

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 30 June 2010

The **SPEAKER (Hon. L.R. Breuer)** took the chair at 11:00 and read prayers.

SUPPLY BILL

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill without any amendment.

ECONOMIC AND FINANCE COMMITTEE: CONSUMER PROTECTION FOR FARMERS

Mr PICCOLO (Light) (11:03): I move:

That the 70th report of the committee, entitled Consumer Protection for Farmers: Reaping a Fair Harvest, be noted.

I will make a few comments on the report and how the report arose, and indicate where the matter goes from here, the report having been tabled and considered by the relevant ministers. The matter came before this house on 10 September when I raised farmers' concerns in my electorate and I also acknowledge the concerns raised by the member for Hammond. I acknowledge that the member for Hammond has supported this inquiry and given great support to farmers in his electorate, and we have worked together on some of the issues.

The issues brought to my attention concerned some farmers who were having difficulties with farm machinery. The issues can be summarised as follows: safety issues, in other words, the safety of the machinery itself; warranty issues, in other words, getting manufacturers to deal with warranty issues to repair machinery which had broken down or was faulty in some way; and also the issue of the farmer dealing with a manufacturer, or big business or multinational companies, and their ability to get them to do the right thing.

The other issue that is very important is looking at farmers as a small business and their ability to influence decisions of, as I said, manufacturers, but also their own economic viability when things go wrong. I had discussions, as I mentioned, with some other members in this place, in particular the member for Hammond. I also had discussions with the South Australian Farmers Federation which is also looking into this issue of warranties and dispute resolution.

On 10 September I raised this matter in state parliament, and I gave a report on those discussions I had had with farmers and the problems they were having in getting machine manufacturers to undertake repairs to machinery that was under warranty. While the initial problem occurred when the warranty was in place, often those problems continued beyond the warranty period, and often the manufacturers were reluctant to take further work.

Two problems arose from this. First of all that the cost of repairs to machinery often outstripped the original cost of the equipment itself. I am aware of one case—and I think this is in the electorate of Hammond—where one farmer spent more money on legal fees and battling for repairs than the piece of machinery, which I think was a tractor, originally cost. There are some issues about why you would do that, but I suppose the farmer thinks at some point the matter will be resolved so he keeps pouring in money. That matter has been resolved; I understand that it has been settled, but whether it is satisfactory is a different matter. However, certainly there is an issue out there.

The other issue, apart from the cost to farmers—and in the case of my constituent the cost to him has been estimated at about \$2 million, and that matter has not been resolved, but I understand that, with the intervention of the South Australian Farmers Federation, the matter is being mediated at the moment and hopefully that will come to a satisfactory conclusion.

The other issue about machinery is the down time, when machinery is not in production. Because of the expense, often farmers buy machinery not only to do their own farms but also to contract work out. So when the machinery is not working in the farming industry, because it is of a seasonal nature one week or two weeks' down time can actually mean half a season of work gone. So not only do they lose their own crop, but secondly they lose the additional income from the contract work. So there is a huge cost. I am aware that in some provinces of Canada they have actually changed the laws to reflect that, that farm machine warranties of certain manufacturers have to retain certain products or items to repair equipment quickly, and if not there are penalties attached.

In that speech to parliament on 10 September, I did indicate to the parliament that I thought this matter warranted an inquiry, because the feedback I was getting, certainly from my electorate, and some of the members, was that it was not an isolated case but quite widespread. So, being a member of the Economic and Finance Committee, I decided to raise this matter with the committee and ask for an inquiry. To my shock and horror—I could not believe it—the Liberal Party members of the committee opposed the inquiry. All three of them absolutely opposed it. Mind you, they did me a favour in the long term—I do appreciate the members' support for me.

However, they opposed it, and these are the grounds they gave to oppose this inquiry to look at these issues: it was trivial; not a matter for our committee to spend its time on; and not really an issue, just something I had manufactured. These are the people who say they represent rural and regional Australia. These are the people who stand up day in, day out on the other side and talk about how we on this side ignore rural and regional Australia.

So they had an opportunity to actually support an inquiry to look at these issues and all three of them—what did they do—opposed it. They said no to the farmers, no to rural and regional Australia. It was an embarrassment to the other members—and I do know there are a few members on the other side who were embarrassed by their colleagues. So, they took their liberalism to the extreme, where they just did what they liked, ignoring the needs of their electorate. Like I said, they did do me a favour though, because it was interesting to note the reaction by the farming community and other industry bodies, who were quite amazed, disappointed and actually somewhat outraged by the Liberal Party's actions.

One of the reasons they gave was that this committee should not actually deal with it, it is not important enough. Clause (4) of the committee's functions states:

...any matter concerned with the regulation of business or any other economic or financial activity or whether such regulation should be retained or modified in the areas.

I would have thought that this is a clear reference point for such an inquiry; but, again, the Liberal Party members of that committee, to a T, opposed it. Like I said, there are a couple on that side who are embarrassed by their colleagues' behaviour.

What did the committee look at? The committee's references are summarised as follows. They were to look at the efficacy of the current warranty laws; what sort of product protection there is; procedures to deal with grievances; and occupational health, welfare and safety issues. The committee took evidence from a number of farmers in written and oral form. They took evidence from the South Australia Farmers Federation. I again acknowledge that the federation has been very active, has worked with the committee, has worked very hard to resolve this matter, and has been very active in establishing a process to resolve disputes. I commend the federation for its work. We also heard from SafeWork SA, Consumer Affairs and dealer organisations.

The reality in rural and regional Australia is that, often, the local dealer is the meat in the sandwich. On the one hand, they try to do the right thing by their farmer client and, at times, they get pushed to the other corner by a manufacturer or an importer. I do acknowledge that, in most cases, if not all cases, the dealers try to do the right thing, but unfortunately they cannot go against the manufacturer's wishes; although, at times, they have done warranty work out of their own pocket.

What did the evidence indicate? The evidence indicated overwhelmingly that there was a problem in this area and that some intervention was required. Despite what we were told at the committee, when the Liberal Party opposed it, the evidence was overwhelming that something had to be done. It was not only in this state, but the number of inquiries that I received from New South Wales, Victoria and Western Australia were also quite strong; so, it was a problem across the nation.

What was the evidence, and what are the problems? The problem is this: essentially, farmers at law are in the main small businesses, because they are generally all incorporated, and they are not covered by the normal Consumer Transactions Act. So, a farmer who buys a piece of machinery, which could be worth half a million dollars or a million dollars, has less protection as a consumer of a product than a person who buys a \$500 refrigerator. In fact, the Farmers Federation president, who gave evidence to the committee, indicated that that is very much the case.

Unfortunately, in this state and also in this country uniform consumer laws at the national level, as I understand it, do not include protection for businesses. So, business to business

transactions are not part of consumer law, but I think they should be and, certainly, it is the view of the committee that that should be looked into.

Secondly, because it is not part of the act, they have to take action themselves under the Trade Practices Act, generally speaking, which means going to court, and that is where we have a problem. The power relationship and the financial positions between a farmer and the manufacturer has an imbalance of power and an imbalance in terms of resources. The committee heard about cases where the manufacturer would just run up a bill and fight the case in court until the farmer gave up. That, to some extent, would probably be a similar case to what happened in the member for Hammond seat, where the farmer, in the end, cut his losses and settled.

What do we do to make sure that farmers get a fair go? The assumption is that, if you are a small business person, you can look after yourself and that you have an equal or a fair level playing field. That is not the case at all, and the history of litigation in this area would strongly indicate that. As I mentioned, the new national consumer laws unfortunately do bypass small business and also farmers.

What were the committee's recommendations? Basically, the committee recommended that there should be an independent mediation scheme that could provide alternative dispute resolution services for the agricultural sector. The committee went on to say that it should be voluntary mediation but that it should have some statutory support to enforce those decisions if they are made. I know that the South Australian Farmers Federation has established such a scheme, and I wish it well. One would hope that the voluntary scheme would work but, in the event of it not working, I think this matter needs to be revisited by this place to see what laws are required.

The other recommendations talked about perhaps looking at extending current state-based consumer protection legislation to include farming machinery. I think that was one of the recommendations supported by my colleague, now the Attorney, who was on that committee. His advice was accepted by the committee, and that recommendation went forward. I am not sure if we are progressing in that direction, but it is certainly something we need to keep a watch on.

One of the other recommendations the committee made, which I thought was important, was that we need to look at some sort of national code of practice which, if you like, helps to develop a framework to deal with a whole range of disputes in the farming sector. That would be something under the Trade Practices Act—a bit like the other codes of practice under the Native Vegetation Act which have legislative backing but which, to some extent, give the industry itself some footing to try to resolve its own problems—that would look at what are acceptable behaviours in that industry. I would certainly support a national code of practice being developed.

The other important issues are around occupational health, safety and welfare. The evidence heard by the committee indicated quite strongly that this is an area that needs some work. One of the problems is that, because of the way the law operates, farmers are often perhaps a bit reluctant to report faulty equipment, etc.; if they do they may get the equivalent of their equipment being defected, which means it is non-operational. They could lose a lot, particularly in the seasonal period. So we need to look at a way of encouraging and supporting farmers, and giving them an incentive to report product which is not appropriate but without penalising them in some way. One can understand that they would—quite rightly—be reluctant to report something if it meant that their machine would be defected for a whole season and they lost their sole source of income.

This matter, which has been reported to parliament today, certainly has not run its course. There are still outstanding issues, and I can indicate that I and members on this side—and I note that the member for Frome has indicated that he supports the recommendation and is also prepared to work in this area—need to pursue these matters to make sure that we give farmers, as the report says, a fair harvest.

In my closing moments I would like to acknowledge the support and contribution of the South Australian Farmers Federation and the National Farmers Federation. I would also like to acknowledge the support of my local federal member Nick Champion MHR who has—excuse the pun—championed this issue in the national parliament. He has raised this in the federal parliament and I understand that he has also met with farmers, certainly in my electorate, and lobbied national ministers. I also understand that he has arranged a number of meetings with farmers at the national level, and that he will be knocking on the doors of relevant ministers to make sure that the appropriate reforms take place at the federal level. It is a bit like other areas of law, when you do

business across the states national laws are needed to support that. With those comments, I conclude my remarks.

Mr VENNING (Schubert) (11:18): I acknowledge the member for Light, who just sat down. I will not name the family involved, but this family first came to me in relation to this problem. Being a farmer myself I will declare my interest, because I do have a strong personal interest in this matter. I understand that my brother also gave evidence, so I declare that as well.

The Hon. R.B. Such: Do you still have the Steiger?

Mr VENNING: No; the Steiger was sold, sadly. My son sold it when I was not around, so it has gone, but it was a great project. The problem we originally had with this was that the Economic and Finance Committee had this matter before it to discuss the position. It is a statutory committee of the parliament, and that was the issue. The member for Light has already highlighted an issue that we had on this side of the house. This is a private consumer issue, so there is a question as to whether or not the parliament should have it.

I agree that, if you are outcome driven, it has been successful. You could say that there was no other avenue, so we did it this way. The member for Light was sitting on this committee, so he chose to do it this way. Irrespective of that—and I still say that it was an unusual thing to send it to this committee—if you are outcome driven, I say, 'Well, good on you.' I know the family, who I see regularly, in fact the man is a member of the Liedertafel choir, who I see every week.

Mr Pederick: Can he sing better than you?

Mr VENNING: He sings similar to me. He is aware of the difficulty we, on this side of the house, had about this. So, I know that family very well. The problem they had was not unknown, and particularly with one particular company.

Mr Piccolo interjecting:

Mr Pederick: You've had your go.

Mr VENNING: You know my position. I am not spinning anything. I am saying exactly what I feel. Where there is an issue of safety—and there was in this instance, with high hydraulic pressures—and when you are messing with these things they can kill people very quickly. A leaky hose at 3,000 psi can kill people, and this was the problem with this. It was obvious to me, and I have a bit of mechanical knowledge, that this was a mismatch of machinery: a machine made by one company and the front made by another, and there was an incompatibility of the two parts.

I will tell you what: it does not happen with John Deere. We are almost 100 per cent John Deere on our property and it never happens. I agree with the member for Light: dealing with multinational companies, such as John Deere and all these other companies—I will not name them—is difficult because these decisions are made in another country, usually Canada or the United States of America. The poor old local agent, the dealer, in this instance a dealer in Lyndoch, and I have no problem with him, they did everything possible that they could to fix this machine. I take my hat off to them. There is nothing negative about them at all. They certainly tried their best. It is just sad that the company did not come up with a better resolution.

As I said, I was quite confused as to why a consumer issue such as this would go to a statutory committee of the parliament. I agree with the member: if you do not send it there, where do you send it? That is a good question. I do not know. As I say, the outcome has been positive, I think, and it has certainly been highlighted. The member quoted clause 4. I read clause 4 and it is very open-ended. Nevertheless, the member interpreted it that way. Again, it has been outcome-driven.

Agricultural machinery is extremely expensive. We just bought a new boom sprayer a few weeks ago, and you are looking at a huge investment. You could buy two or three houses for the cost of one of these things, and they are very high tech. They are all hydraulically driven and if there is any problem with it the farmer cannot fix it with a piece of wire, like they used to, you have to get the technician out. The technician comes out, plugs his computer in and says, 'Yes, you've got a problem,' and the farmer can do nothing about it. So, the down time, as the member said, is critical.

Farming today is very time critical. If the machine stops operating, these machines are so expensive that the dealer does not usually carry a spare machine. In the old days, when we had small tractors, the dealer would often have two or three sitting on the lot, and he would lend you

another tractor—in these instances, no way. There is usually only one in the district and that is the one that has gone down. So, that is a concern.

The warranty responsibilities are quite clearly laid out. When you look at the recommendations—and I will just read the two—of the committee, and the member did not mention them, recommendation one is:

The committee recommends to the Minister for Consumer Affairs and the Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries that a mediation scheme to provide alternative dispute resolution services for the agricultural sector be created.

My question for the member is: has that happened? I certainly do not have a problem with that mediation scheme being set up. The second recommendation is a bit more vague:

The committee recommends to the Minister for Consumer Affairs and the Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries that an alternative industry-based dispute resolution scheme be voluntary, that its decisions are binding on parties and, if necessary, it be given statutory backing to give it effect.

Is that conflicting with the first recommendation?

Mr Piccolo: It is complementary.

Mr VENNING: Well, I would have a good look at that. I ask the member: has anything happened since then? I know the Minister for Agriculture, as an expert, will be keen to get his fingers into this, and I can see no problem with that, particularly if it is done in conjunction with, say, the South Australian Farmers Federation (SAFF) and with a couple of independent people sitting on it. I think it would be a good move, because there are always going to be disputes like this.

Finally, I hope there will be some long-term outcomes. I think this took an unusual path. Whereas I did not agree with my colleagues who did not want to deal with it, I can understand why, because of this confusion of having a statutory committee of the parliament deal with what is a consumer issue. Again, it is outcome driven. If it is come up with a positive result, irrespective of whether it is right or wrong, I support that.

To the family involved with this, I say that I am sorry that you have been through this problem, because these people are hay contractors. This machine is a very critical type of machine—it is a windrower—and with it being down like it was, it certainly cost that family a lot of money. I am pleased that we have come up with a resolution, and I hope that we can move on. Again, all credit to the local dealer at Lyndoch. They did all they possibly could to assist, and I hope there is nothing in this that will cause them any hurt or pain whatsoever. So, the outcomes are there. Let us see what the long-term outcome is and, if it is, I am fully supportive.

Mr KENYON (Newland) (11:26): As the current chair of the committee—however, not being a member of the committee at the time—I just rise briefly to support the motion of the member for Light. I note that in his speech he talked about the consumer protection laws in Canada. Both the United States and Canada have particularly good consumer protection laws, and they are an example for Australia. I think we lag behind in consumer protection legislation and, over time, I would like to see our legislation strengthened.

I would certainly like to see a few more teeth. Individual customers and, in this case, small businesses—farmers particularly—are not in strong bargaining positions with international or even small to medium businesses in many cases. In particular, once you have handed over your cash you are in a very difficult position. Having some teeth in our consumer protection laws is something to aim for, and the United States and Canada provide a really interesting example of how we might go about doing that.

I am particularly interested in anti-trust laws. It is probably time Australia had some anti-trust laws—another federal issue, I understand, but it is something I would like to see. I think the American anti-trust laws have only been used twice, but they provide a very big stick for governments to use, allowing them to talk a lot more softly if they choose to do so. I would very much like to see anti-trust laws in Australia. I think we have issues with Woolworths, Coles and Telstra, and anti-trust laws would enable us to negotiate a little bit more evenly, or perhaps have a little bit more flexibility out of these companies when governments need to talk to them.

Over time, these companies have become more powerful and more dominant in the markets and, as a result, are working against consumers. That balance between consumers and retailers/sellers has been weighted unfairly in many ways. I do not know about anyone else in this chamber, but I will be very happy when the day comes when I do not have to deal with Telstra and

I can move all of my telephonic accounts to other companies. That will be a great time, and I will not need to spend half an hour on the phone every time I need to communicate with my phone supplier.

I would also like to note the opposition of the Liberal Party to this very investigation, and even now the member for Schubert is out there trying to defend the position of the Liberal Party in opposing this inquiry.

Mr Venning interjecting:

Mr KENYON: You had better sit down so you can interject, Ivan. It is quite clear to me that, if nothing else, this is an ideal thing for a statutory committee of this parliament to be inquiring into because, while it is an individual example, it gives rise to an investigation into the laws of the state, and it will allow us to give due consideration, with a concrete example of how the laws of the state may be unfairly affecting consumers/small business in this state.

The fact that the Liberal Party was not standing up for small business does not necessarily surprise me, given its record over the last eight years. What does surprise me is the Liberal Party's refusal to stand up for its farming constituency, which you would think is the very heart of the Liberal Party in this state. However, the Liberals saw fit to just let it slide so that they did not have to deal with it. They did not see any reason for them to intercede on behalf of one of their core constituencies. However, it is not for me to tell them how to go about their business. I note only that the members for Mount Gambier and Frome are here as Independents and not as members of the Liberal Party.

When decisions such as this are made by the Liberal Party, it does not surprise me that the members for Frome and Mount Gambier are Independent members. I am not going to lecture Liberal Party members; that is for them to do. All I point out is that the Liberal Party did not win seats that it needed to win, and I think this is part of the reason. Having said that, I think it was a very useful inquiry—an inquiry that needed to be made. The seasonal nature of farming and the importance of farming to our state's economy and the capital intensity of farming mean that we really need to be certain of where we are at.

We have to be very sure that we have the right meshing of consumer protection and small business laws in this state. This is a prime example of where they probably do not quite gel and where consumer protection laws might need to be pushed into the small business realm, which you would usually not expect to happen. Historically, you would say that farming has often not been treated as a business in this country but, in this particular case, we need to take a good look at how those two elements interact. With those few words, I am happy to support the motion of the member for Light.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher) (11:32): I welcome this report. Whilst initially it might be dealing with one or two individual situations, I agree with the member for Newland that we need a complete overhaul of consumer protection laws. Most businesses do the right thing. I have had experience in my electorate, and I had an unusual instance in my early days as a member, which is going back a while. A lady who had a problem with her waterbed asked whether I could come down to help sort out the issue. I thought, 'Hello, hello!' I went down to see her, and she told me that she had bought this double waterbed, which had a divider in the middle. She said, 'I can't get next to my husband'—I said, 'Oh!'—and she said that she had been sleeping on the lounge.

Anyway, because the lady had had the bed for more than the statutory time within which you can return something, I rang Mr Waterbeds, which is not his real name. I said, 'I think we've got an issue here,' and he said that he would exchange it—and he threw in a doona cover. So, I am pretty sure I got that lady's vote. That is smart business practice—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: No, I don't think Mr Waterbeds was the husband! I had another one not long ago involving Adrian Brien Ford, where someone paid a deposit for a car and then realised they could not follow through with the sale because they had other financial issues. So, I contacted Adrian Brien Ford, and they agreed not to pursue the matter—that is smart business.

Another one more recently was where the dealer—an air conditioning company—was not quite so cooperative. The company basically said, 'Well, stuff the customer,' because the lady did not talk to them in a nice way. Well, I do not condone people talking in a rough way to business. However, most businesses are smart, most businesses do the right thing, but there will always be

some that do not. I think that we need a review of consumer laws overall, not just for the protection of farmers.

Just to wrap up on this issue and this report and some of the issues which, obviously, were not covered in it and which it did not intend to cover, farmers as individuals are very vulnerable because they operate in a pretty tough market. They are vulnerable, obviously, to a whole lot of things—climatic conditions and so on. What we are seeing as an ongoing issue (and it has been addressed elsewhere and, hopefully, will be resolved in part through the COAG inquiry) is labelling, which is disadvantaging our farmers; fair prices, because farmers get screwed down, particularly by some of the larger commercial operations; and imports, which are not adequately checked in my view—only a small percentage are checked by AQIS, the quarantine service.

You only have to look at the price that dairy farmers get for milk and then you look at the price you pay for flavoured milk in a small container to realise that someone is getting milked, and it is not the dairy cow. A dairy farmer is lucky to get between 30¢ and 40¢ a litre for white milk at the gate, and then you buy a 600ml iced coffee and it costs you about \$3, so there is a bit of a mark-up there. Farmers moved away from co-ops, which was one of the strong elements, I think, of farming in South Australia for many years—the various cooperatives.

I think that farmers might well revisit the concept of working together and supporting each other through cooperatives, because otherwise they get picked off one at a time. We know that they do not like tight associations. Farmers do not like to be told what to do. They tend to be independent sort of characters, but I think there is merit in having more cooperative type arrangements, whether it is in buying, purchasing power, protecting their consumer rights and so on. I think that farmers ought to be moving towards, as a suggestion from me, being in cooperatives.

I commend this report. I think that it is a small step, and it highlights the fact that, in South Australia you might be one citizen or a couple of citizens, but you can still have access to our parliamentary system to have a conduct of an inquiry; and I think that is one of the virtues of our democratic parliamentary system.

Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder) (11:37): I wish to make only a brief contribution to this, not having been a member of the Economic and Finance Committee at the time of the investigation being carried out. I do not have a detailed knowledge of it and I have not had a chance to review the paper itself, but I do have some historical involvement in that I know that the time of the consideration of the establishment of the investigation was around the time of the Paskeville field days occurring in the northern part of my electorate.

I had a stand there and I had farmers and machinery dealers come to see me about the fact that they had heard that an inquiry was going to be undertaken. I do respect the fact that the member for Light pushed the idea of this committee investigation based on concerns that had been put to his office. He spoke to the farmers involved, he was concerned about the responses being received from some of the dealers and he decided to see whether there was an opportunity to investigate what was happening.

I am also thankful to the member for Light who provided to me a copy of the one submission which, I think, was received from within my electorate, a farmer in the Urania area I have had some contact with. They told me the story of their issue in relation to a very valuable piece of machinery, where there had been some frustration with the responses for the need to fix some minor problems with that. It is important that our farming community is supported, but it is also important to recognise that the machinery dealers who operate in regional South Australia with which this report deals are people who, in many cases, have been there for many generations.

They are family businesses that have a strong commitment to the community. They do go out of their way. I know that dealers who operate in my electorate work very long hours in the peak times when a breakdown occurs and an immediate response is required to get a machine fixed and back operating, because, when a farmer is working, all they want to do is to make sure they continue to work. It is a difficult issue. I know there has been some criticism in regard to the opposition's response to this. I also read the report that was in *The Stock Journal* and wondered about it.

However, I do recognise the fact that, at the time of that comment being attributed to the opposition, there were also some proposals from the opposition concerning investigations into other matters before the Economic and Finance Committee which were also very justified. I think it demonstrates some of the frustration that lower house committees feel in that, yes, they are well

chaired and a strong spirit of bipartisanship exists the majority of the time, but political influences occur when, say, we from this side feel that a real case needs to be investigated, but because it could be potentially damaging to the government, it is not supported by the majority of members; namely, members sitting on your right side, Mr Acting Speaker.

