-for-profit or a commercial operation.

The estimated cost of this measure is \$6.2 million over the four years from 2009-10 to 2012-13, including \$1.6 million in 2009-10.

Consistent with the government's revenue reform commitments, remaining mortgage duty and rental duty will be fully abolished from 1 July 2009 and stamp duty on the transfer of non-quoted marketable securities and non-real property transfers will be abolished from 1 July 2012.

This is fully in accordance with the Intergovernmental Agreement on Federal Financial Relations.

Mr Speaker, with government comes responsibility for sound economic management and also for difficult and hard decisions.

As a result, today I am announcing that the New Prisons and Secure Facilities Project will be cancelled.

This has been a difficult decision for government, but one that is necessary to ensure that we can continue to deliver our commitment to deliver critical social and economic infrastructure and key services.

The decision to cancel this project will reduce our future debt obligations by more than \$500 million.

Mr Speaker, the government carefully examined the case for the full range of our infrastructure, and, on balance I believe it is right to put schools, hospitals and public transport ahead of building new prisons and secure facilities in this state.

There remains provision in the budget, though, for an additional 232 prison beds within existing facilities over the next three years.

This is in addition to the 374 new beds provided in 2007-08 and 2008-09.

That is, we have provided in recent years a total of some 606 more prison beds to sustain the prison population due to our tough on crime, tough on the causes of crime legislative program.

Mr Speaker, today I am also announcing the government is to establish a Sustainable Budget Commission to be led by the noted economist Mr Geoff Carmody. Mr Carmody was the co-founder of Access Economics, I believe, with Mr Chris Richardson, and was the executive officer of the Howard Commonwealth Government's National Commission of Audit which reported to the Howard-Costello government in June 1996. Mr Carmody is familiar with this type of work and will bring a great deal of experience to the role.

Other members of the Sustainable Budget Commission will be Senior Managing Partner of Ferrier Hodgson and Chair of the Economic Development Board, Mr Bruce Carter; Monsignor David Cappo, Commissioner for Social Inclusion; Professor Jennifer Westacott, Senior Partner at

KPMG; Mr Chris Eccles, the Chief Executive Officer of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet; and Mr Jim Wright, the Under Treasurer.

So, within that commission is an independent chair of great standing and experience, trusted by the Howard Liberal government, together with the chairs of our Social Inclusion Board and Economic Development Board, to ensure that social policy and economic policy are brought to the table.

The Commission will be supported by a secretariat from the departments of Treasury and Finance and Premier and Cabinet.

It will be asked to recommend strategies to achieve additional budget improvement measures of \$750 million in the forward estimates period, with \$150 million to be achieved in 2010-11, \$250 million in 2011-12 and \$350 million in 2012-13.

This savings task is challenging, but one that the Rann Government has previously confronted.

Similar savings tasks were conducted in 2002, where in excess of \$1.5 billion, from memory, was taken from recurrent and operational expenditure, and in 2006 with the Greg Smith review. We have implemented 96 per cent of all savings recommended and further savings measures. We have a track record of delivering our savings agenda.

Cabinet has already tasked the Commission with examining the budget process and putting forward an appropriate date for the 2010-11 Budget taking account of the 2010 election and the Commission's work.

Full terms of reference will be given to the Commission immediately following the March election so that it can begin its detailed work.

To achieve a proportion of this savings task, the government today will make it very clear, and has made it clear, that we will seek outcomes in public sector wage negotiations not exceeding 2.5 per cent in the next round of enterprise bargaining agreements.

South Australia cannot afford a blank cheque for public sector pay deals, particularly in this current environment, and it is time that our pay outcomes reflected what is a reality for workers in the general economy in the private sector.

Forecasts for inflation range from about 1.25 per cent to 2 per cent over the next few years. We are offering the Public Service security of position, tenure and modest wage outcomes, with real growth in those wages, but to be contained at a time when factory workers at General Motors are working three days a week, many workers are working less hours, jobs are being lost, in some cases, as I read from EDS, and finance sector workers being asked for a pay reduction. This is not an unreasonable request to the public sector in our state.

Increases of 2.5 per cent across all public sector wage outcomes will ensure that not only are real wage increases delivered to public servants, the need to cut further jobs and the savings task will be significantly reduced.

