

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Monday 28 April 2003

The **PRESIDENT (Hon. R.R. Roberts)** took the chair at 2.15 p.m. and read prayers.

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

The **PRESIDENT**: I direct that written answers to the following questions, as detailed in the schedule that I now table, be distributed and printed in *Hansard*: Nos 63, 73, 116, 190, 192, 200, 202, 205, 206, 212, 215, 217, 218, 222, 223 and 224.

NORTH HAVEN MARINA

63. The **Hon. T.G. CAMERON**:

1. Who owns the North Haven Marina?
2. Who have been the successive owners since its establishment?
3. (a) How much did the government receive from the sale of the North Haven Marina Channel; and
(b) To which part of the budget were the proceeds allocated?
4. Who, in the Ministry, are full paying members of the Cruising Yacht Club of SA?

The **Hon. P. HOLLOWAY**: The Minister for Government Enterprises has provided the following information:

1. The North Haven Marina is owned by a combination of SA Marinas Pty Ltd, the Cruising Yacht Club of SA Inc and private owners pursuant to a number of strata plans.
2. The current North Haven Marina area was vested into the North Haven Trust in 1979 a statutory authority empowered by the State Government to develop the North Haven Marina. In 1983 the North Haven Trust sold all of the land including the water out to the entrance and the breakwater to Gulf Point Marina Pty Ltd. Excluded from the sale was property (including an area of land and harbor) which was sold to the Cruising Yacht Club. Sales from that time on have been undertaken as part of normal real estate property transactions.
3. (a) The Government received \$6.5 million from the sale of the North Haven Marina, as this included the North Haven Channel it is not possible to provide a separate amount.

(b) Following settlement of the contract of sale the debt owing to the SA Government, Financing Authority was repaid in July 1984.

4. I am advised that there are currently no ministers who are full paying members of the Cruising Yacht Club.

ATTORNEY-GENERAL TRAVEL ALLOWANCE

73. The **Hon. R.I. LUCAS**:

1. Has the Attorney-General, as a member of the House of Assembly, used the parliamentary travel allowance to travel to Sydney and meet with prominent members of the Vietnamese community in the western suburbs of Sydney since 5 March 2002, or prior to that date?

2. If so, what were the names of those prominent members of the Vietnamese community?

3. What was the total cost of any such trip?

The **Hon. T.G. ROBERTS**: The Attorney General has provided the following information:

1. No.
2. Not applicable.
3. Not applicable.

SPEEDING OFFENCES

116. The **Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY**: Can the Minister for Police supply figures on speeding fine revenue collected on the following highways—

1. Dukes Highway—
(a) between Taillem Bend and Bordertown; and
(b) from Bordertown to the Victorian border;
2. Sturt Highway between Gawler and Renmark;
3. Barrier Highway between Kapunda and Broken Hill (South Australian border);
4. Eyre Highway between Port Augusta and Ceduna; and
5. Process Highway between Taillem Bend and Mount Gambier, for the following months: November 2001; December 2001; January 2002; February 2002; March 2002; April 2002; May 2002; June 2002; July 2002; August 2002; September 2002; October 2002; November 2002; December 2002; and January 2003.

The **Hon. P. HOLLOWAY**: The Minister for Police has provided the following information:

The requested data in relation to speed camera detected offences has been extracted from database systems maintained by the South Australia Police and is depicted in the attached spreadsheets. Data related to other means of detection such as laser expiations is not provided. These expiations are issued from hand written notices which do not support statistical extraction of data specific to the highway locations requested.

Speed Camera Offences Expiated During Nov-01 and Jan-03

Highways	Suburb/town	Nov-01		Dec-01		Jan-02		Feb-02		Mar-02		Apr-02		May-02	
		No.	amt \$	No.	amt \$	No.	amt \$	No.	amt \$	No.	amt \$	No.	amt \$	No.	amt \$
Barrier Hwy	Burra	0	0	3	473	20	3,252	27	4,257	4	754	0	0	0	0
	Hallett	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Hanson-Burra	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	1,871
	Manoora	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Olary-Cockburn	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	133
	Oodlawirra	8	1,360	1	133	0	0	1	207	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Saddleworth	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Saddleworth-Riverton	1	207	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Terowie-Oodlawirra	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Whyte Yarcowie	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Dukes Hwy	Bordertown	1	133	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	946	4	606	0	0
	Coomandook	46	8,452	3	733	2	526	0	0	3	547	2	414	0	0
	Coonalpyn	14	2,158	1	133	3	473	1	207	1	133	0	0	0	0
	Culburra	40	7,508	8	1,428	1	129	2	340	57	10,765	12	2,040	4	606
	Keith	55	9,051	4	680	2	266	4	606	18	2,912	3	473	0	0