Politics come into it, too, but I can assure all members of the chamber and anyone reading the contributions on this matter that in no way is the Liberal Party not supportive of small business and the farming community. It wants to ensure that all have the opportunity to be successful and it is focused on anything that allows that to happen. Some rather scurrilous remarks have been made across the chamber this morning which I believe do not truly reflect our position. It is unfortunate that they were made. Whether it is now or in the future, members of the Economic and Finance Committee will be focused on undertaking some investigations that provide opportunities for South Australia's money—and that is what it should be focused on—to ensure that it is spent in an appropriate manner.

This is a difficult issue. I know that the machinery dealers to whom I have spoken are committed to ensuring that the product they sell, especially in a farming situation—and it is often worth hundreds of thousands of dollars—works as it is designed to do, and as soon as there is a problem, there is a very quick response to fix it and to get that machine operating. Yes, the committee's inquiry is understood, acknowledged and supported. I do not believe a minority report was submitted.

It is an important step forward and will give surety to all sides of the equation that, when a lot of money is spent on a piece of machinery, it will be operational. The farmer wants that and the machinery dealer wants that, because the best way for the machinery dealer to be assured of future sales is by ensuring that the quality of the machinery they sell is recognised by anyone in the market who is looking for a new machine, because word of mouth advertising sells better than anything. I appreciate the submission of the report to the chamber and look forward to some improvements in the future.

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (11:42): In speaking to this report on consumer protection for farmers, I indicate that the member for Light kept me informed of what was happening because, as he mentioned in his speech, he was aware of a constituent of mine who had a tractor and he could not get any happiness from the local dealer concerning a repair that needed to be done so that he could operate the machine. This machine was quite good mechanically, but there was a major issue with the air conditioning system. It is very sad that the dealer did not seem committed to fixing the problem. What I believe was probably more the case is that I do not think the company above the dealer gave the dealer the appropriate support to address the issue. I firmly believe that major machinery companies are quite happy to take cases like this to court.

As the member for Light indicated, a tactic of machinery companies is to hand it over to their legal wing and forget about the actual nuts and bolts of the machinery, and then leave them to handle it until the farmer runs out of cash, patience, or both. It is a real tragedy what happened with my constituent and the amount of money involved. I believe that it was the first time my constituent had bought a brand new tractor in his farming career, so you can imagine the disappointment that this has caused him. It has caused him years of stress and it is unjust. Essentially, the major manufacturing company handed this case over to their legal wing and left them to handle it. I think that is where much of the fault lies.

The other thing with which I agree with the member for Light is that it does need pursuing on a national scheme, and that is simply the nub of the matter. It is national legislation under the Trade Practices Act that should be addressing these issues, because there are far too many of them and we on this side do champion the cause of farmers. It should not get to this stage when you have machinery worth in the hundreds of thousands—harvesters these days can be optioned up close to a million dollars by the time you spec them up—there should be far better protection for the buyers of this machinery and also, at the end of the day, they should be manufactured better, or matched up with other machinery—as has been indicated today—if one part of a machine is manufactured in one place and one in the other.

The big frustration in farming—and I should note that I have a direct interest obviously, coming from a farming background, so I mention my interest in farming directly—is the availability of service and the availability of parts for machines. When machinery is so expensive it is fair and just that farmers think that these things should be available so that they can get on with life. So I do have real sympathy for the people who have been caught up in this. I believe it can be worked out with national legislation, and that would go some way toward helping the problem.

I am a bit confused (as is the member for Schubert) about two of the recommendations of the committee. Recommendation 1 states:

The Committee recommends to the Minister for Consumer Affairs and the Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries that a mediation scheme to provide alternative dispute resolution services for the agricultural sector be created.

Recommendation 2 states:

The Committee recommends to the Minister for Consumer Affairs and the Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries that an alternative industry-based dispute resolution scheme be voluntary, that its decisions are binding on parties and, if necessary, it be given statutory backing to give it effect.

I think to save confusion—I was not on the committee and I am no expert—perhaps combining those two recommendations would have been simpler for people reading the report and taking it in.

I note the windrowing machine that the member for Schubert and the member for Light referred to. I actually had a look at the machine, and the problem was that one part of the machine had high pressure hydraulics and one part had low-pressure, so it was never going to work. The company, as I said before, was quite happy to go down the legal route and just let it work out that way. A friend of mine also bought a similar machine but, sadly, he bought it second hand, so he falls into the 'buyer beware' category and would not have the same protection as someone buying a new machine. These things do need to be addressed.

In closing, I note the comment of the member for Newland, who alleged that we are not here for our farming constituents. I can tell you that we are here for our farming constituents, and if members on the other side (including the members for Light and Newland) are so concerned about the farming industry, they should go to their Treasurer and their so-called self-proclaimed expert on agricultural affairs, minister O'Brien, and ask him why he is pillaging PIRSA, cutting it to bits, and just destroying it. They are not going after the mining side of PIRSA. Don't get me wrong, I support mining full on, as does the member for Newland. I know he supports mining.

Members interjecting:

Mr PEDERICK: If these members want to come in here and make these allegations, well, let's see them stand up in here for the public servants today. I know that one person, after 33 years' faithful service to PIRSA, was told two or three weeks ago that it is over today. And there are others who have been working in the higher levels of research and development with SARDI. I am not going to mention names, but I believe their last day is today as well. These are people who have been at the leading edge of research and development in this state, and their jobs, as far as working for the department of agriculture is concerned, are finalised today. Certainly, in one case that I know of, a person has been told he will have to accept a transfer out from where he lives. He wants to stay where he lives. He has lived in that community for over three decades, and he wants to stay there.

This is the thanks that this government gives to these people, who are so vital in ensuring that the rural industries of this state are vibrant and keep going. We have this so-called self-proclaimed best agriculture spokesman in the world, minister O'Brien, who puts out a press release the other day saying he wants the food sector to be as good as defence and mining. Well, he is just cutting the guts out of it. If you have got absolutely nil investment and then less investment, where do you think it's going? It's going nowhere. They are hollow words. Let's not carry on about what our relationship is with farmers. We know what the Labor Party's relationship is. The biggest farm they are aware of is that bloody eighth of an acre in their backyard.

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg) (11:51): I just wish to briefly speak to this report. I too am inspired by the member for Hammond to confirm the opposition's concern at the prospect of the death of PIRSA. What is so stunningly bizarre about the government's action is, firstly, when I came back into the parliament after the election and observed that the minister for primary industries is down at the end of the line, it just confirmed to me how little the government was concerned about primary industries in this state.

Notwithstanding that, of the top 10 income producers for this state—in fact the entire viability of this state—nine are primary industries. They are what keep our state alive. They are what provide us with the income for those of us who might be in urban living, provision of services, and the like. They are the actual income producers. Primarily, alcoholic beverages, and copper, uranium, wheat, barley, and fishing are in that top nine, and they are spread across the region outside of the greater metropolitan area of Adelaide.

The 10th one in that category is the car manufacturing industry. Sad as it may appear, the car manufacturing industry for South Australia may not have a long-term future as an income producer that it has had in the past, and that will be a sad day, because manufacturing has played an important historical contribution to the economy of the state. But, as we have seen, the collapse of employment and opportunities that were there for what was originally Chrysler and then Mitsubishi, which is evident, and the closure of one of the shifts at the General Motors Holden plant, are all signs to us, coupled with the moving out of the state of the component industries that have been so well represented in this state over the last 30 to 40 years.

I am sure that people like Sir Thomas Playford, who is splendidly displayed in our chamber, if he were here today, would be deeply disappointed at what is the eminent slowing down of a major industry. However—

Mr PICCOLO: Point of order. I know that the Liberal Party is embarrassed by this whole inquiry matter, but it would be useful if the Liberal Party could talk about the inquiry itself. I know that the member for Bragg is trying to extend this to go over time, but it would be an injustice to the farmers, whom the inquiry is about—

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Kenyon): Order!

Mr PICCOLO: —that the speech go along in this—

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! Member for Light, I think I understand the point of order. Member for Bragg, you will need to keep to the report, and I will just point out that at 12 o'clock we will need to move along. Member for Bragg.

Ms CHAPMAN: However, when that 10th industry, the manufacturing industry, bites the dust as a major income producer I have absolutely no doubt that the tenth will actually be a primary industry in this state. The whole ten are what keep our state going. They produce income, and they provide the very basis upon which those of us in the service industry depend—lawyers, doctors, accountants, etc.—to enable us to actually receive the funding, the people and the purpose for being here, to actually be able to function and live here. Our whole state was built on primary industry and farming. I can go back to the original charter in the House of Commons, if the member for Light is really interested in that.

However, I would like to say that we started this state with democratic standards, and with them an absolute commitment to mining and farming, whether at the pastoral level for stock or for harvesting in intensive or broadacre farming. Either way, these have been very important industries for the state right from the start. Indeed, some of the first laws in this chamber were in relation to customs and excise before we became part of a federation, issues regarding rules for the exploration and exporting of our mineral wealth and all the rules that we had in establishing, for example, pastoral boards to protect our environment in the very sensitive areas in the northern part of the state—bearing in mind, obviously, that a large part of the state is desert.

That includes the Riverland, of course, a beautiful part of the state—and that member is not immediately present. It is an area that is a river running through a desert but, with proper water management and irrigation, it has been opened up as a food basket for South Australia. All these things are very important for the financial stability and future of this state, and are the only opportunity for this state progressing. In the past I have been a strong advocate of re-amalgamating with the Northern Territory—we gave it up in 1910—which would, of course, give us more land for farming, pastoral and mining activities.

In fact, it would give us a massive increase in the male population. We have a disproportion between this state and the territory; we have a majority of females and they have a majority of males, so it would not be a bad idea if we got together. I am happy to recommit my passion for this proposal, given that we are here in the year 2010, 100 years since the passing of commonwealth legislation, to take that precious part of Australia away from South Australia. I can tell the house that I will be one who continues to bat for getting it back.

In the meantime, it is important that, to secure the farming community, we ensure that it is not overburdened with regulation and that it is protected so that, when farmers buy a product, it works. If it does not work, they must be properly protected against mischief at the manufacturing level or inadvertent neglect at the time of retailing or wholesaling. All this is important to ensure that we do not crush our farming community, as the demise of PIRSA clearly will.

My father, a former minister for agriculture in this state, would turn in his grave, given the pioneering work that was done by both Labor and Liberal governments in opening up the deserts,

from Libya to Algiers to Saudi Arabia, to find that today we are effectively on the last day of an institution that has supported the most productive and essential income earning and economic base of this state. It is a very sad day; it is shameful. I feel a bit sorry for the minister as well; basically he is going to be useless. He is going to be redundant. He is going to be paid off. He will have to go back to Springfield and start growing strawberries or something. However, the reality is that he will be out of a job, and yet the economic engine of this state will be left without a support base.

The only remedy is, of course, for the farming community of this state (including pastoralists and graziers) together with mining, to pay separately for services, which every other industry of this state, one way or another, gets some support from, but not those who are critical to the viability of this state. We may as well close up and sell up.

Debate adjourned.

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Attorney-General, Minister for Justice, Minister for Tourism) (12:00): I move:

That standing orders be so far suspended as to enable the consideration forthwith of Notices of Motion, Other Motions, Nos 2 to 17, set down for Thursday 1 July 2010.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have counted the house and, as there is not an absolute majority of the whole number of members of the house present, ring the bells.

An absolute majority of the whole number of members being present:

Motion carried.

LEGOE FAMILY

The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher) (12:02): This is quite an historic moment when the government gives precedence to private members' matters, so I commend it for that.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Enjoy the moment, member for Fisher.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: I commend the Rann government; it is obviously getting close to the people, and that is what we want. I move:

That this house commends the Legoe family for their generosity in donating land in the Coorong to honour Colin Thiele AC.

Madam Deputy Speaker, I know you come from a highly esteemed literary family; your mother is well recognised as a writer, and you would appreciate the contribution of someone like the late author Colin Thiele. On Sunday 13 June, a large group (probably 150 people, or more) gathered opposite the Salt Creek roadhouse in the Coorong to acknowledge the gift by the Legoe family of land that they had owned for a long time in the Coorong. Whilst it is not a huge piece of land in size, it is a critical piece of land. It amounts to 13 hectares, and it is between the northern and southern sections of the Coorong National Park. It is very significant in that it is essentially in pristine condition and will enable the completion of that national park.

The Legoe family is noted for its generosity. His Honour Christopher Legoe, who inherited this land from his father, I understand, said that he was the black sheep of the family—he went in to law. We will not make any comment about that, but he did not continue the farming tradition. We know of other members of the extended Legoe family in the South-East, including the late John Legoe, who was very effective and active in the community through his council and the LGA. So, there is a tradition of community service and the Hon. Christopher Legoe decided that, to honour Colin Thiele, he would donate this land left to him by his father. We should acknowledge that, because it is the sort of thing that helps improve the quality and represents the character of South Australia, particularly members who have been very generous in their contribution.

At that gathering we had a lot of distinguished people. We invited representatives of the Ngarrindjeri. Unfortunately, they were not able to attend, but I did speak with one of the senior members at Meningie on the morning of the ceremony, so they were well aware of what was happening there. We know some of the works that Colin Thiele wrote: *Storm Boy*, *The Sun on the Stubble*, *The Fire in the Stone*, and so on. He was a great South Australian. He was born in Eudunda in 1920, and I know that he is acknowledged in Eudunda. However, I do not believe as a community and certainly as a government we have honoured Colin Thiele to the extent that we should and need to.

There are a lot of people in the community who have great regard for Colin Thiele and what he did and are disappointed that the government has not gone out of its way to acknowledge his contribution. I do acknowledge that the former minister for education kindly agreed, when there was a consolidation of schools at the Aberfoyle campus, that the name Thiele would be the name of the combined new school there. Sadly, that meant the loss of the name Heysen, which we know is recognised in the tunnels and other things, but another great South Australian who deserves to be recognised.

Colin's widow Rhonda was at the ceremony, as were his daughters who came down from Queensland, and we had Barbara Hardy, who is another notable South Australian. There were a lot of other distinguished people who have great regard for what Colin did not only as an author but also as an educator. In a way, Madam Deputy Speaker, that mirrors to some extent what your mother has been involved in: not only writing but also as an educator. Colin Thiele, as I say, deserves greater recognition, even beyond what has been done through the generosity of the Legoe family.

At the ceremony we had David Moyle representing the Nature Foundation of South Australia, who kindly facilitated this transfer of land. I will not go into the ins and outs of it, but it is not easy to donate something to the community, as the Hon. Christopher Legoe found out. However, through the good officers of the Nature Foundation it was possible for his family to donate that land and for it now to be effectively given to the community. We had other notable people there who knew Colin Thiele: former associate professor Alan Brissenden was there, and many others. That ceremony was a wonderful occasion. There is a commemorative stone there. If members travelling through the Coorong want to take a break, if they walk in about 100 metres or so from the Salt Creek Roadhouse they will see the commemorative stone and plaque that has been put there.

To conclude on this topic, I recently wrote to the Adelaide City Council who, after I lobbied them for a while to acknowledge Roy Rene (Mo)—and that was with the support of the then member for Adelaide—finally, and to my pleasant surprise, had a sculpture done commemorating Roy Rene in Hindley Street. If members have not seen it, they should go and have a look. I have suggested to the Lord Mayor, Michael Harbison, and members of Adelaide City Council that they might consider acknowledging the work of Colin Thiele by, for example, a sculpture of him, Mr Percival or Storm Boy, or something like that, either in Rundle Mall or some other situation.

When you walk down the mall, you will see that people love sculptures, and I think it is something that is worth doing. I sent a letter to the Premier and Minister for the Arts saying that the government should come on board in that project as well. Colin Thiele is well recognised outside of South Australia—his books have been translated into many languages—but, like the old saying about people not being recognised in their own land, I do not believe it has happened in the way it could and should.

The other suggestion regarding Colin Thiele which I made some years ago but which the government has not picked up is to create some literary scholarships. It was suggested at the function, when talking to people, that maybe the focus of those could be on works either for children or those that have a particular nature orientation in them. That could and should be considered by the state government. I commend this motion to the house, both as an honour to Colin Thiele and his many fans in South Australia, those who had great respect for what he wrote and what he did, and also the Legoe family and, in particular, His Honour Christopher Legoe, for their generosity in providing that land in the Coorong to complete the Coorong National Park and to have a lasting and ongoing tribute to Colin Thiele, who loved the Coorong and nature. I commend the motion to the house.

Mrs VLAHOS (Taylor) (12:12): I rise to support the honourable member's motion. The land donated to the Crown by the Legoe family is adjacent to Salt Creek and Coorong estuary, and it makes a positive contribution to the state's reserve system and the Coorong National Park specifically. The 16 hectares of land supports native vegetation typical of the coastal environment that is in the area, which is an iconic area. It includes several feeding habitats for the endangered orange bellied parrot, which I am led to believe has been recorded in the area. The land will be added to the Coorong National Park in the coming year, and it will form part of the River Murray South-East nature link corridor, a state government initiative aimed at protecting broad areas of habitat and communities of plants and animals.

This donation of land recognises the importance of the partnership between public and private spheres, as the member for Fisher has highlighted, and the conservation of the state's

precious environmental assets. The memorial to Colin Thiele that the Legoe family plans to install on the land is a fitting gesture to South Australia's favourite and most honoured son. With his most famous literary work, *Storm Boy*, the late author brought the beauty and ruggedness of the wild environment to an international audience, both children and adults. Certainly, as a child in the 1970s, I read that book and followed that film, and I became more aware of South Australia as a Queenslander at the time.

As the government and the community work together to protect and conserve the Coorong and Lower Lakes, it is timely to recognise Colin Thiele's environmental concern for this area and our endeavours to ensure that generations beyond our own will continue to enjoy, appreciate and treasure the beautiful but fragile Coorong landscape. The minister will be seeking to have the land formally added to the Coorong National Park during the 2010-11 financial year.

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (12:14): With great pleasure, I speak in support of the motion brought to the chamber by the member for Fisher. I congratulate him for his doing so, otherwise this chamber may not have become aware of this important gift to the people of South Australia. The piece of land in question is at Salt Creek. It is a small parcel of land in my electorate of MacKillop, and it is obviously adjacent to the Coorong. For those of us in the South-East, Salt Creek is an important staging post, and has been for generations, between the south-east of the state and Adelaide and this end of the state.

We often complain that we are isolated—indeed, we are and have been isolated since the beginning of the state—but by some quirk, this small parcel of land has remained in the ownership of the Legoe family for many years whilst all the surrounding land was converted to what is now known as the Coorong National Park. It is a significant park, and I could make many comments about the park; in fact, I might make a few. It is fulfilling that the Legoe family, particularly his honour Christopher Legoe, saw fit to pass this parcel of land to the state so that it can be added to the park and overcome that anomaly where there is a small parcel of privately-owned freehold land within the Coorong National Park.

It is also very fitting that, as the member for Fisher pointed out, this gift to the people of South Australia be dedicated to the memory of Colin Thiele, a great South Australian, a very popular South Australian author and former school teacher. I remember very fondly as a young boy reading *Sun on the Stubble*. I must admit that I have never read the more recent work, *Storm Boy*, but I happened to walk past a television that was going sometime within the last week where the film of *Storm Boy* was being replayed. I must admit that I did stop and take in some of the scenes for a few minutes. I think it was that film, probably as much as anything, that brought the Coorong area to the conscience of the South Australian and the greater Australian public.

The Coorong, as we are well aware and as we do know, has been suffering incredibly in recent years, significantly due to the lack of flows or the very low flows down the River Murray, and the fact that very little fresh water is flowing through the barrages into the estuary at the mouth of the Murray. When the estuary and the mouth of the Murray becomes relatively fresh with significant flows of fresh water out of the Murray through the barrages, some of that water mixes with the water in the Coorong and, over a period of months, freshens up the water in the Coorong.

More particularly, I would argue that the Coorong has changed because of activities that we undertook over a period of well over 100 years now (more like approaching 150 years), that is, the draining of the South-East. I have quoted this particular piece before in the house at various times, but I remind the house that George Goyder, a former surveyor-general, stated in 1864 that, in his opinion, half the land between Salt Creek and the Victorian border became inundated to between one and six feet deep every winter.

That is a huge volume of water, and the vast majority of that water was locked in behind the dunal systems which form the landscape of the South-East and it slowly but inextricably flowed to the north-west. As it was soaking through the dunes, under the dunal systems and progressively to the west from one flat to the next, a significant amount of that water did historically end up in the Coorong—some of it as surface flow, some of it as groundwater.

The digging of drains in the South-East, which started in the late 1860s in the first instance, was principally to allow passage of the mails between Adelaide and Mount Gambier rather than to open up more agricultural land. It was not until after some of the flats were drained that those who were digging the drains became aware of what fantastic agricultural land had been exposed after being drained.

That is how my forebears went to the South-East. They went there digging drains with a group of men sent down by Goyder and they took up farming in and around Millicent. In fact, they built the first permanent stone home in the town of Millicent, a home that is still occupied but not by the family. The impact of those drains has obviously been dramatic across the whole of the South-East, but it has also, in my opinion, been dramatic on the Coorong and that, to a significant extent, is the reason why the southern basin of the Coorong is now hypersaline and has been for many years.

I do not accept the proposition that was espoused by David Payton from the University of Adelaide that, because the southern basin of the Coorong had reached a salinity equilibrium, in a sense a hypersaline equilibrium, we should have left it at that stage. He made that case some years ago when we were debating and establishing the Upper South-East Dryland Salinity and Flood Management Scheme and had had imposed by Environment Australia (the commonwealth equivalent of our environment department) a limit on the amount of water that could be deposited into the Coorong from that drainage scheme. It was limited to 40 gigalitres a year.

It is, I think, a nonsense that we would do that, and it is only because in recent years the lack of flows down the Murray has exacerbated the hypersalinity situation in the Coorong that people such as David Payton, I think, are revisiting that earlier decision. Certainly, once the drainage scheme in the South-East is completed—and that will be very soon; it has taken a long time—I want to reopen that debate about the limit that is placed on the amount of water that can flow from the South-East through the Upper South-East drainage scheme, or any other scheme that is implemented in the future into the southern basin of the Coorong.

I think it would be great to see the southern basin of the Coorong freshened up to become at least estuarine, if not be returned to what was, according to the local Aboriginal communities, largely a freshwater system. I certainly concur with the comments made by the member for Fisher and again congratulate him for bringing this matter to the attention of the house. The Coorong is an iconic environmental site. The completion of the Coorong National Park by the addition of this small parcel of land augurs well for the future of the area and I congratulate the Legoe family for their gift.

The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton—Minister for Environment and Conservation, Minister for the River Murray, Minister for Water) (12:22): I too in speaking to this—

Mr Williams interjecting:

The Hon. P. CAICA: No, I didn't. What I actually—

Mr Williams interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Okay, that is not what we are here to talk about.

Mr Williams interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for MacKillop, I think you will find this is my time. Thank you, and now it is minister Caica's time.

The Hon. P. CAICA: Yes, and I have been misrepresented. Do you or do you not want me to repeat it?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: No; guys this is not the time for this argument.

The Hon. P. CAICA: I also wish to thank the member for Fisher for bringing this matter to the attention of the house and making us aware of the kind generosity of the Legoe family. I too thank and congratulate the Legoe family for the land that has been donated. That land is adjacent to Salt Creek and the Coorong estuary and is a very positive contribution to our state's reserve system. It is a very good area that supports native vegetation typical of the coastal environment in that area.

In my very brief comments, I congratulate and thank the Nature Foundation of SA for the work and the role that they played in this process in respect of this land being provided and donated by the Legoe family. It has been said that the land will be added to the Coorong National Park and form part of the River Murray South-East nature link corridor, which is an initiative that the state government is committed to and which is aimed at protecting broad areas of habitat.

In conclusion, I again thank the member for Fisher, the Nature Foundation of SA and I also sincerely thank the Legoe family for the donation of this land. Of course, it augurs well for the future in respect of the relationship between privately owned land and the commitment of that land to what ultimately is going to be the public estate of South Australia. With those few words, I thank

everyone who has been involved in what is a positive contribution to the environment of South Australia and, in particular, the environment in respect of the Coorong and the Lower Lakes area.