Given that many public sector workers enjoy security of tenure, I do not believe, neither does the government, that it is unreasonable for them to restrain their wage demands.

I will talk in detail about the volume of those savings, but if we are able to achieve 2.5 per cent across the public sector, of the \$350 million in savings required in years 2012-13, \$290 million of that can come from wage restraint. Anything less than that will be made up in further public sector efficiencies. The government is realistic, it knows that that is a hard task, but the challenge, in a sense, is there for the public sector.

Mr Speaker, the Commonwealth announced the Nation Building—Economic Stimulus Plan for recovery in February to address the impact of the global financial crisis on Australia.

The Rann Labor Government fully supports this program.

It will provide an immediate employment boost whilst making long-term investments to strengthen future economic growth.

Accordingly, the Council of Australian Governments developed special arrangements for implementing the plan and all Premiers and First Ministers signed the National Partnership agreement on the Nation Building and Jobs Plan.

The plan will deliver \$1.8 billion in additional funding to South Australia over four years, commencing in 2008-09, in the areas of education, housing and transport.

In addition, on 12 May this year, the Commonwealth budget provided a further stimulus package, with South Australia receiving a further \$1.1 billion for a range of capital projects including:

- \$645.7 million for public transport infrastructure that includes \$291.2 million for the Seaford rail extension (a long campaign by the member for Mawson, the member for Kaurana, other members, the member for Reynell, in particular, and the member for Bright), \$293.5 million to bring forward by two years the upgrade and electrification of the Gawler line, which has been the long-held argument and lobbying put forward by the member for Light, both as mayor and as the local member. He has delivered to his community an outstanding result in this budget for which he should be very proud. Also, for the north-eastern suburbs, with a variety of members from the north-eastern suburbs, from the member for Newland to the member for Florey to the member for Hartley to the member for Torrens and, dare I say, the member for Davenport, there is a \$61 million injection for an improved link between the O-Bahn and the Adelaide central business district. On that, in particular, I acknowledge the excellent work of the Minister for Infrastructure in consistently lobbying his federal counterpart and the Premier for consistently lobbying the Prime Minister to such an extent that I thought we might not get anything, so much were they pestering the federal government;
- \$228 million has also been provided by the Rudd Labor government enabling us to expand and double the size of the Adelaide Desalination Plant from 50 gigalitres to 100 gigalitres. And may I pay tribute again to the Premier for his outstanding lobbying of the Prime Minister consistently on this case. (I note my media adviser getting worried as I am ad-libbing components of my speech); and
- \$200 million to build a new Health and Medical Research Institute adjacent to the new Royal Adelaide Hospital on the north-west precinct, the railyard. We are already in the marketplace, we hope to have tenders let before the election and perhaps even a soil turning. Can I pay tribute to the Minister for Health for putting this on his agenda. I am glad that the commonwealth paid for it because, otherwise, I think we would have copped the bill. Again, can I praise the outstanding efforts of the Premier in lobbying the Prime Minister. I think the Prime Minister of Australia is very happy that our budget is done, he can get some peace from our Premier.

Mr Speaker, the Commonwealth's investment is supported by the state government's own infrastructure investment program creating a partnership for jobs and economic stimulus.

Mr Speaker, the Education and Children's Services operating budget for 2009-10 will exceed \$2.3 billion.

Spending per government school student continues to grow in 2009-10.

Spending per student has risen from when we arrived on the Treasury benches and in office from \$7,598 in 2001-02 to \$12,627 in 2009-10—an increase of more than \$5,000 per student.

In partnership with the Commonwealth, the 2009-10 Budget provides around \$1.5 billion for new education initiatives over the next four years.

It includes around \$1.2 billion over the next two years for government and non-government schools in South Australia for a program of capital works under the Building the Education Revolution initiative as part of the Nation Building—Economic Stimulus Plan.