Speed Camera Offences Expriated During Nov-01 and Jan-03

Highways	Suburb/town	Jun-02		Jul-02		Aug-02		Sep-02		Oct-02		Nov-02		Dec-02		Jan-03	
		No.	amt \$	No.	amt \$	No.	amt \$	No.	amt \$	No.	amt \$	No.	amt \$	No.	amt \$	No.	amt \$
	Olary-Cockburn	0	0	0	0	2	430	4	629	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Oodlawirra	0	0	0	0	3	568	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Saddleworth	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	353	21	3,437	2	276	0	0	0	0
	Saddleworth-Riverton	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Terowie-Oodlawirra	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	632
	Whyte Yarowie	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	138	0	0	1	215	3	491
Dukes Hwy	Bordertown	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	215	5	690	0	0	0	0
	Coomandook	1	319	4	606	4	532	5	916	1	215	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Coonalpyn	7	1,005	11	1,685	7	1,005	8	1,580	18	2,941	1	215	0	0	0	0
	Culburra	1	133	5	1,111	1	133	6	1,059	22	4,322	17	2,912	2	353	1	138
	Keith	0	0	6	1,088	14	2,344	16	2,434	83	14,099	32	5,521	9	1,550	2	276
	Ki Ki	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	276	1	215	0	0	0	0
	Tintinara	3	399	11	1,537	1	133	0	0	55	8,668	12	1,733	1	215	1	215
Eyre Hwy	Ceduna	0	0	1	207	3	473	0	0	0	0	3	414	0	0	0	0
	Ceduna-Penong	0	0	0	0	1	207	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Ceduna-Wirrulla	0	0	0	0	2	414	0	0	0	0	5	844	1	215	0	0
	Iron Knob-Kimba	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Iron Knob-Port Augusta	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	138	7	1,123
	Kimba	2	340	1	133	0	0	1	133	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Minnipa	0	0	1	133	2	340	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Poochera	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Port Augusta	0	0	1	207	13	2,410	13	2,206	3	414	0	0	1	138	0	0
	Wudinna	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	215	0	0	0	0
Princes Hwy	Kingston-Millicent	0	0	1	133	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Meningie	1	133	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	690	0	0	1	215	0	0
	Meningie-Salt Creek	4	754	1	207	0	0	1	319	3	491	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Millicent	15	2,291	2	266	13	2,099	0	0	11	1,749	3	568	1	215	0	0
	Millicent-Mount Gambier	14	2,306	88	14,296	6	1,132	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	133	0	0
	Mount Gambier	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	1,181
	Murray Bridge-Taillem Bend	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34	5,256
	Taillem Bend	1	133	1	133	4	680	1	133	10	1,529	2	353	0	0	39	6,296
Sturt Hwy	Barmera	1	133	1	207	1	133	9	1,550	4	552	19	2,853	12	1,964	0	0
	Barmera-Renmark	0	0	0	0	1	133	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Berri	0	0	4	532	9	1,358	33	5,016	1	138	14	2,009	0	0	1	138
	Berri-Renmark	2	340	0	0	1	133	1	215	3	414	7	1,224	0	0	1	218
	Cobdogla	2	452	2	340	3	547	5	844	6	1,059	6	1,059	0	0	5	782
	Concordia	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Glossop	5	887	0	0	0	0	1	138	1	138	1	215	3	414	1	138
	Monash	5	999	0	0	1	133	2	276	1	138	6	828	3	414	0	0
	Nuriootpa-Daveyston	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	141
	Nuriootpa-Truro	4	606	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	141
	Paringa	35	5,247	24	4,006	12	1,818	19	3,228	19	3,079	37	6,211	28	4,321	5	776
	Renmark	1	207	1	133	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	138	0	0	0	0
	Sheaok Log	20	2,994	1	207	0	0	0	0	3	491	7	1,043	2	422	2	279