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (12:24): I too support the motion by the Hon. Bob Such, commending the Legoe family for their generosity in donating land in the Coorong to honour Colin Thiele and, just in light of the donation of the 16 hectares, I believe it is such an act of generosity; I must say that not everyone would be prone to use this same generosity, so I really do commend the Legoe family for that. In light of the comments of the member for MacKillop, I too studied *Sun on the Stubble* at school, very entertaining reading by the author Colin Thiele, a very successful South Australian author, who also wrote *Storm Boy*, which was made into a very successful film back in the mid-70s.

It is with regret I note that the Coorong is a far different place now from what it was back then. Let us hope that in the future—and I know the member for MacKillop mentioned part of the problems with the Murray and the Coorong—as we move forward, as we work towards a sustainable system through the appropriate sustainable diversion limits, as we work with getting more water from the South-East back into the Coorong, that we have a far more sustainable future instead of having, especially in the southern lagoon, a very hyper-saline pool.

Let us hope that as a state government, and as governments throughout the Murray-Darling Basin, we can work proactively towards that. In closing, I will again commend the Legoe family in what they have pursued to do here and what they will be doing. It is great also in recognising their contribution in recognising the contribution of Colin Thiele to this state.

VISITORS

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Before we continue, I would just like to recognise the presence in the gallery today of students and teachers from Marden Primary School, who are guests of the Hon. Ian Hunter MLC.

LEGOE FAMILY

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg) (12:27): I rise to support this motion, and obviously we are here to acknowledge and recognise the Legoe family in particular for their generous donation. I also wish to recognise this part of the world by the first inhabitants, that is the Ngarrindjeri people. They, of course, have had a very sad history in South Australia, and they were very active in developing this region, and indeed after the establishment of missionaries in South Australia were very active in farming in this area around the Coorong and significantly advanced, I think relative to other regions. So I particularly want to acknowledge the history that goes with this region. It is all the more fitting, I think, that the Legoe family dedicate this commissioned gift to Colin Thiele AC.

I consider myself privileged firstly to have had the opportunity to meet Colin Thiele during his lifetime. That was largely arising out of my grandmother having a bookshop in which she sold a lot of Australian children's books—she had even in more recent years, until her retirement at age 92, sold the Deputy Speaker's mother's books—and also featured great South Australian writers such as Christobel Mattingley—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I would just like to say thank you for helping my mother pay off the mortgage; it is very kind of you.

Ms CHAPMAN: Secondly, Colin Thiele provided an enormous number of books for children, and I am privileged to have read many of them as a child. A great history of South Australia is encapsulated in those books. Just a few, which have been set in this region, have been recognised, such as *Storm Boy*, which became a very famous South Australian film. I can mention others such as *February Dragon*, which relates the brutal effects of bushfire. It is a very powerful book for any child to read about the South Australian and Australian landscape generally and the ravages of bushfire. Another book that I recall is *Sun on the Stubble*. Other speakers have mentioned it; it is well known.

During a visit to Germany, which I attended for the Berlin elections after the wall dividing Berlin fell in 1989, I had the opportunity to attend ZDF, which is a significant television and film production entity in Germany. It is so large in area alone that when you enter the facility you have to show your passport, and you are shown to certain regions along certain streets to get to the production area. The reason I attended was to view the first cut of the film *Sun on the Stubble*, which was made with the German equivalent to Mel Gibson at the time (I cannot remember his name). He featured in the production of this film, and much of the filming took place in South Australia in our own Barossa Valley.

The extent of the work of Colin Thiele in terms of both literature and the education of children in this state and, indeed, across the country—to some degree recognised internationally—is meritorious on its own. For the Legoe family to have recognised him in this way I think is a great tribute to them. On behalf of South Australians, I think that we owe them a great debt and I thank them sincerely.

Motion carried.

MEMBERS' STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES

The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher) (12:31): I move:

That this house adopts the following Statement of Principles for Members of Parliament:

1. Members of parliament are in a unique position of being accountable to the electorate. The electorate is the final arbiter of the conduct of members of parliament and has the right to dismiss them from office at elections.
2. Members of parliament have a responsibility to maintain the public trust placed in them by performing their duties with fairness, honesty and integrity, subject to the laws of the state and rules of the parliament, and using their influence to advance the common good of the people of South Australia.
3. Political parties and political activities are a part of the democratic process. Participation in political parties and political activities is within the legitimate activities of members of parliament.
4. Members of parliament should declare any conflict of interest between their private financial interests and decisions in which they participate in the execution of their duties. Members must declare their interests as required by the Members of Parliament (Register of Interests) Act 1983 and declare their interests when speaking on a matter in the house or a committee in accordance with the standing orders.
5. A conflict of interest does not exist where the member is only affected as a member of the public or a member of a broad class.
6. Members of parliament should not promote any matter, vote on any bill or resolution, or ask any question in the parliament or its committees, in return for any financial or pecuniary benefit.
7. In accordance with the requirements of the Members of Parliament (Register of Interests) Act 1983, members of parliament should declare all gifts and benefits received in connection with their official duties, including contributions made to any fund for a member's benefit.
8. Members of parliament should not accept gifts or other considerations that create a conflict of interest.
9. Members of parliament should apply the public resources with which they are provided for the purpose of carrying out their duties.
10. Members of parliament should not knowingly and improperly use official information, which is not in the public domain, or information obtained in confidence in the course of their parliamentary duties, for private benefit.
11. Members of parliament should act with civility in their dealings with the public, ministers and other members of parliament and the Public Service.
12. Members of parliament should always be mindful of their responsibility to accord due respect to their right of freedom of speech within parliament and not to misuse this right, consciously avoiding undeserved harm to any individual.

And that:

- (a) upon election and re-election to parliament, within 14 days of taking and subscribing the oath or making and subscribing an affirmation as a member of parliament, each member must sign an acknowledgement to confirm they have read and accept the Statement of Principles, and
- (b) a message be sent to the Legislative Council transmitting the foregoing resolution and requesting its concurrence thereto.

The reason for this motion is that, several years ago in here, a select committee looked at the issue of whether or not there should be a code of conduct for members of parliament—a statement of principles is another way of expressing it. That select committee comprised members from different political persuasions, and this is what that select committee recommended.

The bottom line is that some people say that MPs are accountable at election time, so you do not need any other statement of principles or code of conduct. I do not agree with that. For a start, the next election is just under four years away, and the statement of principles, or code of conduct, sets some guidelines for behaviour, particularly when members come into this place or the other place.

Some would say that we have a pretty good track record in this state, and that is true. We have had very few instances where, to my knowledge, MPs have not acted in the way that they should. You can question some of the interactions, some of the sparring and to-ing and fro-ing that goes on—and that is touched on in the statement of principles in the way that we should deal with each other in here—but I do not believe that we can have a situation where we are regarded as

professional people if we do not have a code of conduct, yet we say that other professions should have one or must have one. It gives rise to the criticism that we somehow have a double standard.

I think it is important that we make clear to the public that we do have commitment to certain standards of behaviour. These are not the only ones. We know that there is a ministerial code of conduct, and we are all subject to the criminal law and other requirements. However, if members look at this statement of principles—which, as I said, is the result of lengthy deliberation by members in both houses—I think they will find it to be a fairly sensible and reasonable approach. Ultimately, if you do something that your electorate does not accept then you incur their wrath, and clearly this does not intend to take away the right of the electors to dismiss an MP.

If we look at some of these points—and I guess this relates to what I just said—we are in the unique position of being accountable to the electorate. It is not only a privilege to represent people in this or the other place, it is also a responsibility, and we need to maintain the public trust in the way we carry out our duties—fairly, honestly and with integrity. I believe that is absolutely essential, and people should not diminish the significance of public trust. Members of parliament do not score particularly well in the surveys that come out from time to time, but the reflection in those polls is often unfair. The media highlights selective aspects of behaviour—normally question time—and the public has little idea of what we actually do and how we behave the rest of the time.

I have been here 20 years now and, as I indicated earlier, I have not come across members of parliament who have got into a position where their behaviour was outrageous. There have been people who have done things they probably should not have done, who have made bad judgements, but in the main we have a pretty good track record. The statement of principles acknowledges that political parties are part of the democratic process, and I agree with that. From time to time there will be Independents but the reality is that, in the current situation, political parties will be there; they can legitimately be there and they will be there into the foreseeable future. So this statement acknowledges that political parties are part of the legitimate process.

With the declaration of financial interest, we have fairly strict guidelines there, and some people—the Hon. Graham Gunn, for instance—used to question whether or not some of these unfairly impinged upon the private matters of members and their families. The issue of not being financially rewarded for how you vote or behave in here is obviously sound and sensible, and I do not think anyone would dispute that. It would be corruption if that was done. In terms of declaration of interest, I think some of that has perhaps gone a bit far now, with people having to declare whether they get a ticket to the ice arena or something like that. I think that is a bit over the top, but generally it is important that members declare gifts and other benefits. That is replicated in principle No. 8 as well.

In terms of the question of applying public resources, which they are provided with to carry out their duties, once again I am not aware of any significant abuse of that. It does raise the whole issue of the global allowance and the travel allowance, things like that. In relation to the global allowance, I think we still have a situation where members are treated, essentially, as children in the sense that we are not trusted to apply the resources for the purpose of carrying out our duties. Apart from this statement of principles, I think that is an issue that needs to be addressed, so that members of parliament can have some latitude in applying the resources—their global allowance and so on—without, and what is currently the situation, someone in the bureaucracy deciding whether or not they can, for example, purchase a copy of the Australian Standards.

I will digress for a moment. I was recently refused the purchase of the Australian Standards relating to road infrastructure—it was \$80—with the argument that it was not part of my duties. Well, it is. People come to me and say, 'I want a road hump or a chicane in my street.' I cannot engage with them in a meaningful way if I say, 'Well, look, I don't know anything about what can or cannot happen.' That is just one example. Another one is that a few years ago I was not allowed to have any newspapers. The argument was, 'You don't need them.' That is ridiculous. That has been changed, but we have variations between the houses in terms of how that operates.

The point I make is that I think members of parliament should be treated as adults and professionals. Obviously, you need some guidelines, but what we have now is a list that excludes a whole lot of things. The inference is that you cannot really be trusted to administer public funds in the way that you should. The issue of not using information improperly makes sense and, obviously, we have not only official information but we are dealing with confidential information a lot of the time.

No. 11 is very important: dealing with the Public Service in a way which is civil, and that is not meant to be a play on words. I think it is fair and reasonable that members of the Public Service are dealt with in a way that is civil. I think there have been occasions in the past where some members in here have treated public servants in a way that is unacceptable. In my experience, public servants have been dedicated to their job, and they are entitled to be treated with the dignity of their particular position and should not be subjected to any sort of behaviour which is unbecoming and aggressive.

Likewise, with each other, in here and in the extension of the parliament. With some of the courtesies which have been part of parliamentary life for a long time, we have to be careful that they do not wither away and are overlooked. One of them is that, if a minister is visiting your electorate, there is a courtesy that the minister will inform the member that he or she is going to visit that electorate. Likewise, if a member is attending a function at which a minister is present, there is a practice that should be upheld that the MP is acknowledged, even if they are from a different political party.

There is also a convention that ministers, in writing to a member of parliament (and vice versa), use the first name. It is not a legal requirement: it is just a courtesy. I notice now that some ministers seem to be slipping away from that tradition. We are not in the bear pit here; we should be treating each other with dignity. There are some other courtesies, such as when I congratulated a minister on appointment, and the reply came back from a staff member. It is not the biggest issue in the world, but you would think that the minister could at least sign the note, rather than get a staffer to send off something to this MP who has written in to congratulate the minister on the appointment.

I think it is important that we deal with each other with dignity and civility. I think at times in here we get carried away on the spur of the moment, but it is important that we do not get into negativity. We heard recently the tribute to Allan Rodda. The reason he is respected is not just because of the way he dealt with others, but that was certainly part of it.

I do not think freedom of speech within parliament is being abused at the moment. I can recall, a long time ago, when a member got up in here and said things about someone which were not correct, and the family members of the person who was named had to move interstate because the wife (the spouse) and the children came under so much attack in their school situation. We have to be very careful of not abusing that privilege that we have here, and I must say that in recent times I do not believe we have seen that abuse. So, I come to the end, where this set of principles will be subscribed to when someone becomes a member of parliament. I think it is important that, when you start in here at a session, you indicate that you are aware of these principles and indicate your commitment to upholding them.

The last part is that, if members here agree, then this message goes to the Legislative Council seeking its concurrence, because obviously—given that the Legislative Council was part of the original select committee—it is important that both houses are involved and have a commitment to the same set of principles. I commend this motion to the house. It is not meant to be a foolproof mechanism to deter people from doing wrong things or silly things, but, as I said at the start, we cannot expect doctors and others to have a code of conduct if we are not prepared to have one ourselves. It is a useful thing and I think the public would expect it and welcome it. I commend this motion to the house.

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg) (12:45): I rise to support the motion. I commend the member for Fisher for introducing it and for chairing the select committee, upon reference from this parliament, which he undertook some years ago. The Hon. Rob Lawson QC and I were nominated representatives on that select committee on behalf of the opposition, and we fully endorsed the statement of principles, which then received the subsequent endorsement of the opposition Liberal Party.

To add to the comments made by the member for Fisher, what is puzzling to me is why, years after this report had been presented to the parliament, the Premier did not leap to his feet with haste to seek to have it endorsed and refer it to the Legislative Council. After all, this was in the wake of the 2002 election, when the Premier was espousing the glory of his victory and how his government was going to be open and transparent. His ministers were going to be accountable and he was going to introduce a ministerial code of conduct, which has been breached many times since and ignored. In addition, he said that there would be standards imposed and that a code of conduct for all members of the house was fully supported.

We were set the terms of reference to go off and investigate what was happening around Australia and, indeed, across jurisdictions around the world and to come back to the parliament with what would be the best way to deal with this. The terms of reference were: first, what form should the code take? Secondly, should it have sanctions other than what is the ultimate sanction referred to in these statement of principles, namely, your head is on the chopping block at the election and it is answerable to the electors? Thirdly, should there be a capacity in the parliament for there to be some penalty attached? And, fourthly, should it be something that should work in tandem with (or override) other laws of the state, and the like.

So we embarked on a rather significant and extensive investigation. We looked at other jurisdictions, for example, France, where members of parliament enjoy an extraordinary privilege. Except in the case of murder or a serious felony—they have a slightly different criminal code system in France—apart from some very rare exceptions, members of parliament are immune, and under their code of conduct they enjoy the privilege of not even being brought before the criminal courts during their term of office. That might have been a motivation for a number of them to stay in office for a long time to avoid prosecution or something.

We considered all these things and we looked at other jurisdictions, and it was quite clear that, at the very minimum, there would be a code, which we ultimately agreed should be referred to as a statement of principles. It would be without direct sanction but would recognise that the people of South Australia are ultimately our executioners in a very real sense if we breach those standards.

An analogy for me was the Ten Commandments. There is a commandment in the Christian principles that thou shalt not kill. We actually have a whole series of laws in South Australia to prevent us from killing someone with intent or in a reckless circumstance and they attract a penalty for murder and, of course, the consequences that go with it. We have manslaughter legislation which, again, produces a series of different penalties depending on circumstances. We have the capacity for lawful killing in the circumstance of a defence duty or war conflict, for example.

We have a category of legal obligations which do produce sanctions notwithstanding what is written in the Christian code of conduct, namely, the Ten Commandments. We took what is the minimalist view. There is nothing of which to be frightened in relation to these statements. A member of this house would be hard pressed to suggest we should act in a way contrary to this motion.

I look forward to the passage of this motion. I cannot wait to hear the Premier's explanation as to why he let the opportunity pass when it was originally tabled in the house. I think ultimately it was tabled by the member for Enfield, as he then was, because for some reason the member for Fisher was not here, but he was certainly instrumental in the tabling of that report as he was also a member of that committee. I look forward to hearing the Premier's explanation as to why it has taken so many years for him to come forward and support it; or, indeed, if he intends to oppose it, what possible explanation he will give to us as to why these basic fundamental tenets should not be observed by every one of us with pride.

Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (12:51): I rise to support the motion that the house adopt this statement of principles. I commend the member for Fisher for moving this motion in the house. I also commend the work of the parliamentary committee that produced this statement of principles some years ago. I share with the member for Bragg a great disappointment that the government has not brought this matter forward prior to today in their own name as it was under the term of this government that the parliamentary committee was tasked with the job of coming up with this statement of principles. I think it is a very good statement of principles. I want to place on the record through this contribution my support for each principle. The first principle states:

Members of parliament are in a unique position of being accountable to the electorate. The electorate is the final arbiter of the conduct of members of parliament and has the right to dismiss them from office at elections.

We are responsible to our constituency. Every time we choose to act in any certain way, we have to be mindful of our electors and our constituents. We should always remember that they come first. I want to rest for a moment on the second principle, in particular. It states:

Members of parliament have a responsibility to maintain the public trust placed in them by performing their duties with fairness, honesty and integrity, subject to the laws of the state and rules of the parliament, and using their influence to advance the common good of the people of South Australia.

In relation to the words 'fairness, honesty and integrity', I call on the government to reflect on that statement of principle. I think it would be useful for this statement of principle to be enforced if only

because it would have suggested to some opposite that they reflect on it during the conduct of the recent election when they felt it was within their right to have volunteers handing out how-to-vote cards, pretending to be Family First volunteers when they were in fact members of the Australian Labor Party and were not supporting the lead Family First candidate for the Legislative Council on the how-to-vote cards.

In the spirit of fairness, honesty and integrity, perhaps some of those members who indulged in that practice might have thought twice about it had they signed up to a statement of principles, including that principle to which I have just referred. It is very disappointing that they did not. A number of other paragraphs in the statement of principles are eminently sensible. They are the sorts of things to which we should be subscribing as a matter of course without the need to have them drawn to our attention, but that does not make it inappropriate for us to be signing up to a statement of principles.

I think that, given that some of these principles are occasionally broken in the course of duties carried out by members of parliament here and interstate, it does not hurt to bring people's attention back to it. Given that the Labor Party has systematically broken some of these principles in the course of the recent election, I think it would be particularly worthwhile ensuring that people sign up to such a statement of principles. The member for Fisher in his contribution today dwelt on the 11th statement of principle:

Members of parliament should act with civility in their dealings with the public, ministers and other members of parliament and the Public Service.

In the short time I have been in this house, I have been disappointed at the number of times that I have seen that statement of principle broken, and the civility that anyone would expect in a professional environment has been absent in this place, I fear. I think that having a statement of principle, bringing that to our constant attention as something to which we could be held accountable would be very useful. I support the motion.

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (12:55): I, too, rise to support the motion moved by the Hon. Bob Such and spoken to by the members for Bragg and Morialta. I thank the committee for its work on this statement of principles. It will be interesting to note whether the Labor Party supports this statement of principles. As has been said, quite a few principles were broken in the election campaign. We had to amend a law yesterday because the Labor Party cannot help itself. We have to legislate to protect them from themselves.

Mr Gardner: We have to legislate for good behaviour.

Mr PEDERICK: Yes; we have to legislate for good behaviour. That is where, as members of parliament, we do need to be accountable to the electorate because, as this statement of principles states, the electorate is the final arbiter of the conduct of members of parliament and has the right to dismiss them from office at elections. This is a fundamental right, and I spoke on this briefly yesterday. The fact is that we are elected to this place, and it is the right of electors to keep us here or not, so we should behave in an appropriate manner and we should be accountable to electors.

It is a far better system than what happens in some places in the world where we have autocracies and dictatorships and people do not have the right to voice their opinion or to have the person who wins by a majority vote represent them in a parliament, or consequently a government or opposition in that country. It is sad when you see some people on voting day come up to polling booths reluctantly. I know of one story when my wife was manning a polling booth in the recent state election. She confronted a guy who was obviously having a light refreshment, having a beer, and he said, 'What the heck do I do to vote?'

I do not think that he bothered grabbing a how-to-vote card from anyone. Who knows what he did? I said to my wife later that day, 'How do we connect to these people?' I thought about it for a minute and I thought that, perhaps for people such as that who are having a relaxing Saturday, having a few refreshments during the day, perhaps we could hand out stubby holders at the booth and they might remember us by that, with our name emblazoned on them when they go in to vote. I am not trying—

The Hon. S.W. Key interjecting:

Mr PEDERICK: Yes. I note the comments from opposite. I do say that in jest, I must admit because, obviously, there are principles we have to uphold going into an election. You just get frustrated. It was a comment I made in jest in terms of how we reach these voters and protect the

principles of everyone's democratic right to vote in this country—to vote on who we want to retain in our electorates or who we want to get voted in to take up a position in the parliament. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

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

MACKEN, MR M.

The SPEAKER: Honourable members, I would like to mention that it is the last day of service for our security officer, Michael Macken, who is sitting in the gallery, after 7½ years of service in this place. I think he is a very popular member of our staff. Certainly since Michael has been here, we have felt a real sense of security. He is always very confident and calm and we do feel secure with him around. All the best wishes to you. Thank you for all your help in this place and we hope that your future is bright. Thank you.

Honourable members: Hear, hear!

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: I advise members of the presence in the gallery of the Highgate Primary School year 7 students, who are guests of the member for Unley. We hope you enjoy your time here and we are pleased to see you visiting us.

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Minister for Housing (Hon. J.M. Rankine)—

Housing Trust, Triennial Review of the South Australian—Report March 2010

By the Attorney-General (Hon. J.R. Rau)—

Police Complaints Authority—Criminal Law (Forensic Procedures) Act 2007 Report for Period 1 July 2009 to 31 January 2010

By the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation (Hon. G. Portolesi)—

Aboriginal Lands Trust—Annual Report 2007-08

NUCLEAR WASTE

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Ramsay—Premier, Minister for Economic Development, Minister for Social Inclusion, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Sustainability and Climate Change) (14:02): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: In recent days, attempts have been made to reignite debate about where Australia's nuclear waste should be stored. There have been efforts by our northern neighbours—the Northern Territory—to have the federal government revisit their decision to place Australia's nuclear waste at Muckaty Station in the Northern Territory. In this government's first term, we fought against the nation's nuclear waste being dumped in South Australia and we won. At the time, we were told it was a losing battle. Just remember, go back and look at what was said. There was no point in opposing; it would be a losing battle. We were told that it had no chance in the courts. We were told by our opponents that our challenge would be futile and that it would cost taxpayers an arm and a leg.

But we did not lie down; we put our state first. We fought and we fought and we fought. We fought the illegal acquisition of the land at Arcoona Station, and we won with a three-nil Federal Court decision in South Australia's favour. This was despite many prominent South Australian Liberals backing the nuclear waste dump being put in their own backyard. They actually wanted the nuclear waste dump for the nation located in South Australia. South Australian Senator Nick Minchin led the charge for the Howard government, putting party above state.

Mr Pisoni interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: 'The best thing to do', says the member for Unley. Make sure that the people of Unley know that the MP for Unley wants South Australia to be the nation's nuclear waste dump. Nick Minchin, of course, is now a born-again greenie, but then he was leading the charge for the Howard government, putting party above state.

The current Leader of the Opposition in this state backed the plan, too, saying that 'putting the nuclear waste dump where it was planned for South Australia was probably the right answer'. They always put their party before their state. How could being a nuclear waste dump for the rest of the nation ever be the right answer for South Australia? We fought, and we won, forcing Senator Nick Minchin and the Howard Liberals—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: —to back off and back down.

Mr Pisoni: You are an embarrassment. You really are an embarrassment.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Such an embarrassment that Nick Minchin folded the tent, packed it in, gave up and raised the white flag; and so did John Howard. We believe it would jeopardise South Australia's clean, green reputation. We spoke to people in the food and wine industries and, together with our status as the only mainland state to be GM free, that reputation is critically important to marketing our food and wine around the world. So, let me make it very clear to the Northern Territory, or anywhere else, that we are prepared to fight again if any future government tries to put the nuclear waste dump in South Australia—because, unlike members opposite, we will always put the interests of our state before party. That is the difference.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

LOCUST PLAGUE

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Ramsay—Premier, Minister for Economic Development, Minister for Social Inclusion, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Sustainability and Climate Change) (14:06): I seek leave to make a second ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

Mr Pisoni: Is this all last minute stuff?