This program will deliver new gyms, libraries and classrooms to over 520 government schools as well as maintenance and refurbishment programs worth up to \$200,000 each in 589 government schools across the state as part of the Primary Schools for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century and National School Pride programs. The private sector, the small contractors, small builders, small business around the state are abuzz with activity from this program

The 2009-10 Budget also includes:

- \$107.7 million over four years for low socioeconomic status schools in the government sector;

- \$72.5 million over three years for the government school sector to improve the ratio of computers to students in Years 9 to 12 as part of the Commonwealth's Digital Education Revolution;
- \$65.1 million over four years for the government school sector to provide access to an early childhood education program for all children in the year before they start school by 2013 (it was a particular desire of the Minister for Children's Services to get that issue on the agenda, and the Minister for Education);
- \$51.1 million over four years for maths and science programs in government primary schools;
- \$4.3 million in 2009-10 to improve literacy and numeracy outcomes in government schools; and
- \$4.2 million over three years to improve teacher quality in government schools.

Mr Speaker, in March 2009, the government announced Pinnacle Education as the preferred bidder for the Education Works—New Schools PPP project.

This project involves the development of six new super schools for the communities of Playford North, Inner North and Inner West areas of Adelaide for more than 4,600 students.

Subject to final negotiations, contractual close is expected in mid-2009 and the first two schools are expected to open in 2010.

Mr Speaker, last year's budget announced the commencement of a major 10 year program to redevelop, electrify and extend the state's public transport infrastructure.

This budget builds on that commitment by announcing a further major expansion of rail infrastructure and services to Seaford, and the earlier implementation of a number of rail projects.

To support these arrangements the Commonwealth will provide \$618.7 million over four years, in addition to \$27 million in the current fiscal year 2008-09.

These projects include:

- \$354.2 million over four years to extend the Noarlunga rail line to Seaford—comprising \$291.2 million for track and related infrastructure and \$63 million for the purchase of new electric railcars;
- \$293.5 million for the upgrade and electrification of the Gawler rail line, enabling the completion date of this project to be brought forward by two years. The total investment in the Gawler line over the next four years is a massive \$335.5 million;
- the electrification of the Noarlunga line, with an additional \$77.4 million to be spent over four years. The total investment in the Noarlunga line over the next four years is a \$327 million capital outlay. It is huge. Thank you for your efforts, member for Mawson; and
- \$61 million over three years to improve the link between the O-Bahn busway and the central business district, significantly reducing travel times, and finally competing David Tonkin's project many decades later.

Further state support of \$125.9 million over four years will support the infrastructure upgrades, new and existing public transport services, free travel for seniors (I was stopped by two seniors in David Jones the other day and thanked for their free travel; I took full credit), as well as measures to provide for more track inspections, more graffiti removal teams and more security officers on our trains.

Mr Speaker, the budget reaffirms the government's commitment to improving road safety, with the provision of an additional \$23 million over four years for our rural road safety program.

This support will be used to address roadside hazards, improve signage and provide junction improvements.

Mr Speaker, next year, the Health budget will exceed \$4 billion for the first time. That is an increase of some 93 per cent since Labor came to office.

The government remains committed to a health reform program including major investments in hospitals and primary healthcare.

Over the next four years works will be undertaken on the redevelopment of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, Lyell McEwin, Whyalla and Berri hospitals, Flinders Medical Centre and Glenside Campus, and progressing the new Royal Adelaide Hospital and GP Plus centres at Marion, Elizabeth and Port Pirie.

The 2009-10 Budget continues to support health services by providing \$546.1 million over four years in partnership with the Commonwealth for health initiatives, including:

- \$200 million to build a new Health and Medical Research Institute adjacent to the new Royal Adelaide site at the City West campus;
- \$114 million to further improve and increase health services across South Australia;
- \$61 million to improve the operations of emergency departments by increasing access to hospital care, establishing acute medical units and improving patient flow;
- \$53.9 million towards improving indigenous health by providing culturally responsive primary healthcare services and improved patient journeys through hospital;
- \$51 million for what I understand will be another 160 nurses and midwives into our hospital system;
- \$40 million towards increasing sub-acute services, including home rehabilitation and community pharmacy network;
- \$25.1 million for a dental health program; and
- \$15.1 million for the SA Ambulance Service to provide more out of hospital emergency medical care.

In addition, \$6 million will be provided in 2010-11 to support the purchase of new aircraft by the Royal Flying Doctor Service to provide emergency and primary healthcare to rural and remote communities. The member for Giles has been a strong proponent of that and a strong supporter, as has the member for Frome, and has argued and lobbied heavily to me (particularly the member for Frome) to ensure that we indeed provide an improved service.