Speed Camera Offences Expriated During Nov-01 and Jan-03

Highways	Suburb/town	Jun-02		Jul-02		Aug-02		Sep-02		Oct-02		Nov-02		Dec-02		Jan-03	
		No.	amt \$	No.	amt \$	No.	amt \$	No.	amt \$	No.	amt \$	No.	amt \$	No.	amt \$	No.	amt \$
	Truro	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	353	15	2,224	4	706	1	138
	Truro-Waikerie	1	207	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Waikerie	0	0	0	0	4	680	5	913	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Waikerie-Barmera	35	6,099	11	1,723	1	133	1	133	0	0	12	2,472	29	6,139	1	319
	Yamba	1	207	0	0	0	0	11	1,853	4	887	10	1,792	7	1,301	6	1,202

TRANSPORT SA, PROJECTS

190. **The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW:** What projects has the government initiated and funded this financial year, within the ambit of Transport SA's investing budget, that had not been commenced or approved by the former Liberal government?

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: The Minister for Transport has provided the following information:

The government is committed to its election commitment to improve funding to the priorities of health, education and personal security. The government's current budget has been structured to commence this process, and future budgets will reinforce and further realise the delivery of this commitment.

In relation specifically to transport issues, this government also gave a commitment to improve the safety of the state's road system. The current investment budget for transport has been compiled to increase emphasis toward safety initiatives, while continuing existing ongoing contractual and other Government commitments.

This government has specifically increased spending on road safety issues to include a \$20.0 million package of road safety initiatives, highlighted by the introduction of a State Black Spot Program. This program will match the funding to the commonwealth government Black Spot scheme, and will double the funding allocated to locations of high crash and high fatal or personal injury records.

Other worthy proactive safety programs, such as the overtaking lane program, the shoulder sealing program and the Responsive Road Safety Program (response to infrastructure deficiency issues raised through the road safety program process) will be continued.

In short, this government is committed to lowering the social impact of trauma from road crashes to the individual road users and local communities, and the high economic impact on communities and government from road crashes.

SOCIAL INCLUSION

192. **The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW:** Has any person been appointed, assigned or engaged to assist Transport SA, Passenger Transport, TransAdelaide or the Office of the Chief Executive to develop policies and programs to accommodate the government's 'social inclusion' agenda?

2. If so—

- Who has been appointed?
- To which agency is the person attached?
- What is the cost?

3. (a) What new transport specific social inclusion programs and policies have been developed in 2002-03?

- What is the cost of any such programs and policies?
- Has funding been allocated to implement the new programs and policies in each instance?

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: The Minister for Transport has provided the following information:

1. The Chief Executive of the Department of Transport and Urban Planning (DTUP) has accountabilities to the Ministers he is responsible to, for delivering on the Government's social inclusion objective as it relates to transport and urban planning. Within the office of the Chief Executive, the Manager, Policy has a role to ensure that any contribution by the Department to whole of government initiatives reflect the government's social inclusion agenda. This position is part of the staff establishment from within the office from its inception.

2. See above.

3. (a) The government's social inclusion initiative is directly focussing on a reduction in homelessness, encouraging school

retention and developing a drugs strategy. More broadly, the Government has requested that agencies ensure their activities reflect the Government's emphasis on social inclusion.

The Passenger Transport Board (PTB) is undertaking a range of work that achieves positive social inclusion outcomes, including:

- improving public transport services in metropolitan Adelaide
- Access Cab reforms
- reviewing passenger transport services in the Northern and Southern suburbs
- implementing policies and services in regional South Australia that deliver community based passenger transport improvements.

The PTB is funded to meet the cost of contracts for public transport services in Adelaide, in addition to subsidising a range of passenger transport services throughout the State. These activities are fundamental to social inclusion. Passenger transport provides an affordable transport choice for many South Australians. Effective passenger transport helps ensure that people can participate in their communities.

DTUP maintains an extensive regional road network, which provides access for regional South Australia. Social inclusion now forms part of DTUP's assessment of investment and maintenance priorities.

(b) PTB's Accessible Passenger Services includes funding for the provision of targeted transport assistance to groups with special needs by subsidising taxi travel (South Australian Transport Subsidy Scheme), provision of fully accessible passenger transport and the contract management of Access Cabs. 2002-03 budgeted expenditure for this output is \$9.489 million.