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Unley!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: It is of grave concern that South Australia is facing its most serious locust threat to primary production in 40 years. The Australian Plague Locust Commission has warned that the danger posed in spring and summer is the greatest for more than a generation. In response to this significant threat, the South Australian government is joining with our state's farmers in a war on locusts.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Bragg! Could we have some quiet, please. We have young people in the gallery today who will wonder what is happening.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Thank you, madam—because the member for Bragg is now so far away it is hard to hear her interjections. Aerial attacks and onground operations will be mobilised to protect the state's \$12 billion agricultural and horticultural industries. Up to \$12.8 million has been allocated to combat the biggest locust threat in 40 years.

An honourable member: Victoria is spending 43.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Oh, I just heard the interjection. This amount is more than double the \$6 million committed by the previous Liberal government to fight the last major locust plague in 2000.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: If left uncontrolled, this locust incursion may be capable of causing up to \$3 billion worth of damage to agricultural production. But locusts do not only threaten cereal production. Given their migratory habits, high value horticultural crops in the Riverland, Clare and the Northern Adelaide Plains can also be at risk. If left unchecked, there are wide-ranging ramifications beyond the agricultural sector, including damage to football and cricket ovals, bowling greens, golf courses, parks and gardens. Swarms of locusts can also hinder regional aviation and cause road safety concerns.

The South Australian government is not going to stand by and allow locusts to destroy the value of our rural industries or our way of life. The funding package announced today by the Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries includes assistance for extensive aerial spraying of open pastoral country and cropping areas in the Mid North, southern Flinders Ranges region, also parts of the Riverland-Murray Mallee region, north of Morgan and south of Loxton.

There will be a rebate scheme for chemical purchases by farmers in the Riverland-Murray Mallee to help control locust hoppers. The scheme will provide a maximum of \$2,500 for properties under 1,000 hectares or, for properties of more than 1,000 hectares, we will pay a rebate to undertake control works on up to 20 per cent of the total land area at a rate of up to \$8.25 per hectare. In exceptional circumstances, the minister can approve greater than these amounts.

The government will also provide additional resources in the coming budget should the locust plague be more extensive or last longer than expected. In addition, a grant of up to \$1 million will be provided to help local government in affected areas to undertake control works. Preparations are well advanced for major aerial spraying in open country and pasture in the Mid North and the southern Flinders Ranges in spring, to complement work by the Australian Plague Locust Commission and authorities interstate. Aircraft have been secured to ensure an effective blitz on affected areas in South Australia.

Earlier this year, the commission undertook spraying on more than 200,000 hectares of land in western New South Wales and southern Queensland to reduce the impact on crops and the level of fly-ins into South Australia. In spring the commission will concentrate its activities in north-western Victoria and south-western New South Wales to stop as many fly-ins as possible.

The South Australian government is having ongoing discussions with Victorian and New South Wales authorities to ensure a coordinated response and to minimise border hopping. I want to congratulate the minister in this regard. In parts of the Riverland, where aerial spraying cannot be undertaken, localised coordinated locust control will be carried out by local government in conjunction with natural resources management boards and farmers. Aerial spraying cannot be undertaken near watercourses, towns and sensitive sites. That is why we have to do these on-the-ground activities as well.

Depending on climatic conditions, control operations against locusts will start in September in the Mid North/Southern Flinders Ranges region and then progress to the Riverland/Murray Mallee. Two command centres to manage the government's response are being set up at Orroroo in the Mid North and Loxton in the Riverland. Community reference groups are assisting the government with our response, and PIRSA will undertake a communications campaign—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: —to keep landowners and communities informed. It is important to understand that we cannot eradicate the locusts, but we can minimise the damage they may inflict with a well-planned control strategy that involves government, landholders, local councils, NRM boards and volunteer emergency services organisations. This government understands and appreciates the value of agricultural and horticultural production to South Australia's economy and our way of life. We are taking every appropriate step to ensure that the locusts threat is dealt with in a targeted and responsible manner.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: And, once again, the Liberals are knocking it. This is all they ever do.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE

Mr SIBBONS (Mitchell) (14:13): I bring up the 4th report of the committee, entitled Subordinate Legislation.

Report received.

Mr SIBBONS: I bring up the 5th report of the committee, entitled Subordinate Legislation.

Report received and read.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE

Mr PICCOLO (Light) (14:17): I bring up the 378th report of the committee on the Evanston land release.

Report received and ordered to be published.

Mr PICCOLO: I bring up the 379th report of the committee on the World Park office accommodation fitout.

Report received and ordered to be published.

STANDING ORDERS SUSPENSION

Mrs REDMOND (Heysen—Leader of the Opposition) (14:20): I move:

That standing orders be so far suspended as to allow for a motion of no confidence in the Treasurer to be put forthwith.

The SPEAKER: I have counted the house and, as there is an absolute majority of the whole number of the members of the house present, I accept the motion.

Motion carried.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Elder—Minister for Transport, Minister for Infrastructure, Minister for Energy) (14:21): I move:

That the time of the debate be limited to one hour, being divided equally between the government and the opposition.

Motion carried.

TREASURER

Mrs REDMOND (Heysen—Leader of the Opposition) (14:22): I move:

That the house has no confidence in the Treasurer and that this house calls on him to resign, and if he fails to do so the house calls on the Premier to sack him.

If I can first of all take some time to put this matter in context. It is the case that the former leader, the honourable member, Martin Hamilton-Smith, first canvassed the idea of an inner city stadium on 7 February 2008. That stadium was to be able to host future FIFA World Cup games, as well as being able to host football and cricket. As it happens, this followed information that later came from the Office of Recreation and Sport, and documents from that office revealed South Australia to lack a stadium capable of hosting international sporting events. I quote from the draft Strategic Assessment of Facility Needs, April 2007:

To be able [to] host future events such as Commonwealth Games and FIFA World Cups a stadium must be developed that caters for spectator capacity of at least 80,000 and be able to be configured to host a variety of activities. No such venue currently exists in South Australia.

Having made that announcement, the Minister for Transport's response to that proposal was:

This isn't so much a vision as a squint.

That was what Pat Conlon said about this matter. Indeed, on 10 April 2008, the Premier said, in response to it—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mrs REDMOND: The Premier said:

This government is not committed to building a \$1.1 billion football stadium in the city centre—and that's a promise.

Bearing in mind, of course, that no such figure had ever been suggested. That was just the government's way of inflating, as it usually does, any suggestions from the opposition. On 18 February 2009, it was revealed that secret Rann government reports actually backed the state Liberals' plan for a world class stadium to attract FIFA and Commonwealth Games bids. That being the case, on 6 April 2009, the state Liberals released their preliminary plan for the Riverside West precinct, with the inner city stadium as the centrepiece of that plan. The proposal noted, of course, that the state Liberals have a policy of rebuilding the Royal Adelaide Hospital on its current site—

Ms Chapman: Good policy.

Mrs REDMOND: Exactly. 'Good policy', said the member for Bragg—and would not use the site proposed by the government. The Treasurer's response to that proposal, on 7 April, was—and I quote—that it was 'a path to bankruptcy'.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mrs REDMOND: Oh yes, but I want to be very specific about who said what when here—very specific. That is what we found. That was the Treasurer's response on 7 April last year, that our proposal for an inner city stadium was a path to bankruptcy. On 26 November last year I made a statement at a lunch at the Hilton and we took the vision further. We there announced our plans for a revitalised city centre at the heart of a multi-million dollar development. The centrepiece of the redevelopment was a 50,000-seat, retractable roofed, FIFA compliant stadium, fully costed by quantity surveyors, WT Partnerships, which is one of the biggest quantity surveying firms—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mrs REDMOND: —in the world. A significant portion of the funding for this \$800 million stadium was to be generated by the sale of land. The Treasurer's response to this proposal was—and I quote—that it was 'like something out of Las Vegas. Anyone can see that it is a poor man's Las Vegas on the Torrens.' But the Liberals' proposal, announced at the end of November, was very popular. In fact, on Adelaidenow it was rating at something like 83 per cent approval. So, it was clear to the government that they had to do something to negative the popularity of our proposal.

Honourable members: Hear, hear!

Mrs REDMOND: They needed a circuit breaker. So what was their response? On 2 December 2009, out they came with their big response: \$300 million in state government funding, with up to \$150 million from the commonwealth, and in order to do that they cancelled the \$100 million that they had previously offered to the AAMI Stadium. They had already deferred that because of the global financial crisis, but then they cancelled that in favour of this new proposal and they deferred, so they said, \$200 million of tram extensions to the western suburbs. Of course, the \$200 million of tram extensions was not, in any event, in the forward estimates. So it was money that did not really exist, but nevertheless that was what they were going to do—and, remember, \$150 million from the commonwealth.

So, on 2 December this was the promise: it was going to provide for a 50,000-seat, FIFA compliant Adelaide Oval with a footbridge across the Torrens. We now know that the current proposal, where we are up to \$700 million, includes neither being FIFA compliant nor the footbridge across the Torrens. So this plan was announced as—and again I quote:

The first stage in a major redevelopment of the east bank of the Torrens...which includes a redeveloped convention centre precinct, restaurants, shops and arts space.

Doesn't that sound familiar?

Honourable members: Hear, hear!

Mrs REDMOND: Yet, a few months earlier, when we had announced it, it was 'like something out of Las Vegas. Anyone can see that it is a poor man's Las Vegas on the Torrens,' according to the Treasurer. So the government announced the Adelaide Oval with a \$450 million taxpayer-funded contribution, bearing in mind that it was \$300 million of state government money, and they said they had to have sign-off by 30 June. Guess what the date is today—30 June.

An honourable member: It's today.

Mrs REDMOND: Yes, it's today. So, it was to be signed off today, and not a penny more than the \$450 million, which, of course, included the federal money. So then we get to the election campaign, and this is where the Treasurer's blundering first started. The Treasurer told the media—and it was FIVEaa on 6 March—and again I quote:

I had a briefing during the week with Leigh Whicker and his team...I know what things cost...what we are comparing is a new stadium—

that is ours—

versus the upgrade of Adelaide Oval for \$500 million.

So, we had gone from \$450 million, including the commonwealth money, to \$500 million. This statement was then exposed by Rob Lucas, who put out a press release that day pointing out that it was an extra \$50 million; and, indeed, if you started from the government's original position of \$300 million of state government money, we have suddenly jumped to \$500 million of state government money.

The Treasurer now tells us that these comments followed a meeting he had had with Leigh Whicker on 19 February, where he was told that the costs had blown out to \$469 million, but that \$469 million excluded the western grandstand, the car parking and the Torrens footbridge. Not only has the project cost blown out but the scope has shrunk. It has blown out by over \$100 million. On 8 March—that is this year, 12 days before the election—Rob Lucas again put out a press release and he claimed that the project had blown out by \$100 million. This tested the Treasurer's memory. He responded with a press release of his own. I think it was rushed out, because there is a slight typo in it, I suspect. He said:

The government has received no advice from the Stadium Management Authority—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

An honourable member: Don't get flustered, Isobel. Keep going.

Mrs REDMOND: I am not flustered one little bit. In response to Lucas's statement on 8 March suggesting that this project had blown out by \$100 million the Treasurer said:

The government has received no advice from the Stadium Management Authority that the cost of the redevelopment has blown out...there has not been one scrap of advice to from—

That is where I think the error is—

the Stadium Management Authority that this is not sufficient to meet the cost of the redevelopment of the oval.

This was less than three weeks after the very specific briefing that he got from Leigh Whicker on 19 February. This is 8 March. In fact, on 6 March the Treasurer told radio FIVEaa—first of all, Chris Dittmar says:

It was \$450 million in December; now you're saying 500.

The Treasurer's response was:

Guys, it was \$450 and I've just given a ballpark figure. It's 450; there's no escalation in the costs.

On 9 March, through *The Australian* a spokesman for Treasurer Foley again dismissed Rob Lucas's claim. This is the third time that Rob Lucas has come out and suggested that there was a blowout—and this time the statement from Treasurer's spokesperson said:

I promise on the soul of my grandmother we have not received any advice—

any advice—

to say the \$450 million is not enough.

On 10, 13 and 14 March Rob Lucas again issued press releases—this is all in the week coming up into the election—and, again, none of these jolt the Treasurer's memory. So, we are less than a week before the election. Then suddenly after the election, on 13 May the Treasurer told the house:

The offer from the state government is \$450 million minus SACA debt. Therefore, the more debt SACA incurs, the less free cash they get for the rest of the stadium.

Still no mention of cost blowouts. That is interesting, because that was also the first time at which we found out that SACA's debt of about \$85 or \$90 million was to be included in what was being

paid out. So we actually went from the government saying \$450 million originally, less the \$85 million or so for the SACA debt, less the \$5 million to set up the Stadium Management Authority, which is \$360 million, and if you took out of that the \$150 million from the commonwealth you are down to \$210 million of state money at that point.

On 25 May the Treasurer told the house in a ministerial statement:

...in addition to the \$450 million for the redeveloped oval, [the government] will also provide a contribution of \$85 million towards the cost of current works being undertaken on the western grandstand. This will bring the total government offer of financial assistance to \$535 million.

I have always said that that was a bit of a sleight of hand, because suddenly there is no mention of where the commonwealth fits into this, so we have actually gone from \$300 million of state money to \$535 million of state money, even though it is being sold to us as a mere \$85 million increase. But to me that sounds like a cost blowout. On 26 May the Treasurer told the media—and this is a very interesting quote:

I absolutely rule out any suggestion that prior to or immediately after the election I was aware that the cost had blown out. The advice given to me—

Note the next words—

officially at least, was provided in the last week.

On that day the Treasurer also famously told the house:

...I was not made aware in any way, shape or form prior to the election that 450 [million dollars] would not be sufficient.

On 27 May the Treasurer told the house in a ministerial statement:

After a thorough document and record search in my office—

And I think that might be the occasion on which he had undertaken to give a diary search, but he did a document and record search which did not include the diary—

I am now in a position, as I said, to provide the house more specific advice. I can now confirm that this meeting occurred on 3 March and I can also confirm to the house that to the best of my memory I was not advised of the potential cost of the redevelopment at that meeting.

There is still no mention at that point of the meeting he had with Leigh Whicker on 19 February. He did not disclose that because he had instructed the SMA not to specifically discuss the costs with him.

Indeed, the Stadium Management Authority was told during the election campaign not to discuss the Adelaide Oval costs with government ministers because under caretaker conventions that would entitle the opposition to hear about it—and, if we heard about it, obviously the public of South Australia would hear about it. We did get briefings on things such as the GST revenue changes and the need to provide some funding for Chilean earthquake victims, but we did not get briefed—and we were specifically excluded from any briefing—by virtue of the fact that the Treasurer specifically said, 'Let's not get a briefing on the costings.'

In our view, the government took the view that the opposition and the public were forbidden to know about the cost blowout on the Adelaide Oval project until at least after the election. A few things happened in the days leading up to 2 June. First, the Treasurer became aware that the Budget and Finance Committee was formed and that it was likely the committee would have the Adelaide Oval project as term of reference and call Mr Whicker as a witness.

The Treasurer became aware that on 25 May Leigh Whicker had indicated to Kevin Cantley (head of the South Australian Financing Authority, a unit of the Department of Treasury and Finance) and Bruce Carter (chair of the steering committee) that they had been told on 22 February that Leigh Whicker had briefed the Treasurer on 19 February about the cost blowouts and that, if he was asked about it, Leigh Whicker would be saying that he would give that evidence.

Ian McLachlan was on ABC radio that morning, and he said that he had told the government's steering committee on Adelaide Oval in February: 'This thing's looking expensive.' The opposition was due to have a briefing with Leigh Whicker, Ian McLachlan and other members of the Stadium Management Authority on 2 June at 2pm—so the Treasurer called a press conference right then at 2 pm. At the press conference he said:

I now recall [strangely] a general discussion about a range of issues in relation to the project I had with the SMA's CEO Leigh Whicker at the SANFL offices at AAMI Stadium on 19 February this year prior to the state

election. At this meeting Mr Whicker indicated that initial estimates of project costs were in excess of the \$450 million commitment from the government.

However, as we would find out in the Treasurer's ministerial statement of 22 June, the Treasurer had waited five days after becoming aware of it; so on 28 May he became aware of it and he waited five days until 2 June to make it public. Yet in that press conference he said:

I am an extremely diligent and honest politician. The minute I recalled it I have gone public with it.

The minute five days later. The Treasurer had all of Friday, Saturday, Sunday, Monday, Tuesday and on Wednesday afternoon—the minute after he found out about it five days earlier—he went public with it.

On 22 June the Treasurer made a statement. The Treasurer misled the public and the parliament. He made a statement saying that he had done a more thorough search of his office and found evidence of his meeting with Leigh Whicker on 19 February where costings were discussed, but he decided that 'the estimates lacked sufficient substance to them'.

However, as we know, the estimates given at the 19 February meeting were based on a six-page consultant's report. For this reason the Treasurer expects this house and the public of South Australia to believe that a figure of \$469 million in a six-page consultant's report that had taken some weeks to prepare was for some reason less reliable than a figure of \$450 million plucked out of mid air for an announcement on 2 December because our proposal was so popular.

The ministerial statement on 22 June also revealed that the Treasurer had attended a meeting on 13 April this year where \$701 million was mentioned as the price tag for the Adelaide Oval. Still, at the meeting of 13 April the Treasurer would have us believe that that meeting also failed to jog his memory about the fact that on 19 February, the day before the writs were issued for this election, he had had that meeting with Leigh Whicker and had found out that there was a blowout in the costs.

So, the Treasurer's ministerial statement of 27 May, based on a thorough document and record search of the office, failed to reveal both the 19 February meeting with Leigh Whicker and the 13 April meeting of the Stadium Management Authority, which strangely enough were the only two meetings where the costings of the Adelaide Oval were discussed. And then on Monday we had, of course, Leigh Whicker's testimony to the Budget and Finance Committee, where he revealed that the SANFL had had grave reservations that the Adelaide Oval upgrade could be completed for \$450 million; indeed, they had written to Andrew Demetriou on 17 November indicating that.

Indeed, yesterday, the Treasurer got most upset in this house when I mentioned that people were happy about the fact that the announcement was made for \$450 million, but I refer to the *Australian Financial Review* of 10 May which points out that, in addition to Mr Demetriou's \$1.8 million salary:

The AFL boss was rewarded for helping squeeze \$450 million from the South Australian government for the redevelopment of Adelaide Oval.

He was paid extra, on top of his salary, for getting that money. As I said, the SANFL wrote to Andrew Demetriou and the AFL on 17 November to this effect, but the Treasurer's evidence is that he knew nothing of that. Leigh Whicker also revealed that the SANFL only found out about the 2 December Adelaide announcement the night before it happened. The fact is that the Treasurer is either incompetent or he has deliberately misled the public, or possibly both, and if he will not resign then I call on the Premier to sack him.

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Ramsay—Premier, Minister for Economic Development, Minister for Social Inclusion, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Sustainability and Climate Change) (14:42): I would like to thank the Leader of the Opposition for her submissions, although they seemed to get a little lost in the detail. Let us remember what this is really about. This is a dummy spit over losing the election. That is what it is all about. It is road rage because the Liberals believed they had the election in the bag. They took the people of this state for granted, and apparently no-one told the Liberal strategy group that, in order to win an election, you need to win a majority of votes in a majority of seats.

This is all about three months of boiling road rage, three months that was building towards today's dummy spit. I heard someone yell out about why the Leader of the Opposition was reading her submission and said that the Liberals are not loose with the truth, except, of course, when they

are dealing with forged documents, forged receipts, faked letters and so on. This road rage is not just by the Liberal Party, this road rage also—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: We have got a long time.

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Premier.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: This road rage also comes through a number of groups that were set up for the election campaign with the Save the RAH group, the land tax group and others. It was like 'catch Tim' a few years ago—all these dodgy groups. We see fake twitter sites, hacking groups, all these things are being done—road rage by the Liberals and their allies, motivated either by a promise or by malice.

Let us just go to some of the issues. Now the opposition's strategy, having lost the election, is to say, 'Okay, we didn't win the election, so now we're going to play bugger up.' That is what this is about: 'We're going to try to stop everything. We're going to try to paralyse this city. We're going to try to paralyse this state. We're going to try to halt development. We're going to try to stop anything good from happening.'

What they cannot bear the thought of is that, early next year, the Minister for Health and I will be side by side signing a deal for the immediate construction of a world-class hospital in this state. That is what this is all about. This is about: you could not win the election, now you are going to turn your vengeance and anger on our state and its interests, because you always—just as with the nuclear waste dump—put your party before your state, and that is the difference. Let us go on to some of the other issues.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Premier will be heard in silence. There is too much noise from my left. The Premier.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Of course, in trying to paralyse our state, they are not just going to oppose a stadium. Their policy of maximum mayhem, that is what they talk about. It is why they are so depressed when we get good job figures. They are so depressed when the employment rate goes down. So, maximum mayhem is their policy. They are opposed not just to the stadium but to the new hospital and the super schools. They were opposed to the trams. They are opposed to the new \$130 million Glenside Hospital. They are opposed to the film studios. Of course, one minute they were calling for the desal plant and now they are opposed to it because it is too big and too costly. This goes on and on. They were opposed to the Northern Expressway. No doubt, they will find a reason to be opposed to the duplication of the Southern Expressway. Of course, also—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Premier.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: It is also about the Liberal leadership. We have seen the member for Davenport trying to be the comeback kid and is spreading rumours. The muffled drums are being sounded at last about what age certain people will be at the next election and perhaps they need to groom someone down the back to come forward, and that is why the member for Davenport still has not forgotten that he has field marshal's baton in his knapsack, as of course does the member for Waite, who I think was the best of the six Liberal leaders whom I have faced on this side of the house—and I say that knowing that it will be reported. It is also about the stadium—

Mr Pengilly interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, the member for Finniss! The Premier.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Okay; but it is also about their opposition to a stadium—

Mr Pengilly interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, the member for Finniss!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: It is about the fact that they do not want football to come home to Adelaide Oval where it belongs. That is what it is all about. We heard from the Leader of the Opposition when she was postulating about these issues that she had never ever been to AAMI Stadium to see an AFL football match. Apparently, that has been rapidly addressed. This is about the fact that most South Australians would love to see AFL football and a world sporting icon at Adelaide Oval. You are going to fight this tooth and nail, because you know that the hospital, when its construction starts next year, will be on one of the sites of your proposed stadium. Although, apparently now it is not the 'Adelaide Oval': it is the 'Adelaide High Oval' next to West Terrace Cemetery. It goes on and it goes on and it goes on.

We believe that football should be in the heart of our city. We want the upgraded Adelaide Oval to be part of a revitalised riverbank, including the new hospital—a hospital and a world-class science centre in a park, the revitalisation of the Convention Centre and the entire precinct. But you do not want that to happen. You do not want football to be played in this city and you are going to fight this tooth and nail. But do you know what, you tried to stop the hospital, but I will invite you along to the opening ceremony, and I am looking forward to seeing you and seeing the patients in world-class facilities—

Mr Pengilly interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, the member for Finniss!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Okay, why is this happening today? It was supposed to happen, by the way, last Thursday. They called on a privileges motion to support a privileges committee—and it was not defeated on party lines. We saw Independents, distinguished Independents of a conservative persuasion, voting with the government because they could see what a fraud this argument was. There was supposed to be a no confidence motion on Thursday because it was so important to the future of the state, but that was the day of a new Prime Minister being sworn in, so they thought, 'Okay, let's wait until Leigh Whicker appears before the star chamber of the upper house. That will fuel us along for a whole week.' But, unfortunately, the Liberals did not like the fact that Leigh Whicker came in, told the truth and totally backed up the Deputy Premier's position in relation to what he was told.