Mr Speaker, in December 2007, the government announced that a new 800 bed state-of-the-art hospital would be delivered in this state.

Project planning and documentation for the new Royal Adelaide Hospital is progressing and expressions of interest will be sought in mid 2009. The delivery of the project as a public-private partnership remains our preferred model of delivery. However, as I outlined to the house yesterday, due to the collapse and constraints of the capital markets, the cost of private capital, we are considering whether or not there will be a capital contribution from government or whether the famed DBOM (design, build, operate, maintain) will be considered. We will have a clearer position when we release the EOIs.

The new hospital is expected to be online and keys handed over in 2016.

Mr Speaker, the Rann Labor Government is delivering water security for South Australians in the face of ongoing drought conditions to ensure water supply to the more than 90 per cent of South Australians who rely on the River Murray.

The Budget provides:

- \$833 million in 2009-10 towards the \$1.8 billion 100 gegalitre Adelaide Desalination Plant—with phase one delivering first water by December 2010; and
- \$164.6 million in 2009-10 and \$414 million over four years to upgrade and expand wastewater treatment plants and water recycling infrastructure.

The 2009-10 Budget also continues, for a further 12 months, the exceptional circumstances interest rate subsidies for drought affected areas. I acknowledge the former minister for agriculture and the current Minister for the River Murray as members of cabinet from rural districts, particularly the former minister who, again, drove a hard bargain on behalf of rural South Australia to ensure that this state stumped up and did its share in assisting and relieving the burden for farmers. The Commonwealth will provide up to \$93.6 million in total and South Australia will contribute a further \$10.4 million.

Over the next four years the government will also invest more than \$52 million in projects to increase storm water reuse. The member for Cheltenham (Minister for the Environment) and the Minister for Water Security (member for Chaffey) were again very strong proponents within cabinet of the greater use of stormwater, and their pressure on government to adopt these policies has been adopted in this budget framework.

The 2009-10 Budget further supports economic development through significant investment in the state's infrastructure and strengthening of our workforce capacity.

The budget provides:

- \$155 million over four years to address the skills shortage in our state by providing an extraordinary 56,000 training places;
- \$37.3 million over four years to support the development of strategic industrial land precincts that provide access to national road and rail links and international port facilities;
- \$14.6 million in 2009-10 to improve infrastructure in TAFE facilities as part of the commonwealth government's nation building package;
- \$12 million over four years to expand the domestic tourism marketing campaigns in South Australia to increase our share of the interstate tourism market. Again, my compliments to the Minister for Tourism and the chairperson of the Tourism Commission, Bob Foord, for their strong lobbying for further effort in the marketing of our state nationally and internationally;
- \$10 million over five years commencing in 2009-10 to support the establishment of a Materials and Minerals Science Learning and Research Hub at Mawson Lakes and a Photonics and Advanced Sensing Institute at The University of Adelaide. I thank the current and the previous ministers for science, who can share the credit for that effort;
- \$3.2 million over three years from 2010-11 to extend the role of the Olympic Dam Taskforce as part of the state's commitment to the expansion of the Olympic Dam project; and
- \$800,000 over four years to attract more international students to South Australian universities.

Mr Speaker, the Techport Australia Common User Facility will be completed in 2009-10.

This facility is a key component of shipbuilding infrastructure to support the construction and commissioning of the Royal Australian Navy's Air Warfare Destroyers.

Mr Speaker, the government this week also announced a new initiative that is dear to my heart, and one that I personally have been heavily involved in—an initiative to promote 'green jobs'. I have been involved because I had to agree to the financing of it.

The Premier announced the provision of \$20 million over two years for the Renewable Energy Fund to support research, development and commercialisation of renewable energy technologies in South Australia.

Mr Speaker, in partnership with the Commonwealth, including through the Nation Building—Economic Stimulus Plan, around \$692 million will be provided over the next four years for the Department for Families and Communities to construct and refurbish social housing to assist the homeless and provide additional resources for the disability sector. The Minister for Families and Communities was again a strong supporter and proponent of this funding.