In 2002-03, \$0.527 million has been allocated to implement services and develop integrated passenger transport in the Murray/Mallee area following completion of a consultative process involving councils and community groups.

The cost incurred by DTUP are intended to deliver benefits in the forms of economic development, social inclusion and environmental sustainability. It is not possible to separate and cost these benefits across all of the programs of the agencies.

(c) See above.

ADELAIDE INTERNATIONAL FILM FESTIVAL

200. **The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW:**

1. (a) What is the budget provided in forward estimates for the conduct of the Adelaide International Film Festival?

(b) To which agency has the funding been allocated?

2. Do the Budget Estimates provide for the full estimated cost of staging the event each year to 2005 and beyond?

3. (a) How many films will be shown in each category/event in 2003?

(b) In each instance, what is the number of South Australian productions?

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: The Minister for the Arts has provided the following information:

1. (a) The amount of \$500,000 per annum is currently provided for in forward estimates for the Adelaide International Film Festival.

(b) The funds have been allocated to Arts SA.

2. The event is a biennial event. The next festival after 2003 will be 2005.

3. (a) The film festival comprised a number of strands, including feature films (in-cinema and outdoors), documentaries, animation, short films, videos, music clips and computer games. The large number of feature films, short films, music clips, videos, games, animation films and associated programming over 8 days of the festival makes the exact number of individual films screened difficult to calculate. There were approximately 119 programmed

events in the Adelaide International Film Festival, some of which were groups/clusters of short films.

(b) South Australian film productions taking part in the festival were as follows:

- World premieres (features):
- 13th House
- Damn Right I'm a Cowboy
- Other features:
- Paradise Found
- The Old Man Who Read Love Stories
- Tracker
- Storm Boy
- World premieres (shorts):
- Making Moves
- The Longing
- Black, white, red all over

- Other shorts:
- We of little voice [part of Indigenous documentary program]
- Turbulence
- Digging dirt and doing pannies
- The quarter mile [Zoom winner]

Further South Australian connections were as follows:

- Roy Hollsdotter Live [world premiere] is directed by Matthew Saville, a former South Australian
- Neon Moon is a short film directed by Nassiem Valamanesh, also a former South Australian
- The Zoom! and Shorts Film Festivals were South Australian initiatives
- The Adelaide Symphony Orchestra played live to Kid Stakes, to Adelaide composer Graeme Koehne's score
- A still life exhibition of stills was mounted by SA artist Matt Nettheim
- 4 minute wonders and Crossover lab, successful parts of the AIFF program, were South Australian initiatives
- There was considerable local involvement in the AIFF forum programs, and the festival was supported overall by key local partnerships and sponsors.

OFFICE OF THE STATUS OF WOMEN

202. **The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW:**

1. What is the estimated cost of the renovations required to accommodate the proposed move of the Office of the Status of Women from the 12th floor to the 3rd floor of Roma Mitchell House?

2. Has this reallocation of office space within Roma Mitchell House been initiated by the Office for the Status of Women or the Minister herself?

3. Will the costs be met from the budget lines for the Minister for the Status of Women, or the Minister for Transport?

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: The Minister for the Status of Women has advised that:

The estimated cost for the Office for the Status of Women to move to Level 3 of the Roma Mitchell House, is \$175,000. A detailed estimate will be prepared once the design is finalised.

The proposed move was suggested by the main government tenant of the building, the Department for Transport and Urban Planning (DTUP), to facilitate improved efficiency for that Department. The Office for the Status of Women agreed to relocate to the third floor to accommodate the DTUP needs. The relocation may be to Office of the Status of Women's advantage as it results in a rental saving.

Any associated costs with the move will be met from the Minister for Transport's budget lines.

SPEED CAMERAS

205. **The Hon. T.G. CAMERON:** How many hours has the government authorised for the Police Security Services Branch to operate speed cameras for the 2002-03 financial year?

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: The Minister for Police has provided the following information:

The government does not authorise the hours that Police Security Services Branch is to operate speed cameras. The Commissioner for Police authorises these operators.

206. **The Hon. T.G. CAMERON:**

1. What were the top ten postcode locations for speed cameras in metropolitan and country South Australia between 1 January and 31 December 2002?