That is the nub of it: this Deputy Premier told the truth. He made a mistake and he came out publicly and did the decent thing, even though it was embarrassing for him to do so—and he did it 20 days before parliament sat. I have worked with the Deputy Premier in many capacities over decades. He is an extraordinarily honest human being. What you see is what you get. He is honest about his own problems, issues and challenges. I think he gets credit from the people of this state for actually saying it as it is and speaking out. We are told so often that people are sick and tired of politicians who believe only in spin—and that is what the opposition said their own costings were at the last election.

People want politicians to be real, raw and open, and that is exactly what the Deputy Premier has been. A fundamental responsibility upon a minister is to act honestly, diligently and with propriety in the exercise of their duties. This obligation is greatest in the minister's accountability and responsibility to this place, to the parliament of South Australia. In reporting to parliament, a minister must, to the best of his or her ability and knowledge, be accurate. Where a minister becomes aware—

Mrs Redmond interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: You think that is the point?

Mrs Redmond: Yes.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Then, where a minister becomes aware of an inadvertent error, he or she must, as soon as possible and in an appropriate manner, correct the record.

So, it was incumbent upon the Deputy Premier to come back in here the next day of sitting and bell the cat and say, 'I inadvertently misled the parliament. I made a mistake.' That has always been the system in the 25 years that I have been in this place and longer in this building and, indeed, for 100 years before and, indeed, in the mother of parliaments in Westminster; and that has been the standard which every premier and minister of this state has applied. However, instead of just doing that, this Deputy Premier called a news conference 20 days before the return of parliament to announce that he had made an error. The opposition cannot accept the truth of that, because it is not in their political interests to do so.

But the fact is that the star chamber in the upper house not only confirmed what the Deputy Premier said but also took the wind out of the opposition's sails, and that is why this motion is being held today and not tomorrow, because they can feel the momentum fizzing. That is exactly what happened. Now, as the father of the house, let me go into objectivity. Let us objectively examine the Deputy Premier's response. Through his staff, the Deputy Premier ascertained the correct information and personally confirmed it by checking the record. He publicly volunteered the fact that he had made an error at the earliest opportunity and, due to the three week break in parliamentary sittings, the Deputy Premier elected to disclose the error and correct the public record because it was in the public interest to do so.

Last week, the Deputy Premier, at the first opportunity, explained the error, corrected the record and offered the house a genuine and sincere apology for his error, which the opposition will not accept. They were prepared to accept it when they were forging documents and using those materials around the place. It was absolutely outrageous and one of the worst things ever seen in a parliament in Australia. They are prepared to accept that, but they are not prepared to accept someone making a mistake and genuinely making an apology to this house and the people of this state.

In short, the Deputy Premier has adhered to the highest standards required of a minister. His explanation speaks for itself and I do not intend to repeat it, other than to say that the error was an honest and genuine mistake and, in the context of the circumstances which he has fully explained, is understandable. In essence, the Deputy Premier has explained that his error was caused by a failure of memory.

Mrs Redmond interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I listened to you in silence. Will you please give me the same courtesy? Courtesy is very important in this house. He simply, in the heat of question time, overlooked a meeting some weeks earlier—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: —and much has happened since that meeting. Recent events have added weight to his explanation. Mr Whicker, the person the Deputy Premier met, gave evidence this week before a committee of the Legislative Council that touched on this issue. What did Mr Whicker say about the meeting? You did not mention that in your submissions to this house. He said:

I also provided Mr Foley with a preliminary cost figure from the Rider Levett Bucknall document...of \$469 million. That was a verbal briefing and a brief briefing.

Mr Whicker in his evidence also explained the range of other topics discussed with the Deputy Premier at that meeting. It is clear from his evidence that the mention of the cost estimate was one of but many topics covered, and only in passing. That evidence is completely consistent with the Deputy Premier's explanation to the house that the mention of the cost estimate was only fleeting.

Last week, obviously realising the weakness of their argument, they tried to bolster it by making further allegations of the Deputy Premier misleading the house by contrasting selectively quoted passages of a Stadium Management Authority announcement last Friday with statements deliberately taken out of context from statements the Deputy Premier made five weeks earlier. That is how shabby the politics of this argument have become. Can I just say this: I remember the night following, apparently, a meeting—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: —that occurred in last December, or the end of November, that went on for some days, involving all the different sports organisations. I remember the Deputy Premier asking me to convene a meeting in the cabinet room of the State Administration Centre. Present were the Deputy Premier, the AFL, SANFL, SACA, Port Adelaide FC, and Adelaide FC representatives.

I addressed the meeting, outlining not only the background to the meeting but also my understanding of where the various parties were. I said I had called everyone together because I wanted to hear from the horses' mouths what they wanted. I wanted everyone in the same room to

ensure that, in fact, we were on the same page. I said that I had been sick and tired of getting mixed messages from various people about what they really wanted, like being told officially that a certain club supported AAMI Stadium but unofficially supported Adelaide Oval.

I said I would only support a united position, not a divided one—because we know what division has done to members opposite. I also said that it was not for cricket to tell me what football wanted. I wanted to hear from football itself. I wanted to hear from the AFL, the SANFL and the two AFL clubs; and we went around the room.

This is a furphy; you know it is a furphy. It is about the member for Davenport trying to raise his profile, lift his credentials. It is about the fact that they know that they have to have different Leader of the Opposition at the next election, and what we are seeing is jockeying for positions. We have a Deputy Premier who admitted his mistake, who did the right thing, who wants to see football back at Adelaide Oval, who wants to see the football come home, who wants to see our state move ahead, and that is why this motion is a fraud.

The SPEAKER: The member for—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Davenport.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (14:58): This debate today is not only about the stadium, Premier; this debate today is about honesty to the people and honesty to the parliament. The reason I support this motion, Premier and Treasurer, is because I believe this Treasurer has been dishonest to the public, dishonest to the parliament, dishonest to the media, and dishonest to his colleagues.

This Treasurer has misled the public, misled the parliament, misled the media, and it is my view that this Treasurer should resign or be sacked. The problem with the Premier and the Treasurer's argument is that they believe ministerial standards should only apply to minority governments. The Premier and the Treasurer were the great champions of ministerial standards when they were over on this side of the house. They were the champions of ministerial standards. Madam Speaker, I find myself occasionally agreeing with the Treasurer, and I will give him some quotes from debates past. The Premier is on record as saying:

This is about whether or not we have an honest government in South Australia, whether or not we have a mandate for continued dishonesty.

I have to agree with you, Premier, with that quote. The Treasurer himself, in talking about honesty to the parliament, stated:

South Australians have a right to have confidence and trust in the integrity and honesty of their government.

I agree with that quote, Treasurer. You said, again, in a similar debate:

How can we say that we have an effective government in this state when it is a government that is built on dishonesty, [and] is prepared to support dishonesty...

Madam Speaker, I put to you that the Treasurer should listen to those quotes and resign or be sacked, because this Treasurer—

The Hon. K.O. Foley interjecting:

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: They were about the past government, but they are now about your government, sunshine; they are now about your government, because in my view you have been dishonest to the public, dishonest to the parliament and dishonest to the media.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I have a point of order. The debate has been conducted in at least courteous tones up to date. It is inappropriate to direct remarks in the first person to the Treasurer; it has to be by the name of his seat or, in particular, through the chair.

The SPEAKER: I uphold that point of order. Refer to him as the Treasurer.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: The reason we are having this debate is because the Premier needs the Treasurer's numbers. We all know that, if the Premier, Mr Rann, moved on the Treasurer, the Treasurer would call in the right wing of the Labor Party. The ghost of defamation

past, the former attorney-general, would be called in to do the numbers, and ultimately the Premier's position is at risk if Mr Foley's position is at risk. The reason we are here today is because this Premier is too gutless to sack the Treasurer for his behaviour over this issue.

I want to touch on the issue of misleading the public for the whole of the election campaign. At the end of this debate we are going to have a division, and every one of the Labor members opposite will sit on one side of the house, whether they support the Treasurer and the way he misled the public during the whole of the campaign or whether they do not support the Treasurer and the way he misled the public during the whole of the campaign. Why do I say that the Treasurer misled the public for the whole of the campaign?

The Treasurer misled the public for the whole of the campaign because we now know—we have weaselled it out of the Treasurer—that on 19 February he was briefed by Leigh Whicker that the stadium cost had blown out, but then for the whole campaign the Treasurer sat there and said, 'I haven't received any advice.' Not a skerrick of advice, no advice, had not been told, there is no blowout: pick a line, the Treasurer spun it. And he spun it because he lied to South Australia for the whole of the election campaign.

At the end of this debate every single one of the Labor members will have to sit on one side of the house, and I cannot wait to letterbox the marginal seats to say that these members actually support the Treasurer's actions. The Treasurer had ample time to come out and correct the record during the campaign. On 6 March there was a radio interview. The Treasurer lies dormant and continues the misinformation. On 8 March, 9 March, and 10 March this Treasurer had ample opportunity to come out and correct the record.

He wants us to believe that he did not tell anyone, not a soul. You can imagine the scene in the minister's office. He goes down to meet Leigh Whicker on 19 February, he comes back to the office and the staff say, 'How did the meeting with Mr Whicker go?' The Treasurer's answer? 'I forgot.' This is the story, the sham, that this government is peddling; that the Treasurer can have a briefing, it goes from \$450 million to \$469 million, and the Treasurer just tells no-one. I mean, does anyone actually believe that story? It is a crock. This Treasurer misled the public for the whole of the campaign, and he took a deliberate decision to do so, by his own admission.

Let us now fast forward to the parliament. The Treasurer says that he accidentally misled the parliament. So, for all of the election campaign he remembered to forget. The 6 March he remembered to forget, the 8 March he remembered to forget, the 9 March he remembered to forget, the 10 March he remembered to forget; but when he comes to the parliament, when it comes here, where it really matters, he forgets to remember. I mean, what is it with this Treasurer? He is spinning a line and we should not accept it. So, he misleads the parliament, by his own admission. He says that he does it by accident. He says that he comes out straight away. Not this Treasurer. This Treasurer comes out five days later.

Did he ring the Speaker on the day of the misleading and say, 'I've made an error'? No. Did he ring the opposition when he found out he had made an error? No. He waits until 2 o'clock, when we were in a meeting with Leigh Whicker, because he thought that we were going to get told by Leigh Whicker. The Premier said in his own contribution that Leigh Whicker was going to tell the truth, and that is absolutely right: Leigh Whicker was going to tell the truth.

The Treasurer came out for these reasons only: McLachlan was on the radio; Leigh Whicker was going to tell the truth, if we asked him, in that meeting; and he was aware, through Kevin Cantley, that his officers had been told that there were minutes to the effect that Kevin Foley had been told before the election. He came out and confessed his misleading because he knew he was going to get caught out.

We should not accept this spinning line from this Treasurer that he came out because he was being honest. He came out because he was being honestly dishonest and he got caught out. This Treasurer has been dishonest to the public, dishonest to the parliament and dishonest to the media and he should be sacked or he should resign.

Honourable members: Hear, hear!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Pengilly interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Finniss, behave yourself.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Elder—Minister for Transport, Minister for Infrastructure, Minister for Energy) (15:06): I think from that, Madam Speaker, it is obvious that we are dealing with a matter of confidence here today, and I think that performance may well have seriously eroded the confidence of some people in this place, but not particularly in Kevin Foley. I think you would have to be not here not to have observed the differences in the relative performances of the two speakers for the opposition. I suspect perhaps Iain Evans helped to write that speech for the Leader of the Opposition, and I have to say it was very informative to watch the pained smile on her face all during Iain's very passionate performance. I will say no more than that. I will leave people to make their own judgements. I did note the member for Schubert nodding off during the Leader of the Opposition's performance, but I will leave it at that.

It was a lovely performance by the member for Davenport, but he would have you believe that he has come in full of outrage about this misleading. His points are that we should not have confidence in Kevin Foley because he says he misled the parliament and he misled the people of South Australia. That is the entirety of his argument. I make one point, firstly. The absolute entirety of the misleading of parliament was Kevin Foley, in response to an interjection—this is their own case; this is what they said—saying something like (what were the words?) 'no way, shape or form.' So, the entirety of the opposition's case—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: They are so discourteous, are they not? The entirety of the opposition's case is that, in response to an interjection, in the heat of what we have seen in recent times in this place, the incredible noise from the other side, the Treasurer said something that he has later had to come back and correct, which he did. The member for Davenport went through some things said in this place before. I am quite happy to go back over many years, when the opposition was in government, and their attitude to the obligations of honesty in this place.

It never came voluntarily; it was dragged out kicking and screaming, in one case. It required not one but two judges to have inquiries before the truth would eventually emerge, and never, to this date, has there been an acknowledgement of the case against them. That is in stark contrast to the performance of the Deputy Premier. So, there it is: the entirety of their case is a response to one interjection in this place.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Well, that's what you said when you came in here on a privileges matter. That is what you said. I am just telling you back what you said. So you can interrupt me if you like, but that is what you said. The other part of it was misleading the public during the campaign. Now, what is purposely being forgotten in this entire debate is that, to a great degree, whatever early estimates and costs there were were not consequential to the position of the taxpayer, had no consequence whatever on the position of the taxpayer. I wonder if you want to remember that, because it was absolutely clear that the contribution from the taxpayer was \$450 million. That was absolutely clear, so those estimates that they are now beating the drum about had no consequence—how was the taxpayer misled? They were up for 450, they were told they were up for 450. Now, subsequently—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Pisoni interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Unley!

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I can guarantee this house—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: They are so rude. This is the thing—there is nothing genuine about this. What we have in here is a motion of no confidence, when they have a star chamber going in another place and, of course, this will be decided on a—they say they have set up that inquiry to get to the truth. But, of course, they are not really interested in the truth, because they have run out of questions and they have got to do something. Honestly, you saw them yesterday, and the rephrasing of questions asked the day before and last week. They have run out of questions, so they are going to get to the end of the inquiry upstairs before they have it. There is absolutely nothing genuine about this at all. I want to come back to this thing about misleading the public. I can guarantee this house that until—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: They are so rude. I can guarantee this house that until we walked into a Labor Party caucus to put a proposition to them to increase that funding there was nothing more than that 450. I do not remember the date of the meeting, but it was relatively recent, and I guarantee you, as was reported, there was some heat in that debate, because—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Will you not be rude? The only people that interjected on them when they were speaking were them. Did you notice that?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: It is the height of bad manners. But they have never been kind to each other, have they? They have never been kind to each other. Can I say, and it has been well reported, that there was a great reluctance on the behalf of some—and they have made their positions clear—to fund football and cricket for more than we had originally committed. So up until that point, up until a decision of a Labor caucus following a cabinet decision to increase that funding, the total exposure of the South Australian taxpayer was \$450 million. That was true on day one of the campaign, and it was true on the last day of the campaign.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: As I said, they are very rude. I want to compare that position of the Treasurer's with the positions taken by the other side. They actually never have produced any costings on their stadium, ever, of any kind. That was for very good reasons—because we actually heard from them about who was misleading whom during an election campaign. The former deputy leader—I mean one of the former deputy leaders of the opposition—when asked if it meant that the Liberal's previous statements were spin in regard to costings, said, in essence, yes. If you don't want to look at the credibility of this batch of Liberals, let us go back a few years, to other questions during election campaigns.

An honourable member: Go right back to John Bannon and the State Bank if you like.

Mr Pisoni interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Unley.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: You can if you like. I'm more than happy I have got a few minutes left. It was not much to answer from your side, I must say. Let us talk about who misleads people during election campaigns. Are you going to sell ETSA? No, we will not sell ETSA full stop, full stop, full stop. Of course, and then a little while after the election, they saw the electric light on the road to Damascus and changed their mind. Now, no-one believes that. That was one of the most egregious lies ever told to the people of South Australia. So on this side we have got a bloke who had a liability capped at \$450 million, whose story has been entirely supported by Mr Whicker, whose story—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: It hasn't gone well, has it? It hasn't gone well for you. So, you have—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I point out the difference in the behaviour of the people on that side in something that they have brought, which they have told us is terribly important. Of course, they have their kangaroo court elsewhere. They have told us this is terribly important, and when they do not like something that is said they interject and shout. That, as I said, was how poor old Kevin got into trouble in the first place. I have no doubt that my colleague, the Deputy Premier, has told the truth about this. I stress this nonsense about the public being misled about a capped liability of \$450 million. If you do not believe that was capped, you should have been in that Labor caucus room when they decided, after a vigorous debate, to increase the amount of funding. You should have been there. I can tell you—

Ms Fox: Robust.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Robust, yes, is a very good way of putting it. What we have is an opposition that, after eight years, so many leaders, so many deputy leaders and a complete inability ever to take a ministerial scalp, because we tell the truth on this side—after all those years they think they are finally going somewhere.

Ms Chapman: What about Atko? Atko for treasurer.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I will say, if Michael Atkinson was treasurer I don't think footy would get very much; I don't think cricket would get very much either. I will close by saying this about what this debate is really about, and I wish people would think about this. When I was a child (a rather better looking person than I am now) I went to my first two grand finals at Adelaide Oval. I think they were 1971 and 1972. I was supporting Port Adelaide.

An honourable member: They were good years.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Yes, they were great years. We were torn apart by Barrie Robran; one icon on another icon at Adelaide Oval. Even though we lost those, I have never seen a game at AAMI Stadium that has matched the atmosphere of those games at Adelaide Oval. Can I tell you: if Kevin Foley has made a mistake, it is his passion to get football back to Adelaide Oval. He has driven this with a passion.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: They laugh, but I tell you that is simply the truth. This matter on our side of the house has been entirely driven by Kevin Foley and his passion to bring this about for football and for South Australia. He made a couple of mistakes along the way and fessed up to them. I am going to give you a few more minutes so that we can hear from another one of your luminaries, because I want another point of comparison. What I can say is this: this is a guy with a passion to get football to Adelaide Oval, who made a mistake and came and fessed up to it. You have been all over him like a rash and he has taken a bit of pain for it, but that is all it is.

At the end of the day, Madam Speaker, that is all it is. That is all they will find with their kangaroo court, which will report in about 2015 or something like that. That is all they will find because that is all there was. Let's get this nonsense over with, let's get football back to Adelaide Oval, and let's get the stadium built. I look forward to going there one day with Martin Hamilton-Smith, who at least knows that it is a good idea to get football there. I am happy to go to the football one day with Martin Hamilton-Smith at Adelaide Oval, because he will enjoy it—and I promise I will turn up.

Mr Hamilton-Smith interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I promise I will be there. But if you try and hold hands it will be a different matter—no. I look forward to being at the football with the former leader of the opposition, who I think did have a passion for this, just like Kevin Foley does. A few mistakes and that is all it is.

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:18): I am absolutely delighted that neither of the speakers on behalf of the government are defending me, because their defence has been lamentable. Since they wanted to delve into history, can I quote from something that was said in this house some years ago concerning the test of a premier. Their role is 'to lead, to make judgments, and to exert moral authority'. He went on to say:

If he had shown any moral leadership or moral authority, then the Premier would have disciplined and got rid of this minister weeks ago.

Mrs Redmond: Who said that?

Mr WILLIAMS: Mike Rann, 1998—moral authority: the code of conduct for ministers of the government of South Australia. I was in the chamber when this was handed down and when this Premier made much of the code of conduct for his ministers. This is printed and it is out there for everybody to live by:

Ministers are expected to act honestly, diligently and with propriety in the performance of their public duties and functions. Ministers must ensure they do not deliberately mislead the public or the Parliament on any matter of significance arising from their functions.

Notwithstanding that we know the Treasurer on his own admission misled both the public and the parliament, this Premier has no moral authority, nor do any of his colleagues. I concur with my colleague the member for Davenport and I may come back to that. The deputy leader—the Treasurer—has acknowledged that on the day before the writs were issued, 19 February, he was given information that he forgot. The Premier's defence is that it was only verbal information. The Premier's defence of his Treasurer is that if it is verbal it does not matter.

In what manner do you have to get the information before it actually sinks in? Does it have to be a caricature? Maybe it has to be a picture for the Treasurer, but I would have thought he could understand a verbal briefing. There were six pages of information from the consultants. The Minister for Infrastructure came out in defence of the Treasurer, too. What did his defence say? His defence was that, by and large, it does not matter because he was only responding to an interjection when he lied to the parliament. So if you are responding to an interjection you can lie to the parliament.

Notwithstanding the Freudian slip that the Treasurer made on FIVEaa on 6 March when he said that the cost was \$500 million, he went on to say on public radio throughout the election period, 'We have got sound costings. We have a group of people working on this and we have sound costings and they are a lot better than what the opposition has got.' That is what he said on public radio. He knew he had sound costings, because Leigh Whicker had explained them to him but, because it was only a verbal briefing, he was allowed to forget it.

That is what the Deputy Premier did. He went on to say, 'Not one scrap of advice; no way, shape or form; on the soul of my grandmother.' Well, I have a lot more respect for my grandmother, as I have a lot more respect for this parliament and the people of South Australia than is held by this deputy leader—by this Treasurer—by this Premier and by this government.

The House divided on the motion:

AYES (18)

Chapman, V.A.	Evans, I.F.	Gardner, J.A.W.
Goldsworthy, M.R.	Griffiths, S.P.	Hamilton-Smith, M.L.J.
Marshall, S.S.	McFetridge, D.	Pederick, A.S.
Pengilly, M.	Pisoni, D.G.	Redmond, I.M. (teller)
Sanderson, R.	Treloar, P.A.	van Holst Pellekaan, D.C.
Venning, I.H.	Whetstone, T.J.	Williams, M.R.

NOES (27)

Atkinson, M.J.	Bedford, F.E.	Bignell, L.W.
Brock, G.G.	Caica, P.	Conlon, P.F. (teller)
Foley, K.O.	Fox, C.C.	Geraghty, R.K.
Hill, J.D.	Kenyon, T.R.	Key, S.W.
Koutsantonis, A.	O'Brien, M.F.	Odenwalder, L.K.
Pegler, D.W.	Piccolo, T.	Portolesi, G.
Rankine, J.M.	Rann, M.D.	Rau, J.R.
Sibbons, A.L.	Snelling, J.J.	Thompson, M.G.
Vlahos, L.A.	Weatherill, J.W.	Wright, M.J.

Majority of 9 for the Noes

Motion thus negated.

MINISTER'S REMARKS

Mr VENNING (Schubert) (15:27): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr VENNING: During the debate on the no-confidence motion the Minister for Transport implied that I had dozed off, or words to that effect, during the speeches. Again, that is a complete

untruth. In my 20 years in this place I have never fallen asleep or even had a catnap. I have plenty of witnesses to say that I did not. It is just more grubby politics and personal vilification in an attempt to draw attention away from the misdemeanours of the Treasurer.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

MENTAL HEALTH

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (15:28): Tomorrow, 1 July, sees the introduction of the new Mental Health Act. The Mental Health Act was passed through this place about 18 months ago, and it has caused a degree of concern amongst various groups, not excluding the ambulance officers, the Police Department and a number of non-government mental health organisations and support groups.

The sad fact is that mental illness is becoming a significant part of the health budget, and we will have to cope with more and more cases of both young people, middle aged and older people suffering with mental health. The figure that is given around the impacts on the economy with respect to mental illness, just with anxiety and depression alone, is \$20 billion a year nationally. Those sorts of figures are huge and cannot be ignored. The need to spend more money on mental health is something that this government needs to be aware of. Some progress is being made, but not much. There is ample evidence in the community of the lack of work, support and funding by this state government with mental health.

However, I am pleased to hear today that the federal Coalition leader (Hon. Tony Abbott) announced that a federal Coalition government would provide an extra \$1.5 billion to provide front-line services for mental health. The Coalition's real action plan for better mental health would deliver 20 new early psychosis prevention and intervention centres. At the moment there is only one in Melbourne, I understand. Early intervention is an absolute no-brainer in mental health. Much emphasis is being put on preventive health but we are not seeing enough early intervention on mental health.

During the last election campaign, we talked about a program to assist young people in this state called Doctors on Campuses. It is a program that is being run very successfully at Victor Harbor High School. That was ignored by the former minister for mental health. I hope that the current Minister for Mental Health (Hon. John Hill) looks at that and takes it up. I hope that, upon the election of a Coalition government in Canberra in the next coming months (we are told), the state government accepts the extra funding for the delivery of 20 early new psychosis prevention and intervention centres, 60 additional youth headspace sites and 800 acute and subacute early intervention beds that have been promised in the \$1.5 billion policy released today by the leader of the federal Coalition (Hon. Tony Abbott).