As a result, under Nation Building, South Australia will build 1,500 new social and affordable homes and refurbish around 400 more, with existing state funded programs providing more housing support for people on low incomes, people at risk of homelessness and people with a disability. Upwards of some 2,200 dwellings will be made available through this program during the course of the next year—again, an extraordinary stimulus measure, as well as a vital social justice measure in itself.

Mr Speaker, the 2009-10 Budget provides the essential resources to maintain the government's focus on and commitment to law and order.

The Rann Government believes in supporting its police service as it continues to enforce the range of law and order policies we have introduced over the past seven years.

Most recently our police have begun enforcing the suite of new laws for it to take up the fight against the criminal bikie gangs with government support also provided to the Crime Gang Taskforce.

In 2009-10 the operational budget for South Australia Police will be around \$661 million.

That's an increase of 5.1 per cent compared to the 2008-09 Budget and 79 per cent more funding for police in this state since the last Liberal budget in 2001-02.

In this year's budget alone there is also support for the \$59 million new Police Academy Redevelopment project, with \$5.4 million to be spent in 2009-10.

When completed it will provide the most modern, technically advanced, training facility, not just in South Australia but anywhere in Australia (and it is up there in the world), for South Australia's police recruits.

The Budget will also provide \$3.3 million in 2010-11 for a new police station at Yalata. I acknowledge the member for Stuart's interest in this issue. I apologise; I acknowledge the member for Flinders interest in this issue.

Under this government, South Australia Police has never been better funded or staffed.

Mr Speaker, more than \$100 million will be invested over four years to upgrade to a new digital Government Radio Network to provide our emergency services with the very latest technology. There will be a public tender and no side deals

The South Australian Government Radio Network is one of the largest public safety radio communications networks in the world, with more than 30,000 registered agency and volunteer users covering more than 220,000 square kilometres of the state, and more than 96 per cent of the state's population.

It is part of the critical infrastructure that is essential to the state's police, ambulance and emergency services when they are required to respond to emergencies and calls for assistance.

Mr Speaker, other measures included in the 2009-10 Budget to support the government's commitment to law and order (I acknowledge the Minister for Police, the Attorney-General and the Minister for Correctional Services for being strong advocates for further improvements in these areas), include:

- \$2.4 million over four years for expanding DNA testing. The Attorney-General and the Premier can take great credit for keeping so many more bad people locked away because of DNA testing;
- \$2.4 million over four years for video conferencing facilities in our prisons;
- \$1.1 million over four years to establish a community corrections centre in Gawler. This is again another policy matter strongly lobbied and advocated by the member for Light, and again his strong representation on behalf of his community has seen the member for Light deliver a further improved service to his community; and
- \$471,000 in 2009-10 to facilitate an earlier opening of the Sturt Street Courts so that we can prosecute and proceed more quickly.

Mr Speaker, this has been a difficult budget to frame in challenging economic times.

This budget strikes a balance between delivering record investment in key infrastructure, supporting South Australian jobs, making responsible decisions to bring the budget back into surplus and preparing our economy for the opportunities that will emerge as the global financial crisis eases.

In conclusion, I would like to thank the outstanding work of my Ministerial colleagues. I mean that sincerely, as this has not been an easy budget for line ministers. This has not been an easy budget for our cabinet, but I am very proud to have worked with a group of my colleagues who have put state and financial responsibility ahead of individual wants in their portfolios. In particular, I thank the chief executive officers of our government agencies, the Under Treasurer, Jim Wright, and Chris Eccles, the new head of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet. I would also like to thank the staff of ministers and the staff of the chief executive officers and, in particular my staff.

I thank my Chief of Staff, Stephen Mullighan, who has done an outstanding job. Remember that name, members opposite. He will be here one day to haunt many of you as a future treasurer of this state. Stephen has done an outstanding job. Thank you, Stephen. Sorry, Stephen; I have probably put the mockers on you! I also thank my principal media adviser, Rick Morris, who has done an outstanding job. I do not want to name individuals, but I particularly those two. I also thank all my staff and the Premier's staff.

I commend this budget to the House.

#### Explanation of Clauses

##### *Clause 1: Short title*

This clause is formal.

##### *Clause 2: Commencement*

This clause provides for the Bill to operate retrospectively to 1 July 2009. Until the Bill is passed, expenditure is financed from appropriation authority provided by the *Supply Act*.