2. How many speed camera fines were issued in each of these postcode areas for the same time period?

3. How much revenue was collected from fines in each of these postcode areas for the same time period?

4. What were the top ten postcode locations for serious road accidents in metropolitan and country South Australia between 1 January and 31 December 2002?

5. How many serious accidents occurred in each of these locations?

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: The Minister for Police has provided the following information:

in response to questions 1, 2 and 3, the top 10 postcode locations for speed cameras for 1 January 2002 to 30 November 2002 are supplied. Data is not available for December 2002. The data has been extracted based on speed camera placement and is sorted from highest to lowest by the number of cameras places within the postcode area.

		Metro	Notices issued	Revenue following expiation
Postcode	Suburb			
5000	Adelaide		21610	3 264 687
5082	Prospect		4565	234 057
5045	Glenelg North		5565	370 107
5158	Sheidow Park		4098	399 656
5067	Kent Town		4751	227 080
5065	Dulwich		2072	103 466
5115	Munno Para West		3969	10 871
5043	Morphettville		3584	131 038
5032	Lockleys		4031	454 931
5046	Warradale		1543	81 527

		Rural	Notices issued	Revenue following expiation
Postcode	Suburb			
5253	Murray Bridge		3037	15 592
5600	Whyalla Playford		1435	180 823
5700	Port Augusta		1071	169 948
5540	Port Pirie		783	104 197
5355	Nuriootpa		1112	150 271
5290	Mount Gambier		1319	257 550
5211	Hindmarsh Valley		787	170 591
5606	Port Lincoln		1202	144 191
5554	Kadina-North Yelta		276	28 182
5343	Berri-Renmark		529	73 450

In response to question 4 and 5, the top 10 postcode locations for serious casualty crashes for 2002 is only available up to 31 October 2002. Serious casualty crashes are casualties that were taken to hospital or treated at hospital or were a fatality. The data does not include casualties treated by a local practice doctor, minor injuries or property damage crashes.

		Metro	Serious Crashes
Postcode	Suburb		
5000	Adelaide		44
5251	Mount Barker		14
5067	Kent Town		13
5108	Salisbury		13
5038	South Plympton		10
5008	Dudley park		9
5032	Lockleys		9
5069	Evandale		9
5112	Hillbank		9
5163	Onkaparinga Hills		9

		Rural	Serious Crashes
Postcode	Suburb		
5540	Port Pirie		16
5600	Whyalla Playford		15
5211	Hindmarsh Valley		14
5271	Naracoorte		12
5290	Mount Gambier		12
5253	Murray Bridge		12
5700	Port Augusta		12
5291	Moorak		11

Postcode	Suburb	Serious Crashes
5343	Berri-Renmark	10
5690	Ceduna	10

The Minister for Transport has provided the following information:

4, and 5. At this time Transport SA is unable to report crashes by location for the period 1 January 2002 to 31 December 2002. Crash reports for the month of December 2002 are still being received from SA Police. It is usual for there to be delays in transferring the complete data sets between the agencies whilst SA Police finalises its internal processing and follow-up investigations. Information can be provided for the period 1 January to 30 November 2002, which follows:

Metropolitan		
Postcode	No. serious road crashes	Location
5000	42	Adelaide
5108	16	Salisbury/Paralowie
5038	14	Plympton/Camden Park
5067	13	Norwood/Kent Town/Beulah Park/Rose Park
5032	12	Lockleys/Brooklyn Park/Underdale
5112	12	Elizabeth/Hillbank
5062	11	Mitcham
5013	10	Rosewater/Gillman/Wingfield
5023	10	Findon/Seaton
5041	9	Daw Park/Cumberland Park/Panorama
Country South Australia		
Postcode	No. serious road crashes	Location
5540	19	Pt. Pirie
5290	17	Mt. Gambier
5600	16	Whyalla
5211	14	Victor Harbor/Encounter Bay/Waitpinga
5251	14	Mt. Barker/Wistow/Bugle Ranges
5253	13	Murray Bridge/Swanport
5271	13	Naracoorte/Padthaway
5700	13	Pt. Augusta
5291	11	Glencoe/Kongorong/Carpenters Rocks
5690	11	Nundroo/Thevenard/Fowlers Bay'

WORKPLACE BULLYING

212. **The Hon. SANDRA KANCK:**
1. (a) Does the Department of Human Services have a policy on eliminating bullying in the workplace; and

(b) If so, has the chief executive disseminated this information to all staff in the department and incorporated organisations?