Mental health has been discussed through the National Health and Hospital framework and the extra funding that was going to be provided, but we saw the Mental Health Coalition, the mental health NGOs and the mental health experts, including many of the professors, write to the federal government saying that they were absolutely disgusted with the lack of funding for mental health, the lack of action that has been taken by the Rudd federal government (now Gillard federal government) in Australia.

It is a wonderful thing to see the Coalition promising an increase in funding for the upcoming years, if they are elected in August. The need to spend more money on mental health has been ignored by the Rudd government (now the Gillard government). Youth mental health is an area that none of us should be arguing over. We should be ensuring that the mental health burden, which is becoming more of a burden for Australia, is at the forefront of all policy decisions. The federal opposition has put forward a good policy: \$1.5 billion for 20 new early psychosis prevention intervention centres, 60 additional youth headspace sites, and 800 acute and subacute early intervention beds. It is good policy.

I congratulate the federal Leader of the Opposition on his announcement today. I look forward to a federal Coalition government being elected in the upcoming federal election, because certainly it will be delivering on mental health. It is a sad indictment on the Labor Party, both state and federal, that mental health has been a poor cousin compared to other health areas. The need to spend it is imperative: it needs to be spent today and it will be spent in the future.

SPORTS STADIUM

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Industry and Trade, Minister for Small Business, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Gambling) (15:33): I apologise to the house for the state of my voice because I know how much members enjoy listening to my voice—

An honourable member: Your dulcet tones!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Today I rise to grieve as a local member of parliament who is concerned about the direction in which the Liberal Party is taking the stadium debate. If the Liberal Party had its way it is now claiming that it would build a brand new stadium on the third oval of the Adelaide High School site. That Adelaide High School third oval is directly behind (or in front, depending on your perspective) of the good residents of Mile End, Thebarton and Torrensville. There has been no consultation with those residents about a 60,000-seat stadium on their doorstep. No policy was put forward by the local Liberal candidate during the last election campaign, nor did he mention what that would do to the suburbs.

In fairness to the people of North Adelaide, they knew before the election, they had a choice. They knew—

Dr McFetridge: They chose.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Indeed; the member for Morphett said, 'They chose.' There were two proposals before the parliament. If the Liberal Party had been successful—if they had actually run a decent campaign—they would have rebuilt the RAH on its existing site and used the rail yards site for a stadium. The people of North Adelaide knew that and voted accordingly. The people of Mile End, Thebarton and Torrensville did not know from the Liberal Party in advance that its new plan is to build a 60,000-seat stadium with a roof behind Adelaide High School. The Liberal Party did not tell them that at all.

I have circulated the Leader of the Opposition's quotes to those residents, asking them to respond to me about their views of this new Liberal Party policy, and I can foresee a great deal of anger towards the Liberal Party for not being open and honest. They were honest about wanting to get rid of the curfew. The Leader of the Opposition, before the election, said she wants the airport curfew changed. She made that quite clear during the election campaign, and I campaigned on that very strongly. So, tick the Liberal Party for being honest on that issue. But, when it comes to the new stadium, I doubt very much that the good people of West Torrens had any inclination that this was their new plan.

What would a new stadium do to the people of Mile End, Torrensville and Thebarton? The same way that residents of North Adelaide would be concerned about Adelaide Oval, even though they had a choice before the election because they knew all about it—

Mr Pengilly: Get Barton Terrace west opened up. That concerns us.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Not Mile End, Thebarton and Torrensville.

Mr Pengilly: No, you mentioned North Adelaide.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I would have thought that they would share the same concerns as their brothers and sisters in North Adelaide, who they have so much in common with. I would imagine that they would be very unhappy with members opposite and, especially, the Leader of the Opposition. Just to make an off-the-cuff remark as the Leader of the Opposition and say, 'Yes, we lost the election'—and I talked about that yesterday—'so there will not be a rebuild of the RAH on its current site. The RAH will be built on this new site and the stadium will be upgraded, but we are doing our best to try to stop that. But, if we are elected in 2014, we will build a stadium behind Adelaide High School.' She spent a billion dollars and decided on a site in 30 seconds, on the radio.

Mr Pengilly: You just pulled that out off the top of your head.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I would like to read about this on Facebook from members opposite. I cannot wait to read the member for Finnis' blog on his Facebook status. Last time I checked his status it said, 'Michael Pengilly, still sacked'. So, I will be taking up this cause for my constituents. I will fight any attempt to build a new stadium behind the Adelaide High School site because I think—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I got it from the radio because the Leader of the Opposition on the radio suggested an alternative site: the Adelaide High School oval. They were her words.

Mr Pengilly: Where did you get the billion dollars from?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: They were her words, again. I will be making sure that those words are distributed far and wide in the western suburbs and letting people know that the Liberal Party now has a new policy of building a new stadium behind Adelaide High School.

The SPEAKER: The member for Chaffey.

Mr Pengilly interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, the member for Finniss! You are very noisy today.

Mr Pengilly: I am. I'm sorry, your worship.

The SPEAKER: That is an elevation in status for me. Thank you very much for that. Member for Chaffey, please ignore the member for Finniss.

RIVERLAND MOTORSPORT AND TRAINING COMPLEX

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (15:38): Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. This grievance speech is directed to the ministers for road safety, regional development and sport in relation to the proposed Riverland motorsport and driver training complex. This proposal is currently before the Berri Barmera Council for approval, and I am informed it will soon move to a public consultation phase as required by the Development Act. I have been taking particular interest in the proposal because it will create a whole new industry in the Riverland, a region which in recent times has suffered significant blows to its economy and its community's confidence.

Government departments, the police and other emergency services, and even the private sector, all conduct defensive driving and advanced driving courses. The proposed complex would be a much more suitable venue for driver training than where it is currently conducted in the Riverland, at Renmark airport. It is intended to create a regional driver training hub at the new complex which is proposed for the Riverland Field Day's permanent site near Barmera. This would create jobs in the region, create a new sporting industry in the region and, most importantly, provide education and a safe environment in which drivers, particularly young drivers, could gain the experience they need to survive on our roads.

We have watched in horror as the state's road toll has increased. More than 60 people have lost their lives on our roads this year, which is now only half over. About 60 per cent of the road fatalities in South Australia occur on country roads. While I commend public authorities in their considerable efforts to keep our roads safe, it is important that we acknowledge that experience, rather than stricter road rules or harsher penalties, is a driver's best asset on the road. This is particularly the case in the seat of Chaffey, where drivers must contend with many unsealed roads and a major national highway, with its increasing number of B-double trucks.

I note that *The Advertiser* has reported that the Motor Accident Commission has commissioned the University of Adelaide's Centre for Automotive Safety Research to investigate school road safety education in Australia and overseas. I commend the government's support for road safety education measures in schools, and further note of the government's commitment to expanding the MFS Road Safety and Accident Awareness Program in schools, but I urge the government to pursue further driver education measures in schools. A dedicated facility in the Riverland for this purpose would be ideal. The proposed site near Barmera is fairly central to the Riverland's four high schools; however, the complex will require state government support.

In the lead-up to the election, the Liberal Party promised \$40,000 towards this worthy cause, and I call on the state government to match this commitment. It is appropriate to consider the proposed complex as a recipient of funding from the government's promised \$20 million restructure package for the Riverland. I direct the minister's attention to an announcement earlier this month by the Victorian government, which detailed a \$100,000 commitment to examine the viability of developing the Murray River communities of Mildura and Swan Hill as elite centres for motorsport. The media release states:

It is envisaged that development of new motorsport facilities in Victoria's north-west will attract regional and national events, boosting the reputation of the region as a base for motorsport and associated activities.

The feasibility study will identify the niche industry in which the region has a competitive advantage, while effectively seeking to diversify the industry base and boosting tourism events. Indeed, I am informed by the Riverland Motorsports Club that recent drag racing events in Mildura attracted sell-out crowds, and it would be a boon for the Riverland to attract some of these spectators too. I quote further from the media release:

...funding is being provided...through the [Victorian] government's Planning for Change program which aims to manage growth, respond to a changing environment and enhance productive, sustainable, liveable communities in provincial Victoria.

The Riverland is certainly seeking such measures to enhance its own sustainability, which has come under increasing threat in recent times. This is clearly a sport with much popular appeal. The Riverland Motorsports Club plans to hold eight such events each year at the proposed new complex. These events would be sanctioned by the Australian Drag Racing Association. It is important that we make a distinction between the illegal hoon activity we are seeing on our streets and motorsports such as drag-racing, held under the strictest regulation and safety conditions. We in this house should provide the best possible driver training and road safety education to give them and others the best possible chance of surviving our roads.

SOUTHERN EXPRESSWAY

Mr BIGNELL (Mawson) (15:44): I rise today to update house on a very exciting project for Southern Adelaide and the Fleurieu Peninsula, that is, the duplication of the Southern Expressway. Last week the government let tenders for a detailed planning study (the process will be completed in August) to look at the best alignment for the duplication of the expressway. People who drive along the expressway will have noticed in the past few weeks engineers out there with their equipment looking at what is there at the moment and how best to deal with the duplication.

Because of its shortsighted approach the Liberal government in power at the time, which built this ridiculous one-way road that is a laughing stock around the world, did not even think about cutting out the cliff faces or making the bridges wide enough, and one of the things we have to do is replace nine road bridges and five footbridges that are simply too short to put two or three more lanes underneath them. So there is a lot of work to be done before the real work can actually begin. That will be late next year, with a completion date sometime in mid-2014, and it is something that people in the South are very much looking forward to. As I said before, it should have been done properly in the first place: it was not, and it will take a Labor government to fix this ridiculous piece of infrastructure, for which the Liberals will always stand condemned.

Last week I hosted the first meeting of the Southern Expressway Jobs Task Force. During the election campaign the Minister for Transport announced that I would chair this task force, which is aimed at ensuring that at least half the 1,500 jobs created during the construction phase of the Southern Expressway go to people living in the South, and to local contractors. That is something which, with a long lead-in time, we are confident we will be able to achieve.

It was a very good first meeting. We had the Minister for Transport—minister Conlon, the Minister for the Southern Suburbs—minister Hill, Sue McCormick, director of the Office for the Southern Suburbs, Paul Gelston, project director of the Office of Major Projects and Infrastructure, Penny Crocker, head of Southern Knowledge Transfer at Flinders University, Peter Nolan, chief executive officer of the Civil Contractors Federation, Mark Searle, the chief executive officer of the City of Marion, and Glenn Hickling, the economic development officer at the City of Onkaparinga.

The meeting aimed to bring everyone around the table so that we could gather everyone's networks and knowledge, and discuss how we would approach it to ensure that we really do maximise the amount of jobs that go to people and businesses in the South. I was very pleased at the input we had from these people, who have so much knowledge and such great connections to people in the South, whether it be through the trade schools or employment agencies, or people like the Southern Business Success Group. We really need to tap into those areas.

One thing we found out through major projects such as the desalination plant and the upcoming extension of the Seaford railway line was that there was not necessarily a great deal of knowledge in the South about how to tender for jobs. So, one of the things they have been doing is running training programs for companies in the South on how to write tender documents, and perhaps not aim for the big company at the top who has won the overall tender but maybe go in at level two or three and apply for jobs at that level. It seems to be something that did not work initially with the desalination plant but is working now through some education, so I congratulate all those

people, who have already done some fantastic work at that level. We look forward to implementing the things they already know into the Southern Expressway project.

We are also going to learn from what happened on the Northern Expressway, and in our next meeting will have the project officer from the Northern Expressway come and explain to us what went well and what did not go so well. There is no point in us inventing everything; if someone already has a good formula out there we would be only too happy to use it. However, we will also look at innovative ways to ensure that the lion's share of the jobs go to people in the South.

Another exciting thing that came out of last week's meeting was that Flinders University students will be able to team up and do their placements on the Southern Expressway. This is a great thing for university students, to be able to go to something in their own backyard and learn on the job; because this will not be the only job, after this the Darlington interchange will be built, so we hope there will be years and years of work for these people.

FISHING INDUSTRY

Mr PENGILLY (Finniss) (15:49): I raise an important issue today in relation to the fishing industry in South Australia. Our professional fishers pay considerable licence fees to have the privilege of being able to catch and sell fish; however, I am deeply concerned about what is happening to the fishermen in the rock lobster fishery, particularly in the northern zone. I have around 16 based in my electorate who all work out of Kingscote—there are many more boats working the northern zone than that—and they are in desperate straits.

Many years ago we had a considerable number of boats working in these waters. Things changed. There were probably too many boats and too many pots and the wheels fell off, to some extent. However, we now find with the introduction of quotas that there has been some success in the past couple of years, particularly this year, in the build up of the biomass of rock lobster in our zone and that most fishermen had their quotas by February at the latest—some went a little bit later, some were in January, some were in early February.

I have received a letter which really worries me, and I am going to read it into *Hansard*. It is from Mr and Mrs Lance Tyley of Kingscote. They have pleaded with me to help them. They said there is another likelihood of quotas being further reduced this coming season. The letter is to the Director of Fisheries, Mr Martin Smallridge, and it states:

Dear sir,

I wish to protest most strongly at the cost of a rock lobster fisheries licence.

For the 09-10 season, you reduced the quota by 34 per cent. This effectively reduced our income by 34 per cent. However, fees, compulsory levies and contributions were not reduced.

How do you expect us to fund these costs?

If your income, or indeed that of any other worker in Australia, had a compulsory reduction of 34 per cent there would be extreme difficulty experienced by every person in trying to pay bills.

In all fairness, having cut the quota, and with potential further cuts, you could see that fees should not remain at, or exceed, the level of previous years when higher catches, and therefore income, could be expected.

We pay a compulsory PIFS levy of \$1,200, [we pay] compulsory VMS levy of \$900, and a licence fee of \$20,438.85 (an increase of base licence fee of \$225 this 10-11 season).

Having to pay these fees for what is now a limited access to a fishery which has the potential to earn excellent export dollars for the South Australian economy, is leading the hardship, not only for us, but for other fishermen.

Since the quota has been cut by 34 per cent, and fee costs increased by 3.3 per cent, we actually pay in excess of \$1,000 per week for the privilege of fishing, because the allowable catch is caught in far less time than the length of the season.

But we still pay licence instalments when not earning an income from fishing. We still have insurance, maintenance costs and the usual household expenses to meet.

Once upon a time, we paid a lot of income tax which allowed the government to pay wages for public servants. When our income is reduced by 34 per cent and costs are higher, the tax is less, so the government needs to find money to make up the shortfall. This is not good for our [nation].

It is not easy to balance our finances when fees keep rising.

Would you please consider reducing, or refunding a portion of, the licence fee, so that I may not lose any more sleep worrying about how to pay these bills.

Yours faithfully, Cherie Tyley [on behalf of the Tyley family].

Where is this going to stop? When are these lunatics who run fisheries going to realise that you cannot get blood out of a stone, that people have to make an honest quid, they have to employ people? They should not have to be pushed into a corner. Already this season, I was informed on Saturday that another two boats had sold their licence. It is just not worth going on. This is ridiculous.

The rock lobster industry in South Australia has been a wonderful cornerstone and success in the fisheries sector for many years. I say to the government, 'For heaven's sake, get hold of this department.' I urge the minister to take some action and to allow these people to do what they do—catch fish in an honest manner—not be forced out by increasing government charges and put under the pump to the extent that they are walking away from the industry.

It is causing chaos to families. Children of families who have been in the fishing industry forever, do not want to follow on. I think it is most unjust and I wish to progress this further with the minister in an effort to get some sense back into this industry. I worked closely with the former minister (Hon. Rory McEwen) on cockles, and I would like to do the same on rock lobsters.

ADULT LITERACY

Ms THOMPSON (Reynell) (15:54): I rise today to thank *The Advertiser*, which is an unusual thing indeed, for an article it carried on Tuesday 6 April, headed 'The problem facing millions of workers: can't read, can't write'. It stated:

An astonishing four million adults in the workforce have poor language, literacy and numeracy skills and cannot understand the meaning of some everyday words. These workers are typically in labour-intensive and low-level service jobs but their inability to follow basic instructions and warnings is causing a safety and productivity nightmare. Among the phrases too difficult for some workers are 'hearing protection' and 'personal protective equipment is required', according to a report by Skills Australia for the Rudd government. The words that many do not understand include: immediately, authorised, procedure, recommended, experience, required, optional, deliberate, isolation, and mandatory.

I invite *The Advertiser* to undertake a campaign to support adult literacy in the way it has worked so well in supporting young children's reading. It is very difficult for somebody like *The Advertiser* to do this, because if people do not have literacy skills they are presumably not reading *The Advertiser*, and in fact I know that the circulation figures for *The Advertiser* in my area are not high; so they have a double reason to do this. *The Advertiser* might like to do, however, as I have been doing, and try to identify people who are taking action to overcome their poor literacy skills, tell some of their stories and publish them, in the hope that their friends, family and neighbours who have recognised that people are struggling will encourage them to embark on some of the excellent programs that are now available to help deal with this issue of adults not having literacy skills that are now required for the workforce.

I would like to commend a number of the unions who, as part of the award restructuring process recognise, particularly in manufacturing, that workers, having been told for many years to leave their brains at the factory gates and just do as they were told, lost skills that they had. Some may not have been able to read very competently when they left school, but many others could read quite competently but, when you are not in an environment that requires regular reading, it is like any other skill, you lose it. The Australian Manufacturing Workers Union, for instance, in the development of the Vehicle Industry Certificate, focused on ensuring that workers had the literacy skills that they needed for the modern workforce. As it happens, that was very fortunate when the tragedy of Mitsubishi closing arose, because those workers were better equipped to look for more jobs.

I would like to remind people of the literacy programs that are available from just about every community centre in the state, and certainly in my area, where literacy skills are required and funded by the Adult and Community Education program. The minister knows that I always want more funding for ACE, so there is nothing new. I would also like to pay tribute to some of the people who talked to me about what they are doing about their literacy. These people are participating in the meaningful adult schooling transitions program that is being held at Christies Beach High School to support adults being able to engage in education, get their SACE or do whatever they like in ways that will reward their lives. Some of the stories are of Anna, John, Trish, Assunta and Des.

John's story is particularly interesting, because he defies all the myths about people who cannot read and write. John left school at 14, went into a bricklayer's apprenticeship and was so successful in his trade that he was able to buy houses for each of his seven children. Yet when he retired he decided that his priority was to learn to read so that he could read a newspaper and go to

the library and borrow a book. John told us of how he had been hiding his status of not being able to read for many years. He would have to invent an excuse when he was at the bank and could not fill in a form, to take it home for his wife to undertake. He and the other students agreed they had become socially isolated as they hid their problem.

LAND TAX (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

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

No. 1. Clause 4, page 3, after line 23—After subclause (1) insert:

(1a) Section 5(10)—after paragraph (b) insert:

(ba) land may be wholly exempted from land tax if—

- (i) the land is owned by a natural person and constitutes his or her principal place of residence (whether or not he or she is the sole owner of the land); and
- (ii) the buildings on the land are used for the purposes of a hotel, motel, set of serviced holiday apartments or other similar accommodation; and
- (iii) more than 75% of the total floor area of all buildings on the land is used for the person's principal place of residence;

(bb) land may be partially exempted from land tax by reducing its taxable value in accordance with the scale prescribed in subsection (12) if—

- (i) the land is owned by a natural person and constitutes his or her principal place of residence (whether or not he or she is the sole owner of the land); and
- (ii) the buildings on the land are used for the purposes of a hotel, motel, set of serviced holiday apartments or other similar accommodation; and
- (iii) 25% or more of the total floor area of all buildings on the land is used for the person's principal place of residence,

(and for the purposes of the scale prescribed in subsection (12), the area used for the hotel, motel, set of serviced holiday apartments or other similar accommodation will be taken to be the area used for business or commercial purposes);

No. 2. Clause 4, page 3, after line 34—After subclause (3) insert:

(3a) Section 5(12)—delete 'subsection (10)(b)' and substitute:

subsection (10)(b) or (bb)

Consideration in committee.

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

That the Legislative Council's suggested amendments be agreed to.

The Land Tax (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill 2010 provides that from 2011-12 all land tax thresholds will be indexed by the average movement in land prices. The average percentage change—and this one will bring a tear to any Treasurer's eye around Australia—in land values for a particular financial year will be determined by the Valuer-General, having regard to the Valuation of Land Act 1971 and the Land Tax Act of 1936.

Honourable members have expressed an interest in understanding the methodology that the Valuer-General will apply to determine the average percentage change in land values. The government has previously provided a working formula to members of parliament that summarise the Valuer-General's approach.

Following further examination of various approaches to determining the average change in land values, including having regard to feedback provided by honourable members, particularly the Hon. John Darley MLC, during briefing meetings on the bill, the Valuer-General has now advised that he intends adopting the following methodology to determine the average percentage change in land values.

Proposed methodology: the Valuer-General will undertake the analysis of land value changes for the taxable properties following gazettal of completion of the general valuation in late May—in any given year, I assume. The average percentage change in land values in 2011-12 will be determined as follows:

- Taxable properties for the 2010-11 financial year (from Revenue SA's database) will be used as the taxable properties data set.
- The Valuer-General will determine the change in total taxable site values for those properties between the values in force for the 2010-11 year and those determined for the 2011-12 year, and use those values to calculate the average percentage change in site values.

I can see the shadow treasurer has had his hand in this methodology. It seems like he would have contributed to the architecture of this. Average percentage change in site values equals total land value in year 2 for properties in the taxable property dataset. That is the top line and we now put a line underneath that. Then we have a total land value in year 1 for properties in the taxable properties dataset minus one multiplied by 100. So you divide year 1 by year 2, minus one and multiply by 100.

The underlying principles in this approach and the previously circulated working formula are consistent. I know there are some doubts in this house, but I assure members that, on advice, they are consistent. The Valuer-General considers that this approach will ensure that the average percentile change—actual percentage change in land values—reflects as accurately as possible movements in the land values of properties subject to land tax. Madam Chair, are you comfortable with that?

The CHAIR: I am very comfortable with that, but I think perhaps the member for Davenport would like to speak.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: He might want to elaborate further on the methodology, in particular.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: I rise to support the motion moved by the Treasurer in relation to the amendments from the other place. The reason the Treasurer has kindly updated the house on the new valuation methodology is that the house was advised in the original debate on the bill of a different methodology. The opposition thought it was important that the house be totally informed of the formula that will be used, so that is the reason the Treasurer gave us that statement—and I thank the Treasurer for that.

The opposition is supporting the amendments moved by the Hon. John Darley in another place. I thank the Treasurer's officers, both his personal staff and the departmental staff, who were called to a briefing late yesterday afternoon that continued for some hours so that the opposition could get a good understanding of what problem the Hon. Mr Darley was trying to fix through his original amendments—the amendments before us now are different from what the Hon. Mr Darley moved originally in the upper house—and what options were available to the parliament to fix it.

I sincerely thank the officers for coming in at short notice, particularly Mr Bray who was ill yesterday and despite ill health came in to brief the opposition. We certainly appreciate that—it shows dedication to the cause.

The problem Mr Darley was trying to fix relates to a constituent who was living in a hotel in the South-East and part of the franchise agreement of the hotel chain required that person to live on the premises. That person basically lived on the second floor and other parts of the hotel and, as it turns out, was not eligible (as it stood) for consideration of land tax relief for principal place of residence reasons. That is a *Reader's Digest* version of the problem we were trying to solve.

I thank the officers for providing to the opposition legal advice which clarified the government's legal position and which certainly brought some clarity to the meeting. The opposition on this occasion was not going to ask the government to take a position contrary to its own legal advice, and that is why these new amendments in a different form have been drafted and put through the upper house and are now accepted by both the government and the opposition.