##### *Clause 3: Interpretation*

This clause provides relevant definitions.

##### *Clause 4: Issue and application of money*

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

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

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

##### *Clause 6: Expenditure from Hospitals Fund*

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

##### *Clause 7: Additional appropriation under other Acts*

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

##### *Clause 8: Overdraft limit*

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

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Hamilton-Smith.

#### CREDIT RATING

**The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Port Adelaide—Deputy Premier, Treasurer, Minister for Industry and Trade, Minister for Federal/State Relations) (15:57):** I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. K.O. FOLEY:** Just prior to coming into the chamber to deliver my budget speech, I was advised of an embargo on a statement released by Standard & Poor's rating agency. That embargo has now been lifted and it is now a public document. I wish to indulge the house by reading into *Hansard* a statement that is critically important to our state and its future.

As I said, the budget was designed to maintain our financial strength and our credibility with financial markets and rating agencies. It is no mistake, and the prime purpose of the function we have put into play in our budget is for us to maintain our AAA credit rating, as others were losing it—and I was fearful that we, too, would lose it.

I advise the house today that Standard & Poor's has reaffirmed unaffected the state's AAA credit rating. The document states:

Standard & Poor's Rating Services today said that the budget announced today for the state of South Australia—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!



**The Hon. K.O. FOLEY:** She is shaking her head. I will start again. It is so predictable. It states:

Standard & Poors Rating Services today said that the budget announced today for the state of South Australia is consistent with the 'AAA' rating and stable outlook already assigned to the state.

The government is projecting non-financial public sector net financial liabilities to peak at 106 per cent of revenue in fiscal 2012. Although this is in excess of the 80 per cent to 90 per cent level which Standard & Poor's has identified as a trigger to reassess the rating, the rating has remained unchanged for three key reasons:

I will read those three reasons into the *Hansard*.

*Ms Chapman interjecting:*

**The Hon. K.O. FOLEY:** Just listen, Vickie. It continues:

- The peak in net financial liabilities is only temporary and Standard & Poor's believes that the ratio will decrease in the medium term as projected by the government. The savings measures announced by the government will support the state's operating position and therefore reduce the state's need to borrow additional funds.
- The increase in net financial liability partly reflects changes to the discount rate. Using a comparable discount rate for the unfunded pension liability results in net financial liabilities peaking at about 85 per cent of revenue—a level close to that recorded when Standard & Poor's changed South Australia's rating to 'AAA' in 2004. Like most states, South Australia has a history of capital expenditure underspending and is therefore less likely to achieve its forecasted debt levels—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. K.O. FOLEY:** I go on, Mr Speaker.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. K.O. FOLEY:** Standard & Poor's credit analyst, Anna Hughes said:

The government's reprioritisation of some of its capital projects and a revision of its operating expenditure highlights the state's preparedness to manage its finances prudently during the current economic downturn and we have factored this into our assessment of the rating.

They trust this government.

**Honourable members:** Hear, hear!

**The Hon. K.O. FOLEY:** The ratings—

*Mr Hamilton-Smith interjecting:*

**The Hon. K.O. FOLEY:** I have been caught out with my AAA budget. The ratings could be re-assessed—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. K.O. FOLEY:** They trust us. They have confidence in us. They believe us.

**Ms Chapman:** Yes, they know you're hopeless.

**The Hon. K.O. FOLEY:** They know that I'm hopeless. I think if they thought that, they would have downgraded us and put us on negative watch. Further, Ms Hughes said:

The ratings could be re-assessed if the higher levels of debt appear in Standard & Poor's opinion to be permanent and/or more severe. The two most likely scenarios for this to occur would be a lack of political will or ability to deliver on proposed savings and a further deterioration in the state's revenue base due to a weaker economy.

Clearly, that states that Standard & Poor's and financial markets trust us, believe in us and have confidence in us. What they are saying is that we cannot go on a spending spree at the next election: it must be tight financial and fiscal management.

I will leave you on this note. This Labor government regained the AAA credit rating in the early part of its term, and, in the most difficult of financial times, when states such as Queensland could not maintain their AAA, this Labor government retains our AAA credit rating. We are the government of financial management. We are the government of economic management. We are the government for the future.