2. (a) What is the formal method of notifying complaints about bullying; and
(b) Are there any informal records kept?

3. How many complaints about bullying have been received in each year for the past three years?

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: The Minister for Health and the Minister for Social Justice have provided the following information:

1. The Department of Human Services (DHS) has a discrimination/bullying/harassment prevention policy, which was endorsed in 1999.

The Department also has procedures for responding to workplace bullying allegations, endorsed in 2002. Both documents have been circulated in print form and are contained in the workforce management human resources reference folder distributed to all units across DHS portfolio in 2002. The policies are also available electronically on the DHS Intranet.

Most incorporated health units also have bullying prevention policies developed and endorsed at the local level.

2. The formal method of notifying complaints about bullying is via a written complaint directed to management.

3. Formal records are kept of each workplace bullying complaint and subsequent investigation

Central statistics on workplace bullying allegations are not kept as complaints may be appropriately dealt with by the local manager.

Individual incorporated health units have responsibility for investigating and resolving bullying complaints within their units, however advice and support is available from DHS workforce management.

BUDGET, MID YEAR REVIEW

215. **The Hon. R.I. LUCAS:** In relation to table 2.1 of the mid year budget review, will the treasurer provide a detailed breakdown of the cost pressures and carry-overs which impact on the forward estimates?

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: The Treasurer has provided the following information:

In Table 2.1 of the mid year budget review, the line 'Cost pressures and carryovers' relates to carryovers approved and cost pressures identified by agencies during the preparation of the mid year budget review. In addition, there have been increases in forward estimates of expenditure on emergency services.

	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06
	\$m	\$m	\$m	\$m
Carryovers	-9.0		-3.0	
Recognised cost pressures:				
- Magistrates 4.3% pay rise	-0.3	-0.3	-0.3	-0.3
- Termination payments for retiring judicial officers	-0.2	-0.2	-0.1	-0.4
- GRN savings from legacy systems not achievable	-5.2	-5.2	-1.0	
- Review of future ICT service arrangements	-1.2			
- Additional costs for Prisoner Movement Contract for higher remand rate	-0.3	-0.3	-0.3	-0.3
- Decision not to proceed with Dog Squad savings proposal	-0.2	-0.2	-0.2	-0.2
- Upgrade of security in Citi Centre	-0.5	-0.1	-0.1	-0.1
- Reduction in development application fees	-0.4			
- Increased Forestry SA dividend from higher than budgeted sales	6.1			
- Reduced savings by the State Electoral Office	-0.2	-0.2	-0.2	
Increase to Emergency Services forward estimates of expenditure		-4.0	-8.0	-12.0
Total	-11.5	-10.4	-13.2	-13.3

217. **The Hon. R.I. LUCAS:** In relation to table 2.1 of the mid year budget review, what assumptions were made about repayment schedules to justify the increased costs of superannuation expenses?

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: The Treasurer has provided the following information:

Poorly performing international financial markets, in particular equity markets, have resulted in negative returns on superannuation assets managed by Funds SA. These negative returns have resulted in unbudgeted increases in the state's unfunded superannuation liability.

The nominal superannuation interest expense recognised in the general government operating statement is calculated on the balance of the unfunded superannuation liability. The increased nominal superannuation expense reflected in table 2.1 is a consequence of the increased superannuation liability arising from negative asset returns.

The government is committed to the policy of ensuring that all superannuation liabilities are fully funded by 2034. As a result of the negative asset returns referred to earlier, the government has increased scheduled cash payments by approximately \$20 million per annum from 2002-03 to ensure that all superannuation liabilities are fully funded by 2034.

218. **The Hon. R.I. LUCAS:** In relation to table 2.1 of the mid year budget review and budget line 'Other', will the Treasurer provide a detailed breakdown for each of the forward estimate years?

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: The Treasurer has provided the following information:

In table 2.1 of the mid year budget review, the line 'Other' relates to various small data corrections and minor timing adjustments identified by agencies during the preparation of the mid year budget review. These adjustments arise as a result of ongoing improvements to the integrity of the underlying agency base data.

222. **The Hon. R.I. LUCAS:** In relation to table A6 of the mid year budget review, what is the reason for the \$163 million increase in equity?