These amendments put the issue of owners of hotels living in the hotels essentially on the same footing for land tax purposes as bed and breakfasts. That is a *Reader's Digest* version of what the amendments do. That will solve the Hon. Mr Darley's problem, and therefore the opposition supports the amendments. The Hon. Mr Darley also moved amendments in relation to

the Commissioner of Taxation's requirement to have no doubt at all in relation to minority interest on the aggregation of land tax issue and, following a detailed briefing by the commissioner about that issue, the opposition decided not to support the Hon. Mr Darley's amendments and, indeed, supports the government's position on that issue.

From memory, the advice to us was that it was a hit to the budget of around \$20 million to \$21 million a year, and the opposition agreed with the government on that issue, and the Hon Mr Darley decided not to proceed based on the results of that briefing. The opposition does not intend to delay the house any longer on this issue. I just remind the house that a different valuation formula is being used than was originally advised. That is now in the *Hansard* for everyone to be aware of. Again, my sincere thanks to the officers coming in at short notice, and we look forward to the passage of the bill.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: What an excellent contribution by the shadow treasurer. I just thought that, in a spirit of bonhomie, is it, Patrick?

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: Sounds good to me. It's all Greek to me.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I thank the shadow treasurer for his generous and complimentary words, which are somewhat in contrast to about 45 minutes ago when he was trying to tear me down and destroy my career, and my very good staff, about whom he was so complimentary, would have been out of a job. Notwithstanding the shadow treasurer's attempts to destroy the lives of about 12 people, I do thank and acknowledge his contribution, as I do to the Hon. John Darley, who is with us.

I think that between the Hon. John Darley, the Valuer-General and, perhaps, the tax commissioner, I am not sure that too many people can understand that methodology. The reason the shadow treasurer said that he would give only a brief description is probably why I am giving only a very brief description of it as well. Sometimes little is best when spoken from politicians. I thank the Hon. John Darley in another place for his very constructive input into refining this piece of law, and it is onwards and upwards.

The CHAIR: It is nice to see that everyone is finally getting along.

Motion carried.

SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

The Legislative Council notified its appointment of the Hon. K.L. Vincent to the committee.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Elder—Minister for Transport, Minister for Infrastructure, Minister for Energy) (16:14): I move:

That the Hon. R.B. Such be appointed to the committee.

Motion carried.

NATURAL RESOURCES COMMITTEE

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Elder—Minister for Transport, Minister for Infrastructure, Minister for Energy) (16:14): I move:

That Messrs Brock and Pegler be appointed to the committee.

Motion carried.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (ARTS AGENCIES GOVERNANCE AND OTHER MATTERS) BILL

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Kaurna—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Southern Suburbs, Minister Assisting the Premier in the Arts) (16:15): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the various acts in relation to the governance of arts agencies; and for other purposes. Read a first time.

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Kaurna—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Southern Suburbs, Minister Assisting the Premier in the Arts) (16:15): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

South Australia's arts companies and cultural institutions make an immeasurable contribution to our State's culture, heritage and identity. In many respects these organisations lead the nation, and indeed the world, in their collections, research and artistic endeavours.

South Australia is unique in establishing so many of its major arts bodies as statutory authorities, providing them with both status and protection as key government entities. Each organisation has its own governing Act, is staffed by public sector employees and has a board or trust offering a range of expertise.

The operational structure of the organisations is tailored to the distinct needs of each. However, while the overarching governance model is the same, there is significant variation between the Acts.

The Premier asked Arts SA to review the arts portfolio statutes to determine whether there was scope for, and benefit in, standardising sections of the Acts. The review concluded that the variation between Acts was not surprising given that they were created at different times over a sixty year period. Further the review identified that there was an opportunity to introduce a number of consistent and contemporary arrangements across the portfolio to address out of date drafting and governance arrangements.

The examination of the Acts included research of governance models used interstate and overseas and referenced current legislation in South Australia. The expertise of Crown Solicitor's Office and Parliamentary Counsel was also drawn upon. The result was an initial list of fifty areas for potential change within the Acts. Consultation with the arts boards and other key stakeholders led to some additions and refinements to the proposed changes.

The object of the Statutes Amendment (Arts Agencies Governance and Other Matters) Bill 2010 is to introduce a suite of governance arrangements for the major arts bodies. The Bill does not change the operations or objectives of the organisations. Rather it seeks to streamline their relationship with government and ensure a consistent, clear set of powers and functions for each board or trust.

The Acts included in the Bill are:

- Adelaide Festival Centre Trust Act 1971
- Adelaide Festival Corporation Act 1998
- Art Gallery Act 1939
- Carrick Hill Trust Act 1985
- South Australian Country Arts Trust Act 1992
- History Trust of South Australia Act 1981
- South Australian Film Corporation Act 1972
- South Australian Museum Act 1976
- Libraries Act 1982
- State Opera of South Australia Act 1976
- State Theatre Company of South Australia Act 1972

The Bill introduces consistent provisions for board structure, such as board size and the appointment and removal of members. A board appointment term not exceeding three years and limited to a nine year maximum will be prescribed. A gender balance provision of a minimum of two men and two women is also introduced for all of the boards.

Some boards currently have two or three positions reserved for representative groups such as subscribers and employees. This can limit the ability to achieve the ideal mix of expertise on each board. The boards have identified alternate ways for some stakeholder groups to be represented so that a number of representative positions are no longer needed. Key representative positions, such as the Local Government members on the Libraries Board, are to be retained.

Board proceedings are also to have common guidelines addressing quorum size, meeting procedures, conferencing, delegations and sub-committees, consistent with 21st century business practice. In addition the Bill introduces a requirement for each board to meet at least six times per year.

The revised board powers section has been drawn from several existing Acts, providing each of the agencies with powers relevant to their activities in today's environment. The powers section is tailored where required. For example, all are given power to charge admission or entry but Art Gallery of South Australia, South Australian Museum and State Library of South Australia can only charge for special events, thereby preserving free access to their permanent collections. Clauses which provide greater protection for official titles and logos have also been introduced.

In order to streamline government monitoring of the arts organisations, consistent requirements relating to budgets, annual reporting and Ministerial control are included. These provisions are aimed at maintaining an appropriate balance between the Government's responsibility to safeguard its investment in the organisations and each Board's ability to manage its operations. All of the Acts will have provisions dealing with authorised officers and their powers. For six of the Acts, this was simply a process of elevating to the level of the Acts provisions currently contained in regulations under those Acts. In other cases the powers are new and will be available to the Boards if required.

The regulation making powers under each Act have been reviewed and made consistent across the board. This was also done with a view to underpinning the regulations under those Acts with robust regulation making powers.

The Bill also contains some changes to individual powers. For example, the clause in the South Australian Film Corporation Act relating to automatic production rights and copyright for all South Australian Government films is to be deleted. This power achieved its 1970s objective of giving the Film Corporation the ability to control much of the departmental film production in the State but, in today's world of digital technology, such a prescriptive provision is no longer feasible or indeed necessary.

In opening up these Acts for changes the opportunity for a statute law revision and a general 'freshen up' was created. The Bill incorporates a revision of style and language, including use of gender neutral terms, updating of penalties and the removal of sections considered redundant.

In summary the Bill introduces consistent and contemporary governance arrangements, clarifies the obligations and powers of the boards and streamlines administration.

I commend the Bill to Members.

Explanation of Clauses

General remarks

This Bill seeks to achieve consistency in governance arrangements and other matters across the various arts agencies. The Acts that have been amended in this Bill are:

- Adelaide Festival Centre Trust Act 1971
- Adelaide Festival Corporation Act 1998
- Art Gallery Act 1939
- Carrick Hill Trust Act 1985
- History Trust of South Australia Act 1981
- Libraries Act 1982
- South Australian Country Arts Trust Act 1992
- South Australian Film Corporation Act 1972
- South Australian Museum Act 1976
- State Opera of South Australia Act 1976
- State Theatre Company of South Australia Act 1972.

The following standard provisions have been incorporated into all of the above Acts. These provisions are substantially the same in each Act, varying only in minor ways as necessary to reflect differences between the Boards and their specific functions. The standard provisions are as follows:

- The Board—this Part deals with governance provisions relating to the Board (also referred to as 'Trust', 'Corporation' or 'Company' depending on the particular Act) and contains the following clauses:
 - Establishment or continuation of the Board—each Board is either established or continued.
 - Composition of Board—each Board will have a maximum of 8 members including at least 2 women and 2 men.
 - Conditions of membership—Board appointments will be for renewable terms of up to 3 years with a 9 consecutive year maximum.
 - Proceedings—the Board must meet at least 6 times in each year.
 - Validity of acts and proceedings—acts and proceedings of the Board will be valid despite any vacancy in membership or a defect in a member's appointment.
 - Ministerial direction and control—each Board will be subject to the general direction and control of the Minister, however, the independence of the Board is retained in matters of artistic, scientific, historical nature or content (as may be relevant to each particular Board) of objects, works, collections, performances and other events or activities and in other matters.
 - Committees—committees may be established by the Board.
 - Delegation—the Board may delegate powers or functions—such delegations must be by instrument in writing.
 - Conflict of interest under Public Sector (Honesty and Accountability) Act—Board members will be exempted from certain conflict of interest provisions under the Public Sector (Honesty and Accountability) Act 1995.

- Common seal of the Board and execution of documents—this is a standard provision regarding formalities of execution of documents by the Board.
- Functions—the functions of the Board are set out.
- Powers—the existing powers of the Board are incorporated into a comprehensive list of powers of a natural person that the Board may exercise.
- Staffing arrangements—staffing arrangements are preserved.
- Annual budget—the Board must prepare an annual budget for approval by the Minister.
- Accounts and audit—accounting requirements are set out including instructions and scrutiny by the Treasurer and the Auditor General.
- Annual report—an annual report must be forwarded to the Minister before 30 September in each year.
- Authorised officers—this Part elevates to the level of the Act, provisions currently dealt with by regulation for 6 of the 11 arts agencies. For the 5 agencies that currently do not have these powers, the powers will be available should they be required. The Part provides for:
 - Appointment of authorised officers—this clause deals with the appointment of authorised officers and declares that all police officers are authorised officers for the purposes of the Act.
 - Powers of authorised officers—the powers of authorised officers include the power to remove or exclude persons from premises of the Board or to seize objects that an authorised officer reasonably suspects may be used to contravene the Act (or regulations under the Act).
 - Hindering etc authorised officers—this will be an offence attracting a penalty of up to \$2,500. Some of the ways in which a person might hinder an authorised officer include obstructing an authorised officer, or failing to comply with a requirement or direction of an authorised officer.
- Official insignia—this Part deals with matters relating to official insignia of the Board including:
 - Interpretation—official insignia is defined, as are the circumstances in which goods will be taken to be marked with official insignia.
 - Official titles and logos—official titles under which the Board may conduct its operations are declared and powers are included to declare other official titles and logos.
 - Unlawful use of official insignia—official insignia are vested in the Board. It is an offence attracting a maximum penalty of \$20,000 to use official insignia without the authorisation of the Board.
 - Seizure etc of goods marked with official insignia—authorised officers may seize goods marked with official insignia reasonably suspected to be unauthorised.
- Miscellaneous—this Part includes miscellaneous provisions as follows:
 - Gifts etc—each Board may receive and deal with land and gifts of personal property and is exempted from the obligation to pay stamp duty on any such land.
 - Ministerial delegation—functions or powers of the Minister may be delegated under the Act—such delegations must be by instrument in writing.
 - Approvals by the Treasurer—may be specific or general and conditional or unconditional and they may be varied or revoked at any time. (Such approvals and are required before the Board acquires or deals with shares or securities issued by bodies corporate or borrows money or obtains other forms of financial accommodation.)
 - Regulations—the regulation making powers have been bolstered in order to provide a solid footing for the kinds of regulations that may be required under each Act. There will be regulation making powers to—
 - provide for the use, care and protection of objects, works, collections or any other property of, or under the care or control of, the Board; and
 - provide for the admission, exclusion or expulsion of members of the public to or from premises of the Board or a part of those premises; and
 - prohibit disorderly or offensive behaviour on premises of the Board; and
 - prohibit or regulate eating, drinking, smoking or the consumption of unlawful substances on premises of the Board or a part of those premises; and
 - prohibit or regulate any other conduct or activities for the purposes of—
 - (i) maintaining good order, and preventing interference with events or activities conducted, on premises of the Board; and
 - (ii) protecting property under the care or control of the Board; and
 - prohibit or regulate the driving, parking or standing of vehicles on premises of the Board; and

- provide for the approval by the Board or an authorised officer of any act or activity that would otherwise be prohibited under the regulations; and
- prescribe fees for the parking of vehicles on premises of the Board and provide for their payment and recovery; and
- provide that the owner and driver of a vehicle driven, parked or left standing in contravention of the regulations are each guilty of an offence and provide or exclude defences in relation to any such offence; and
- provide for procedure in relation to alleged offences against the regulations dealing with the driving, parking or standing of vehicles; and
- provide for evidence or burden of proof in proceedings for offences against the regulations dealing with the driving, parking or standing of vehicles; and
- provide for the management (including disposal) by, and vesting in, the Board of unclaimed property; and
- prescribe penalties not exceeding \$1,250 for breach of any regulation.

The opportunity has also been taken to make other isolated changes in addition to the standard provisions. Examples of these changes are as follows:

Section 35 of the Libraries Act 1982 has been amended in order to enable the Parliamentary Librarian to exempt the provision of material to the Parliamentary Library and to enable the provision of material to the Parliamentary Librarian and the Board in electronic form in restricted circumstances.

The Bill removes powers in section 11(a) and (aa) of the South Australian Film Corporation Act 1972 that currently entitle the Corporation to sole and exclusive right to produce, or arrange for the production of, film for or on behalf of the government and to ownership of all rights in any film made for or on behalf of the government. These changes reflect a more flexible approach to production and ownership since the early days of the Corporation.

Another noteworthy change in several of the Acts is the removal of sections that fix particular persons to positions, for example 'Secretary to the Board' (under the State Opera of South Australia Act 1976 and State Theatre Company of South Australia Act 1972), 'Secretary to the Trust' Adelaide Festival Centre Trust Act 1971 and 'Director' (under the Art Gallery Act 1939 and South Australian Museum Act 1976). Removing the references to positions provides Boards with greater flexibility in relation to appointments and functions of appointees.

Schedule 1, Parts 1 to 11 of the Bill includes statute law revision amendments to the Acts, updating archaic language and obsolete references.

Schedule 1, Part 12 of the Bill includes transitional provisions that—

- (a) will enable current members of Boards to continue in office for the balance of their terms, thus enabling a smooth transition to the new model; and
- (b) provide for names, titles and logos declared under the Adelaide Festival Corporation Act 1998 to continue as if declared under the new provisions; and
- (c) provide for the appointment of authorised officers or persons under the respective regulations to continue as if appointed under the new provisions.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Griffiths.

RAILWAYS (OPERATIONS AND ACCESS) (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 26 May 2010.)

Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder) (16:16): I confirm that I am the lead speaker for the opposition for this bill. Given that there is a consensus, there will be no need to go into committee. It is possible that, depending upon their availability, other members may choose to speak, most likely the member for Schubert, who, no doubt, will talk passionately about the Barossa rail. I recognise that this bill was introduced on 26 May. A briefing was provided to me on 1 June, and I am thankful to Mr Pat Gerace from the minister's officer and the DTEI staff members who assisted with that briefing.

I must admit that, when I read the second reading contribution of the minister, it became obvious to me that this is something we would accept quite quickly. When we sat down for the briefing, I wondered why we were talking, because we had very few questions to pose. It is only a matter of acknowledging that this bill ensures that there is an opportunity for investment to occur and for surety on rail costs to be in place.

My understanding of the bill is that it relates to major intrastate rail only and therefore predominantly would be related to grain transport. It certainly does not affect ARTC (Australian Rail

Track Corporation) lines or, indeed, areas which indentures cover. It stems from February 2006 COAG discussions about the need to review this. ESCOSA and the Emergency Services Commission were involved in the review. I am pleased to recognise that consultation was quite extensive with the industry.

I put on the record that the inquiry by ESCOSA into the access regime commenced in February 2009. They received submissions to the paper from ABB Grain, Asciano, Genesee & Wyoming Australia, Gypsum Resources Australia, Penrice Soda Products and Western Plains Resources. Following the consideration of these submissions, ESCOSA released its draft inquiry report to which four additional submissions were made by ABB Grain, Asciano, Genesee & Wyoming Australia and Penrice Soda Products.

At a meeting with some rail operators after this bill was introduced, I met with Genesee & Wyoming. I asked their position on the bill. They certainly indicated their support for it. Consequently, the paper put to the joint party of the opposition recommend that it be supported without amendment. I recognise that rail in Australia has a rather interesting history. From what I am advised, the genesis of the different gauges results from whether it was supplied by English companies, Irish companies or Scottish companies. I have also been told by a person who is somewhat fascinated with rail that, in the history of Australia, there have been some 24 different gauges, which I find amazing.

The Hon. P.F. Conlon interjecting:

Mr GRIFFITHS: The minister indicates that he wants to get rid of some infrastructure, I think, that relates to this.

The Hon. P.F. Conlon interjecting:

Mr GRIFFITHS: Is it?

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: Peterborough.

Mr GRIFFITHS: Peterborough, at Steamtown, yes—the roundhouse.

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: It's the biggest in the southern hemisphere.

Mr GRIFFITHS: Yes. The minister refers to the roundhouse building at Peterborough which is part of the Steamtown operations. I worked at Peterborough for two years so I have been to that facility. I recognise the good people there who still try to promote the rail history of that community, too. Sadly, they are no longer able to operate on the rails.

This bill relates, as I understand it, though, more to grain transport, and that is an important issue for this state. Certainly, many of the producers of fine grain who export and derive an income for themselves and, importantly the state and the nation, rely on the fact that there is an efficient method of getting their product to the ports where it can be loaded and sold to overseas countries. So, having this network in place, with a level of charges that provides opportunities for it to be used as a transport option instead of it having to be put on truck and therefore adding to the freight movements on our road network, is important.

We support the bill. Other people, no doubt, will speak on this. I can confirm that it is a relatively simple one, and I hope it has swift passage through the house.

Mr VENNING (Schubert) (16:21): Yet again, the member for Goyder got it right and, yes, I certainly would appreciate having an input into this. Anything to do with railways, in all of my time here, has certainly attracted my attention, because I am a very avid supporter of rail. It is certainly sad to see all the rail corridors we still have around the state that are not being used. I can see a time when we are going to see a lot more activity on our rails, as we do with our trams.

Whoever would have believed that in 1955—and I can remember that—we were pulling up the tram lines, and who would have believed that here we are putting them back again? I think the same thing can be said of our rail system in South Australia. The system is there and we have an excellent network remaining, some of them not used, that we should be allowing access to.

I am pleased that this bill, and we certainly support it, raises the matter in relation to national standards, right across. It has been a problem we have had right through the whole country where, crossing the border, we have had different standards and rules, and different regulations apply. Now, through this, we will have a consistent national system of economic regulation for nationally significant infrastructure (including our rail) to implement efficiencies, based on the recommendations following an inquiry conducted by our own Essential Services

Commission of South Australia (ESCOSA). Most of the lines we are discussing here are those used primarily to transport grain—and, of course, today, that is by ABB, now Viterra. Again, I declare an interest as a grower, and also my brother is a director of Viterra.

The member for Goyder also mentioned that Penrice holdings operates on one of these rail services. Every day there is a train up and back to the Barossa, and it goes right past my office. I could walk out the back and catch the train, if there was a seat on it for me. Again, I will keep batting away.

I had lunch on Friday with Mr John Geber, who now owns the wine train outright. I note the Minister for Transport is here, and I am pleased that he is. Can I say this, and I am not being mischievous or political: I thank the minister for receiving some students from the Barossa the other day. I am very pleased that he found the time to listen to them. Can I say that I had nothing to do with anything they did or said, but apparently you answered their questions very well, and the mayor reported to me that you were a perfect gentleman; so, thank you very much.

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: They didn't get a yes but they got a lot of well-explained noes.

Mr VENNING: Irrespective, I have not seen the result of that, but I will, I have no doubt. I did not send them, honestly, but I am pleased that you gave them time and heard what they had to say.

In relation to the regulations across the state, I can't help but again raise with the minister Mr Geber's strong endeavour to run again the wine train. I have a sniff in the air that something may be happening, minister. Can I smell it? Something may be happening. I cannot understand what the problem is, because—

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: I've got lots of trains and that's not one of them.

Mr VENNING: He owns the train. If he is to run the train, I believe the only problem is guaranteed access and then, of course, public liability if something happens and he runs into something.

The Hon. J.J. Snelling interjecting:

Mr VENNING: Well, it is, but I'm sure most of this could be overcome if we had a desire to do this. Minister Laidlaw did. Remember? We ran this train. It was running successfully and profitably until 11 September, SARS, and all the rest of it, and it was a great success. I know I am batting hard for the Barossa hospital, but I am also batting hard for this rail. This is an easy one, because the railway is already there. If they can run a 30,000 tonne stone train twice a day, surely they can run a rail car. They cannot run a rail car? I cannot believe that.

Again, I have not given up. I keep pushing the case. I am sure that the minister will agree. I am sure that he will be on the first train, because he is also a person who knows good wine from poor wine, and this is the wine train. I am sure the minister will put the train back on the rail and be on the first train. It will be a great ceremonial occasion, and the minister would not miss it for quids.

The Hon. P.F. Conlon interjecting:

Mr VENNING: Well, it does happen. The reforms aim to reduce the regulatory uncertainty and compliant costs for the owners, users and investors—most importantly, the investors, because we need people to invest in our rail infrastructure, we certainly do. There is no reason why our rail system cannot be world-efficient. The main lines have all been recently upgraded, apart from the one up through Broken Hill, which does not need a lot of work on it; but the main line, particularly the Adelaide, Port Pirie, Port Augusta, Whyalla line, which is in excellent condition for taking heavy freight. Why we cannot run a passenger rail car to the Iron Triangle, I do not know.

The minister has before him a report from the ERD committee. It is a fantastic report, Madam Deputy Speaker. Can I recommend it to you? Three professors from the Adelaide University were prominent in putting it together. We are waiting for a response from the minister. I hope he is going to respond very shortly, because the matter was raised before the election. We said that we would wait 12 weeks after the election, and that time has well and truly gone. Minister, I hope you will respond to this report—he is not listening—because it has some very good stuff in it.

This report talks about how we subsidise passenger rail in the city of Adelaide. I cannot remember the figure exactly, but it is fairly high. It is about \$170 to \$180 per travelling passenger in the city, yet, in the country the minister will not run trains because they will not make a profit. I have to say that is rather hypocritical, because you cannot have one rule for one half of society and

something different for the other half. The minister is definitely not listening, but I hope he will respond to that report—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I can actually hear him, and he is talking about trains, if that is any consolation to you.

Mr VENNING: Is he? Okay.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Yes.

Mr VENNING: He is talking about trains?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Yes.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr VENNING: No, I'm not finished.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: No, he genuinely is chatting about trains. I can hear him.

Mr VENNING: I was just saying, minister, you have before you a report from the ERD committee, which is awaiting your response. It is a very good report, and I know that you will climb all over it.

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: But it doesn't have anything to do with this.

Mr VENNING: No, it's about railways. It is railway options; it's railways—trains. I will await that report with a lot of enthusiasm. Can I commend Penrice. They have been through a bit of a rough spin lately with the quarry. That is all getting fixed and it is now fully transparent. They are fixing the problem in relation to the quarry in the Barossa Valley. They run the stone train every day, and they do it very well. They now, I understand, are cooperating, minister, with any operator that wishes to run on that line, because they do hold the lease on the line, through ESCOSA. This is what this bill is all about. They are happy to meet third-party people and cooperate. They have not in the past, because they only run the one train, so their timetable would not be full enough to allow any other train to run. So, we are making progress here.

I know the minister can be positive. I am optimistic—nothing is impossible—that we will eventually see some light at the end of the tunnel. I commend this bill to the house. I also note the access roads should be extended to certain existing railway infrastructure, particularly to accommodate future mining developments. Some of these rails are still there; some are empty corridors. I believe that, should a company wish to access rail for their produce, they should be able to do that.