### WATERWORKS (RATES) AMENDMENT BILL

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

No. 1. Clause 8, page 3, lines 28 and 29 [clause 8, inserted section 65CAA(1)(a)]—

Delete '1 June in any particular year' and substitute:

31 December in the year preceding the commencement of the financial year

### STATUTES AMENDMENT (PUBLIC HEALTH INCIDENTS AND EMERGENCIES) BILL

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

No. 1. Clause 11, page 5, lines 33 to 36 [clause 11, inserted section 26A(1)]—

Delete subsection (1) and substitute:

- (1) The Minister may, by notice in the Gazette, modify the operation of section 18, 26 or 31 of the Controlled Substances Act 1984 for the duration of the declaration of an identified major incident, a major emergency or a disaster if satisfied that it is necessary to do so in order to meet—
- (a) the demand for drugs for medical purposes arising from the incident, emergency or disaster; or
- (b) the ordinary demand for drugs for medical purposes despite interruptions to medical services or supplies or other difficulties arising from the incident, emergency or disaster.

No. 2. Clause 24, page 9, line 10 [clause 24(3), inserted definition of Public Health Emergency Management Plan]—

After 'Chief Executive' insert:

and approved by the Minister

No. 3. Clause 26, page 10, line 21 [clause 26, inserted section 37A(1)]—

After 'may' insert:

, with the approval of the Minister,

No. 4. Clause 26, page 10, line 34 [clause 26, inserted section 37B(1)]—

After 'may' insert:

, with the approval of the Minister,

## ADJOURNMENT DEBATE

### BAROSSA VALLEY

**Mr VENNING (Schubert) (16:04):** The State Rann Labor government wants us to be the world's leading food and wine destination—and I support that—yet then turns around and creates a huge impost in liquor licensing regulations, which will severely impact upon some of the great wine and food events that we have on offer in this state, and I have just been stunned by the lack of success in the budget, particularly for country people. In early April South Australia's wine regions collectively were rated among the top 10 regions of the world in the *Travel + Leisure's* 50 greatest destinations of all time listing. In response to the listing the Minister for Tourism said:

The standout experiences offered by our wine regions help us lure travellers from our high-spending target markets in Australia and overseas, boosting visitation and injecting more money into regional economies. The state government will continue to support and promote greater assets South Australia offers visitors.

This is not the case with regard to the impositions by the state Rann Labor government through its liquor licensing regime upon groups trying to hold successful food and wine events for their local community and visitors alike.

Every year a street party is held in Lyndoch from approximately 5pm to 10pm, previously held in the main street but now held in the recreational park, and liquor is served at that event. This year it was decided to hold an event on Easter Monday and it was named Lyndoch Family Fun Day as the 2008 event had to be cancelled because of rain. The organising committee applied for the

appropriate liquor licence and was told three weeks before the event that it had to hire security guards.

Following the last event in 2007, the committee donated \$500 to charity, helping provide a roof over the heads of homeless children. This was after the committee raised the \$4,000 needed to cover its costs, which was difficult enough. How is it supposed to do this when they have to fork out for security guards for the day? Alcohol is served at the event, but it is a family orientated event with lots of kids entertainment and not a money-making event or a booze-up, with entry being a gold coin donation.

In the past 15 years the street party has been held there, there has never been an incident where the police needed to intervene. I therefore find it ludicrous that they are expected to hire a security company. Surely it is not too much to ask for the local police to stop by and check in. The police say, however, that it is not their responsibility. The event ended up hiring a security guard for the day, and kindly another guard volunteered for the day to help the committee keep down its costs.

I attended the event and, as is the case every year, there were no incidents or problems with behaviour. It was a wonderful family day, with many children enjoying the rides and entertainment, and the adults enjoying wine and beautiful food. Events like this demonstrate the community spirit for which the Barossa is known. The police attended for a brief period, despite their telling me personally that it was not their responsibility to do so.

An event named Lyndoch Uncorked used to take place annually at Lyndoch and alcohol was served at that event also. That event was cancelled because of the exorbitant costs largely associated with the need to hire security guards—a requirement of the liquor licence. I wonder how many more events like this will be cancelled not just in the Barossa but across our whole state. I note that the member for Mawson is here: his electorate is probably also affected. The Barossa is South Australia's food and wine flagship, but how about removing state government impediments? How dinkum are we? If you cannot help—and there has been very little—do not put impediments in the way.