Dividends Received	2002-2003 \$M	2003-2004 \$M	Variance \$M
Motor Accident Commission	10	–	10
South Australian Asset Management Corporation	230	42	188
South Australian Government Financing Authority	84	18	66
Total Dividends Received	324	60	264
Other Receipt Movements	755	733	22
Total Other Receipts	1 079	793	286

The pattern of dividend distributions shown above was factored into the 2002-03 Budget and remained unchanged for the 2002-03 Mid Year Budget Review.

224. **The Hon. R.I. LUCAS:** In relation to table A7 of the mid year budget review, what is the reason for the \$129 million difference in 'Borrowings (net)' for 2002-2003 compared to budget?

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: The Treasurer has provided the following information:

The item 'Borrowing (net)' in table A7 of the 2002-03 mid year review reflects an increase in repayments of borrowings of \$129 million for the 2002-03 estimated result compared to the 2002-03 budget. The Treasurer borrows from SAFA to fund the consolidated account. An improved consolidated account position results in a lower level of borrowing by the Treasurer from SAFA.

WAITE PRECINCT QUARANTINE

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY (Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: I wish to advise that the Waite precinct at Urrbrae has been placed under quarantine. The quarantine follows the CSIRO's advice that one sample

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: The Treasurer has provided the following information:

In preparing an answer to this question an error was discovered that affects table A4 and table A6 published in the 2002-03 mid year review.

The equity line in the balance sheet of the non financial public sector represents the value of the net assets of entities in the financial institutions sector. This sector includes SAFA, Homestart, Workcover, MAC and SAAMC.

The \$163 million increase in equity in table A6 is overstated. This is because the mid-year review estimate of the opening equity position of public financial corporations was not revised following the final outcome for 2001-02. Accordingly, the net worth positions of the general government and non-financial public sectors are overstated.

However, there is no impact on the key budget aggregates of general government net borrowing or net debt as published in the 2002-03 mid-year budget review. The 2001-02 budget results for these aggregates are also unaffected.

The published numbers included a total equity position for the public financial corporations of \$983 million. The revised figure is \$811 million. A revised Table A.4 and a revised table A.6, incorporating revised opening equity balances to take account of the final 2001-02 outcome, have been released on the Department of Treasury and Finance web site. These revised tables will also be published in the *Government Gazette*.

223. **The Hon. R.I. LUCAS:** In relation to table A7 of the mid year budget review, what is the reason for the \$286 million reduction in 'other receipts' for 2003-2004 compared to 2002-2003?

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: The Treasurer has provided the following information:

The reduction of \$286 million in other receipts between 2002-03 compared to 2003-04 largely relates to dividend flows from Motor Accident Commission, SA Asset Management Corporation, and the SA Government Financing Authority as follows:

of wheat from a field planting at Waite tested positive to the wheat streak mosaic virus (WSMV). This is the first detection of the virus in South Australia and, although we would expect any losses from the spread of the virus to be minor, this new incursion must be treated as a serious threat until more is known about its distribution and impact. The quarantine move is in line with national protocols to manage WSMV and will only affect the movement of seeds, plants and plant material from research facilities within the precinct.

A specialist management team, including Primary Industries and Resources SA, the South Australian Research and Development Institute and the University of Adelaide, has been formed to manage the issue at a local level and will work closely with a national consultative committee on WSMV. Strict protocols will be enforced to ensure that researchers and assistants who deal with potential host material restrict their use of this material during the quarantine. They will also be required to wear protective clothing to ensure that the microscopic plant-feeding mite that spreads the WSMV is not distributed by their activities.

The mite that spreads the WSMV principally targets wheat and related cereals. The virus can cause severe losses in some

varieties of cereals used in research and grown overseas. These plant types are not grown commercially in South Australia. The virus was recently identified at CSIRO in Canberra and an eradication attempt has been undertaken involving the destruction of host material at both the Black Mountain and Ginninderra sites. Although suspect CSIRO material has been growing in an isolated growth room at the Waite, recent testing of these three plants was negative for the presence of the virus. A national consultative committee on WSMV recently endorsed a survey of all wheat breeding sites across Australia to determine the extent of the virus.