I know that the Burra line is still there, and I know that there is some interest. One company has expressed interest in looking at Burra again, and I really do hope that it does not get near the heritage area. The company looking is Phoenix Mining. So, you never know what can happen in relation to these things, and I just hope that all these things can be pulled together. Talking about ABB, I also note that today is the last day of our long-vaunted Barley Marketing Act. I understand it falls off the *Notice Paper* tonight; automatically, it is gone. That is just a bit of history I thought I would give on that one.

Again, I commend this bill and commend Genesee & Wyoming and all those people who run rail services in this country. Anyone wanting to run a rail service ought to be encouraged to do so, particularly on the West Coast, where we have a narrow gauge system. There is a great opportunity for someone to get over there and operate a rail system. I am sure the government—even this minister—would be there and say okay, and would, hopefully, give them all the same rights. I still live in hope that we see the return of a passenger rail system for our regional people, certainly to Port Pirie, because I hope that one day, before I finish in this place, I can do as my father did before me and catch the train to parliament.

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (16:31): I too rise to speak to the Railways (Operations and Access) (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill 2010. I note the comments from the member for Goyder acknowledging that we had 24 gauges of rail, which was just ridiculous. Just look at the three most common gauges: narrow, standard and broad gauge. It became evident many years ago that that was two too many gauges in that instance.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr PEDERICK: We need one gauge; absolutely. It was interesting to note that the Melbourne to Adelaide line used to be a broad gauge line. That was standardised with the

Melbourne to Adelaide rail standardisation, or the MARS scheme, which took place in the early nineties. I happened to be a contractor on that scheme, and it was excellent work.

Mr Venning: Conflict of interest!

Mr PEDERICK: No; I acknowledge that it was a nice bit of work to pick up and add on to a bit of farm income. It was very interesting work, actually. I may digress, but we had a machine to undo the clips holding down the line so that they could be picked up and moved further into the concrete sleeper. This was essentially a maintenance machine. There were two of us operating it—a couple of farm lads—and it did not take long for it to blow up. It intrigued me, coming from—

The Hon. P.F. Conlon interjecting:

Mr PEDERICK: I should say that it broke down, to clarify that for the *Hansard*. It was interesting to note, coming from a self-employed background where if something broke you just fixed it—

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: With fencing wire.

Mr PEDERICK: Probably with fencing wire, in response to the Minister for Transport. That has been done in more cases than one, to get something going with a bit of No. 8 fencing wire, I can assure you. What happened was that if the machine broke down you just jumped off and the union-staffed repair van was just up the track a bit. You sat down and they came up and fixed it. If you were energetic you could have used the hand tools, which we did for a while, but—

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: Did you have one of these things?

Mr PEDERICK: No; I did not have one of those little trolleys. I cannot remember now what they were called.

Mr Venning: Kalamazoo.

Mr PEDERICK: A kalamazoo; I did not operate one of those. The little machine we had was, I think, powered by a Honda motor and went steadily along the track. I do commend the guys who worked on that project for the manual labour involved. The steel line was pulled up in midair, and there was a lot of bending down, turning things around, shifting rubber matting, etc. It was backbreaking work. Thankfully they kept me on the unclipping machine for most of it, because it was very hard for a big bloke like me bending down to sleeper level. But I digress.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr PEDERICK: Maybe.

Mr Venning: You should try it now; it might do you good.

Mr PEDERICK: No, my back would still ache. It just goes to show the problem when you have different gauges in a rail system. We are steadily—although it is going to be a long time yet—getting things back to perhaps a standard gauge all over the state. I note the narrow gauge line on the far West Coast. They had a big harvest last year and Viterra, formerly ABB Grain, had a lot of grain to handle over there, as in other parts of the state. Obviously, there are speed limitations with that line, but it is a line that I believe was put in in a hurry—that year's secondhand rail—and I guess the narrow gauge was the cheapest option. Rail is certainly something that will need to be upgraded over time to keep up with the growing demands, especially with more people accessing the use of it.

I note that the intention of this bill is to provide a consistent national system of economic regulation for nationally significant infrastructure, including the railway, obviously, and to implement efficiencies into the act, with these efficiencies based on recommendations, following an inquiry conducted by the Essential Services Commission of South Australia.

The ESCOSA inquiry into the access regime commenced in February 2009 with the release of an issues paper for public consultation. ESCOSA received submissions from ABB Grain, Asciano, Genesee & Wyoming Australia, Gypsum Resources Australia, Penrice Soda Products and Western Plains Resources.

Genesee & Wyoming Australia expressed concerns within its submission, highlighting that the issue of return on investment needed to be addressed in relation to economic efficiency. Penrice Soda Products highlighted the need for increased transparency in the form in which price information is being provided by the access provider to access seekers.

Just briefly, regarding Genesee & Wyoming, it operates lines throughout the Hammond electorate. In 2006, with the centenary of rail through the Mallee, the Pinnaroo line, it was very good of Genesee & Wyoming to get on board and run a special train out to Pinnaroo, and then pull up at all the stops heading back to Tailem Bend so that every rail siding had their celebration with the communities that have relied on that rail for 100 years. Genesee & Wyoming made a major contribution to the Mallee celebrating the centenary of rail in the region.

I note also, under mining, that ESCOSA expressed in the draft inquiry report that the access regime should be reviewed to ensure it is flexible and robust enough to respond to increased mining activities. It was pleasing to see that for quite a while Australian Zircon was utilising the Tailem Bend to Loxton line, with the mine being situated at Mindarie, on the edge—with the redistribution—of Hammond and Chaffey, but firmly in Hammond when the mine opened up. It was good to see them using containers to shift the Zircon sands. It is a bit of a pity that mine is in mothballs at the moment, but let us hope that it can get active again soon and promote more employment in the Mallee as time goes on.

We need access to rail by all stakeholders. I note, as the member for Schubert noted, Viterra, who has taken over ABB Grain, and that it is so much better that they are utilising rail as much as possible. It keeps trucks off roads. Having points like Tailem Bend in my electorate, where if it is made advantageous for the growers to deliver there to a strategic point, it is better to deliver grain there, instead of having all the semi-trailers and B-doubles heading into Adelaide, down Portrush Road and around to the Port.

I have done that trip a few times in a semi and it is fairly daunting, especially if you try to come down the hills one gear too high. You soon realise that it is not worth it, with smoking brakes. There is nothing surer than that you need to be coming down a hill in the same gear as if you had to climb it. I digress once again, but I support the bill and hope for its speedy passage through the house.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (16:40): I was called away for a few unexpected meetings, so I am not quite as organised as I would like to be, but I do still greatly appreciate the opportunity to say a few words in support of this bill.

From my perspective, representing the electorate of Stuart, this is a very important matter. Peterborough, Terowie and Port Augusta, which really are the heart of Stuart, have a very proud rail history and have benefitted from, and also suffered from, efficiencies over the last couple of decades, but certainly with regard to industry, state and national benefits, more broadly, efficiency in this industry is what we have to seek.

This bill is about quite a few things, but from my perspective it is essentially about improved efficiency in the intrastate rail network. Again, from the perspective of Stuart, that largely interlocks with grain transport. That is probably the most important issue for Stuart and many of the other country electorates represented by people on this side of the house. That efficiency is critical, because in terms of the supply chain for grain from the farm to the consumer, we must keep in mind that most grain is actually exported. I think about 70 per cent of the grain that South Australian farmers produce goes overseas, into very competitive markets, working on a world price, so efficiency is very important. The supply chain is essentially from the farm by truck to a local terminal on the railway line, then by rail to a seaboard port, and then typically overseas from there. All three of those major steps (road, rail and sea) need to be as efficient as they possibly can be to support our grain industry, which is so important to us.

Approximately 20 to 25 per cent of the state's current food revenue comes from grain in South Australia. South Australia is responsible for approximately 20 per cent of Australia's total grain production, so this is important from a local, state and national perspective. As I said, approximately 70 per cent of all grain produced goes overseas. As well as the fact that it goes overseas into these really competitive international markets that are supplying at a world price, there is the fact that you have to overlay seasonal variabilities with regard to production.

So farmers are out there all over South Australia doing the very best that they can to produce incredibly high-quality grain in difficult seasons and in good seasons, and then trying to match them up with bad prices and poor prices. These are all things that are completely out of our control, but the efficiency of our transport logistics is certainly within our control, so I am very pleased that this amendment goes to trying to improve the intrastate rail component that is essentially taking it from many grain depots, grain silos, all through country South Australia, and usually to seaboard ports. So it really does need to be as efficient as possible.

That rail link is particularly important, because the cost of fuel on rail is around about half the cost of road. Another important thing is that road freight all across Australia over the next 10 to 15 years is predicted to double, so anything that we can do to use this more efficient rail link and to make the existing rail link more efficient is going to be good for our state and also for our farmers who are trying to supply grain to the world market.

This market, certainly from the state's perspective, is about five to seven million tonnes a year, again, depending on seasonal variations. That represents about two to three billion dollars of revenue for our state. We cannot do too much to affect that—seasons impact that; farmers are already being as efficient as they possibly can be all throughout country South Australia—but if we can make this an efficient system to get this grain to these world markets then that can only help our industry, our farmers and our state.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Elder—Minister for Transport, Minister for Infrastructure, Minister for Energy) (16:45): I thank the members of the opposition for their contributions. One of the great pleasures of being the Minister for Transport is bringing a rail bill to the parliament, because not only is rail important but it does hold a rather peculiar fascination for many people. I have to say, I appreciate the contributions made. I was a little disappointed that the member for Hammond occasionally touched on matters germane to the bill. I preferred much more the free-wheeling style that was going on—I say that in the best of good humour.

It is an opportunity to talk about rail when a bill is brought here, and it is vitally important in many electorates and plays a huge part in our history, as the lead speaker for the opposition pointed out, with I think the largest turntable in the Southern Hemisphere at Peterborough. Peterborough used to be the capital of rail in Australia and it does have a marvellous history. I thank people for their contributions and I look forward to the speedy progress of the bill.

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

ADJOURNMENT DEBATE

SPEED LIMITS

Mr VENNING (Schubert) (16:48): I will use the 10 minutes I have in the adjournment debate to fill out the government's time to say that it is short-changing the people of South Australia. I rise to speak about a very serious issue: the speed limit of 100 kilometres past St Jakobi Lyndoch Lutheran School, located between Lyndoch and Williamstown on the Lyndoch Valley Road. This is a very successful and popular school, with an increasing student enrolment. There is a major building work program underway right now, I presume by the federal government's Building Education Revolution (BER) scheme, so it does attract my attention very much. Yesterday we opened a similar facility at Tanunda Lutheran Primary School, and Senator Dana Wortley and the member for Light, Mr Piccolo, representing the minister were there.

In relation to this school, I have a lot of support for it. This matter was first brought to my attention in August last year by the principal, who understandably had serious safety concerns about having such a high speed limit past their school. A childcare centre is also located next to the school, so there are often a lot of toddlers, preschool and primary school-aged children in that vicinity. I wrote the Minister for Road Safety about the issue and received a response in October last year which stated:

The Department of Transport, Energy and Infrastructure (DTEI) has advised me that due to the rural nature of Lyndoch Valley Road between Lyndoch and Williamstown the 100km/h general rural speed limit applies.

DTEI considers that the site is operating satisfactorily and the introduction of a pedestrian actuated (push button) crossing and a lower speed limit during school hours is not supported at this time.

I have since been contacted by a number of parents of children who attend the school, and they remain concerned about the safety implications of having a 100 km/h speed zone on the road directly in front of the school, despite the minister's response inferring that the high speed limit is not a problem.

I have visited the school, some time ago, and last week I stopped my car and sat there for a quarter of an hour or so. I parked my car and watched the traffic zooming past when the children were coming out of school at half past 3, quarter to 4, and it is dangerous. People were playing Russian roulette with their children, trying to get them across the road to where their cars were parked. These parents have now taken the initiative of contacting landholders in the area to see whether they would permit signs being erected on their property urging motorists to slow down. The

response they have received has been positive and the police have given their approval, providing the signs are different from council and government signs.

The situation would not occur in other states or territories. In New South Wales a 40 km/h speed zone operates at all school sites on gazetted school days. In Victoria the school speed limit applies outside every school. Some schools have a fixed limit of 40 km/h and time-based limits are also used, reducing higher limited roads to either 40 km/h or 60 km/h. Queensland has varying speed limits in school zones (based on the speed limit in place) which are implemented in both the mornings and afternoons when children are likely to be in the vicinity. In Western Australia it is 40 km/h on school days between 7.30am to 9am and 2.30pm to 4.30pm—and that sounds like a good idea. In Tasmania a 40 km/h limit is in place in all school zones. In the ACT a 40 km/h speed limit applies in designated streets in school zones. In the Northern Territory 40 km/h school zone speed limits are in force from 7am to 5pm on school days.

If this school was located on a 100 kilometre road in any other state or territory a reduced speed limit would apply. In most states it would be 40 km/h, in Victoria it would be either 40 km/h or 60 km/h and in Queensland it would reduce to either 60 km/h or 80 km/h, depending on the amount of pedestrian activity. I cannot see any reason why we cannot put time limits on this to activate the lights during school hours (so people can slow down to 60 km/h) and when they are switched off revert back to the old speed limit. I have no problem at all with that. Why can't we do it? Clearly, we are lagging behind every other state and territory in relation to the importance we place on keeping our children safe when travelling to and from school.

I believe that the current situation at St Jakobi is an accident waiting to happen. I do not want to put it on the record and then have to come back and say, 'I told you so.' That would be the saddest thing. Will it take a fatal accident involving a child for the Rann Labor government to alter the speed limit? It seems fairly basic to me. The school has been trying for many years without success to have the speed limit reduced. I urge the Rann government and the department to reassess their position and reduce the speed limit in this case before a child is seriously injured or even worse. I will be contacting the minister again to reiterate my request and that of the school community to reduce the current 100 km/h speed limit past St Jakobi Lutheran School.

I want to change the subject. I note today is the last day of the South Australian Barley Marketing Act. I believe it is a sad day because it has served us very well in South Australia. I know that several members here would understand why the Barley Marketing Act was put in place. This came after the old wheat stabilisation—and the member for Mount Gambier would remember it. These issues were put in place to protect farmers against scurrilous traders who have a lot more information than they do. Well, the wheat stabilisation plan enabled us to get a realistic price across Australia. It put a floor in the market and then we went on to the Barley Marketing Act here in South Australia because we grow more barley than any other state.

It has worked very well, but it falls off the *Notice Paper* today because the Barley Marketing Act had a ceiling in it of 30 June—which is today. Tomorrow we do not have a Barley Marketing Act. We had it for many years—probably 30 years—and it has served us extremely well. The old Australian Barley Board and people such as Herb Petras, who the member for Hammond would know well, are legends. These guys are great farm leaders who have served us extremely well and who have given us orderly marketing. One of the reasons our farms have done so well and are in a position to take on pretty tough times now is that, in the past, and through the boards, such as the ABB and others operating under the Barley Marketing Act, they were able to secure a reasonable future.

I am very sad to see this go. What has happened with this Barley Marketing Act—and not everyone would agree—is that we also had the single desk for grain sales. The members in here all knew. None of the members in the chamber at the moment were here at the time except the Hon. Steph Key. I fought hard. Myself and five members on this side of the house fought hard to keep the single desk, in other words, orderly marketing for grain growers and orderly marketing for the industry. I am pretty upset to see that gone. That has gone, too. We really do have a fully deregulated system, and now we see the results. It has taken us one year to see the results of what we have done.

We have gone back to the old days. The members here are not old enough to remember the times when our fathers were just price takers against traders who knew more than they did, and they would keep driving the price down. Again, I declare my interest as a barley and wheat grower. Also, my brother happens to be a director of Viterra. I find that a difficult conflict for me to handle

because it does somewhat gag me. You have no control over what a member of your family does. He got that job purely on the amalgamation of Viterra and ABB.

I am very concerned that our system in South Australia is still three quarters full. We look like having another bumper harvest, and our system is going to be three quarters full. All I can say, as I have told my sons, is: 'Get out and buy some silos and buy them quick.'

Mr Pederick: There are plenty out there, the silo makers are saying.

Mr VENNING: Well, I pay credit to Ahrens Ltd who make the best silos. I will give them a commercial plug because they have donated a silo to every country football club in the state. What a fantastic—

Mr Pederick: And some in Victoria—120.

Mr VENNING: They have donated 120 of them to every football club and some even in Victoria. These things would be valued between \$5,000 and \$6,000 each.

Mr Pederick: It would be \$6,000 plus.

Mr VENNING: They are \$6,000. It is a great product. I will try to buy at least one of them because I think it is a great gesture by Ahrens, particularly Bob, the owner, and Stefan, the son and manager. I say, 'Well done, you two. You're certainly doing a great thing for country sport and for farmers in general.' All I can say to the farmers is that they have got to get out there and buy some storage, because, as a result of what we have done, the system is still full of grain. Viterra, I think, is trying to drive the price down a notch. It is active enough in the marketplace and we now see this impasse. Ships are coming and they are not being loaded here, they are going to Western Australia.

There are huge penalties to be paid for these ships coming and not being filled, so someone is paying these bills, too. We have got these inefficiencies because we have deregulated. I know that the member for Hammond and others will not agree with me, but all I can say is that we will see what happens. I am very concerned because we need to clear the grain out of the system so that we have some space to put this bumper crop that, hopefully, we are going to have this year. I am lucky because our farm is in an early district and we can get our grain in. I feel sorry for those farmers on the West Coast in the later districts when the system will be full and the grain is too good to put on the ground.

Time expired.

ROSTREVOR LIONS CLUB

Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (16:58): I am pleased to rise to speak to the adjournment debate this afternoon because it gives me an opportunity to pay tribute to some of the fantastic volunteers in the electorate of Morialta, and I am thinking particularly at the moment of the Rostrevor Lions Club. I had the privilege on Saturday night to attend the hand-over dinner of the Rostrevor Lions Club, and I want to place on the record my appreciation for the work that it does in the Morialta electorate, as well as the broader eastern suburbs community.

In particular, the President of the Rostrevor Lions Club, Trevor Symonds, handed over to himself to continue in the fine tradition of Trevor Symonds being the President of the Rostrevor Lions Club for another year. The Rostrevor Lions Club does a great deal of work in the Morialta electorate in many ways. For a small Lions club it punches well above its weight, and that is a credit to every member of the club.

The Black Hill Challenge is an annual event that has been going for 10 years now, and it has hundreds of entrants every year. Last year there were fewer than 200 entrants. It was down a little, but I still think that was a remarkable result, because we are talking about a running race—running up to the top of Black Hill and down in a day that was about 40° Celsius. The fact that over 100 contestants still competed is a tribute and testimony of the esteem which the Black Hill Challenge is held by athletes in the South Australian community, as well as the community in our area. That event raises thousands of dollars every year for the Royal Flying Doctor Service, an organisation for which I know many members in this place have a great appreciation. They do very fine work and a lot of the work they do is thanks to volunteer fundraising support from groups like the Rostrevor Lions Club.

This fits in pretty well with the efforts of Lions International. It is a service organisation with over one million members worldwide. It is the largest service organisation in the world. I say that,

as a Rotarian, we are a little jealous, but we are only marginally behind in terms of our numbers. I think both organisations do a wonderful job. Blindness is a health issue around the world and Lions does great work in combating it by raising money locally in our area, as well as around the world. In Morialta, we are privileged to have two Lions clubs, the Rostrevor and the Athelstone clubs. I look forward to my involvement with both clubs, as well as the other service organisations across my district.

Many members at the moment will be attending a number of changeover dinners or handover dinners. It is the season for the Lions and Rotary. I am looking forward to going to the Morialta changeover this Friday night and the Burnside Rotary Club changeover at Sunday lunchtime. I regret that I cannot attend the Magill Rotary Club changeover as it conflicts with parliamentary duties. On Monday night, I will be pleased to attend my own Rotary club's changeover dinner, that is, the Campbelltown Rotary Club. I hope to see one of its honorary members who is also a member of this place at that dinner. I hope we have the opportunity to catch up in case we miss out on anything this week.

I will now refer to the work that these organisations do. Kiwanis have a particular focus on youth and the Rotary clubs have done magnificent work towards the eradication of polio around the world over many years, and to extraordinary success, I must say. In relation to polio—I am speaking off the cuff because I did not expect to speak to this adjournment debate—I recall that, some 20 years ago, 360,000 cases of polio were found per year and we have that down to fewer than 1,000 around the world. That is as a result of the work of service organisations such as Rotary and their partners.

However, as far as Lions go, the contribution from a club of 15 people in my electorate is outstanding. People such as Harry Tornow, Harry Nitschke and the secretary of the club, Reg Ayliffe (whom I was sorry to miss on Saturday night) and all club members have been making such a contribution to our community for such a long time and I feel that it is only appropriate to register the contribution they make in an august place such as this. I commend the work of the Rostrevor Lions Club and I look forward to working with them in the years ahead.

WATER METERS

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (17:03): Given that there is an opportunity to speak for six minutes, I do have a very important issue to raise and it is something that I have written to the housing minister about; that is, the issue of water meters in Housing SA homes. This problem has arisen in quite a few places in my electorate where Housing SA homes share meters. So, you might have two dwellings with one water meter. The water supply comes in through one meter and then is diverted to two dwellings. The largest example that I am aware of is where 19 dwellings share one meter. I can understand that there is not always money to spend on all the things that you would like, but I point out the difficulty that that can cause the people living in those homes, both in a financial sense and the use of water.

This problem has arisen quite a few times in the electorate of Stuart. It is a very important thing. I give the simple example of two homes sharing a meter. One home has one person living in it and one home has a very large family, with lots of friends and visitors coming and going and using the water in that house. That is a difficult issue to deal with when the standard practice is to take the total amount of water that goes through that one meter, deduct 30 per cent off each bill (which I think is lovely for those people) and then the balance is split 50-50 between those two dwellings.

It may be the case that there is one person living in one home and not doing any gardening and another very large family living in the other home and using lots of water, including for gardening and perhaps a kiddie pool and that sort of thing, yet they still split the bill 50-50. The most concerning example, which is a very recent one, is that of a lady who lives in Port Augusta in exactly that sort of situation. Her share of the water bill was \$500. That is an enormous impost for a senior lady to bear—for one person living in one dwelling—when, very likely, the other home is using perhaps four, five or six times as much water as she is.

It is a difficult issue when you have up to 19 dwellings sharing one water meter, so the total water bill comes in, a percentage discount is taken off, and whatever is left over is split evenly between 19 homes. There may be examples that I am not aware of where there are even more homes on the one meter. So what I propose is that the government looks not at putting a new meter on every single home because, while that would be tremendous, that may not be affordable at the moment—I am always aware of the need to balance budgets—but, certainly, if perhaps

where there are just two, three or four homes on the one water meter it would be possible for the government to spend the \$200, \$300 or \$400 required to put separate meters in those homes and make things more equitable.

It would be more equitable from the point of view of sharing the bill so that you do not have one lady living by herself getting a \$500 bill. No doubt the other family got a \$500 bill as well but, certainly, there is no way they would have used the same amount of water. It would be equitable with regard to sharing the fair cost of the water and also equitable with regard to the use of water across the state. When people are in a situation where they are sharing the cost of water, unless they are confident that their neighbour sharing the same water meter is also being diligent about conserving water, it is human nature to think that there is no need to be too efficient. That is no good for the state.

We all understand the importance of water and that it is the most valuable resource we have in our state, and we all understand how much pressure we are under as a state to conserve water but, when you are getting a \$500 water bill and you are just using one person's worth of water, it sure takes away your incentive to be economical in your use of water. Also, if you are only going to pay 50 per cent of the water bill regardless of how much you, your large family, friends and visitors use, there is no incentive, based on most people's human nature, to try to conserve water, either.

It needs to be equitable both with regard to sharing the bills fairly and also the need to try to use a sensible amount of water in every home throughout the state. That does not matter whether it is a Housing SA home or a very large, opulent house: everyone has a responsibility to try to reduce their use of water. So I think that, if it was possible to adjust the meters in this way, it would contribute to both those key issues.

At 17:09 the house adjourned until Thursday 1 July at 10:30.