On 1 May I was at Seppeltsfield to celebrate with the Premier the bottling and tasting of the 1909 100 year old port. Our host did a fantastic job. The managing director, Nathan Waks, and the director, Bruce Baudinet, greeted many important guests from all over, including the Premier. Seppeltsfield has the finest historic wine stocks in the world—no idle boast—and what a venue. No wonder the Minister for Transport picked it for his wedding venue. I also commend the wonderful gift the owners presented to the state via the Premier: 20 bottles of wine in a beautiful presentation pack. I ask the Premier what he has done with that. I hope he will present it to the parliament and have it on display either here or in the parliament, or in some prominent place where people can see it.

**Mr Bignell:** He got 10¢ each for the empties.

**Mr VENNING:** He got how much for the empties—10¢? It is a beautiful package and I urge members to look at it. It is beautifully presented and it is fantastic we are able to go there. The Premier enjoyed it, and certainly so did I.

Also, another owner, who does not wish to be public and never has her photograph taken is, of course, Janet Holmes a Court. I pay tribute to her because she has bought an icon of great South Australian importance—not just the land, buildings and history with it but also the fantastic wine stocks. I have been there twice in the last 12 months and both times I really did enjoy it and will long remember it. So, all power to them.

Also, today I express my sincere condolences to the family of the late Mrs Margaret Kelton. Greg Kelton, as we all know, is a journalist in this place, and sometimes we like him and sometimes we do not. He has a critical role writing for *The Advertiser* on politics, and most of us know him. I express to Greg and his family my sincere condolences. I know his wife has been sick for some time, and it is a very sad moment. Please receive from me and all members in this place our sincere condolences. We are thinking of you and the family at this moment.

I also want to thank the Minister for Health and the Attorney-General, after my request yesterday in this house, after my speech, and the emotion, concerning the two lads who were killed in the Barossa Valley. The second one was unable to be cleared from pathology and the family was told it could not have the body until late next week. I raised this with the Attorney-General and

the Minister for Health sitting together, and that body was released in one hour. I say simply: thank you.

I was disappointed in today's budget. It is probably out of order for me to comment, but I say I was disappointed today that there was not too much for country people. I certainly look forward to closely scrutinising the budget.

### **SEA AND VINES FESTIVAL**

**Mr BIGNELL (Mawson) (16:11):** I rise briefly to add the government's condolences to Greg Kelton and his family. I also take up another point. I recognise the wonderful contribution that the member for Schubert makes to the wine industry and, like me, he shares a passion for the industry. We are out there to promote and protect it, and to make sure that everyone within the wine industry prospers, because when they prosper the whole state prospers.

Getting to the point of licensed events, this week is the Sea and Vines Festival in McLaren Vale, and I encourage everyone to get along to it. It is a wonderful occasion and is held each June long weekend. There is a choice of some fairly big functions where there are bands and, of course, seafood and fine wine.

**Mr Venning:** Do they have security guards?

**Mr BIGNELL:** They do indeed have security guards, and most of the wineries have welcomed that because it has allowed them to police the big coaches that come in. Sometimes, the behaviour of some of the people on the coaches spoils it for others. Like many things in life, unfortunately we have to put in place rules and regulations for the masses when, unfortunately, the minority spoils it on some occasions. That has happened in recent years but they are only isolated incidents. Most of the wineries welcome the fact that they have to have security guards and a certain number of toilets and, once they reach their limitations, they have to turn away big buses. So, it works fairly smoothly, and they do cooperate with the police and the liquor licensing department.

I wish everyone in McLaren Vale a very happy and prosperous long weekend at the Sea and Vines Festival. I will be at The Producers on Sunday, where the food will be by Tori Morton and David Arbon, and the wines will be Battle of Bosworth. On Monday we will be at the Currant Shed, one of the great restaurants in McLaren Vale. So, we will be doing a little bit of smaller scale stuff and then maybe calling into the Bocce Club and a couple of other wineries around the place on both Sunday and Monday, the two days of the Sea and Vines Festival in McLaren Vale.

At 16:14 the house adjourned until Tuesday 16 June 2009 at 11:00.