As a result of this latest finding of the Waite, it is expected that these surveys will be fast-tracked and expanded to determine the epidemiology of the virus in Australia. Mr David Cartwright, Chief Inspector, Plant Health, Primary Industries and Resources SA, will participate in a telephone hook-up with the consultative committee tomorrow afternoon to further consider this issue.

PRISONERS, NON-PAROLE PERIOD

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY (Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries): I table a ministerial statement on review of conditions of release on parole made by the Premier in another place.

FOOD INNOVATION GRANTS

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation): I table a ministerial statement on South Australian business success with food innovation grants made by the Hon. Rory McEwen, Minister for Trade and Regional Development.

YUMBARRA CONSERVATION PARK

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation): I table a ministerial statement on the Yumbarra Conservation Park made by the Hon. John Hill, Minister for Environment and Conservation.

QUESTION TIME

CADELL TRAINING CENTRE

The Hon. R.D. LAWSON: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Correctional Services a question on the subject of Cadell work practices.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.D. LAWSON: Prisoners at Cadell Training Centre have for some time been engaged on community work, for example, cleaning up public and council owned facilities and the like, the Waikerie cemetery being one of the beneficiaries of this work. Prisoners work in groups and are overseen and supervised by prison officers. This program has been most beneficial to the rehabilitation of prisoners in readying them for release. It has also been of benefit to the communities. The modus operandi is that gangs would be away from the training centre for the day and have lunch on site. The opposition has been informed that the union objected to prison officers taking lunch off-site and, notwithstanding the views of officers, has insisted that they return to the training centre for their lunch break. This has greatly undermined the efficiency and effectiveness of this excellent community project. My questions are:

1. Is the minister aware of union objections to prison officers taking their lunch break off-site?
2. Did he approve of the requirement that prison officers now return to the training centre?
3. Will the minister take steps to ensure that this is an effective program?

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS (Minister for Correctional Services): I thank the honourable member for his very important question in relation to the rehabilitative effect of work on prisoners. Just as the previous government took steps to make sure that as many prisoners as possible were found work that was either of a training nature or of some financial benefit to the community or prison, the government has continued the same policy. I have stated a number of times in this council that we see work as a rehabilitative way for prisoners to re-enter society. Certainly, the prison at Cadell has done a good job, as have the other regional prisons, of working with communities to ensure that prisoners carry out work which is of a non-commercial nature and which does not compete unfairly with the private sector but which is work that has a community benefit. We take every possible step to make sure that work is available and that communities can engage appropriate prisoners in appropriate forms of work and provide that change, while observing occupational health and safety.

I am not aware of the situation in relation to the particular instance of Cadell work groups returning to Cadell to have lunch at the insistence of the unions. I will take steps to familiarise myself with the statements being made by the union representing the interests of the correctional services officers. In some cases there may be some occupational health and safety reasons on some sites, but I will endeavour to find out the reasons. It may be in response to an industrial campaign with which I am not familiar.

I will take those steps, as indicated by the honourable member, to familiarise myself with those issues to try to bring about a satisfactory outcome that encourages the work that communities offer to be provided to prisoners, because we do need that cooperation between the community and the prisons in those regional areas to ensure the success of these prison work programs.

DEPARTMENTAL BOARDS

The Hon. CAROLINE SCHAEFER: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries a question about departmental boards.

Leave granted.

The Hon. CAROLINE SCHAEFER: Mr Premier—sorry. I wish, sir. Mr President—

The PRESIDENT: I have in the past been Acting President; I might as well be the Acting Premier.

The Hon. CAROLINE SCHAEFER: Mr President, in recent times the Premier has stated his intention to abolish many South Australian government boards and has said that he will 'cut a swathe through their numbers'. He has also requested that ministers list which boards they are prepared to abolish from their portfolios. As all members would be aware, the minister has a unique portfolio in South Australia in that he is responsible for myriad industries and regional issues that are encompassed by agriculture, food and fisheries.

There is such a diverse range of issues that often the only people capable of making informed decisions on behalf of the

state or advising the department and the minister are those who are directly involved with the specifics of the industry at issue. Certainly, the diminished numbers in PIRSA do not have the physical capability or diversity of expertise to enable them to advise on all matters without some assistance. Many of the boards under the minister's portfolio were specifically set up so that they could advise the minister direct on the specifics of their particular industry.

Typically, these types of boards are not expensive to fund and often carry out mundane administrative tasks but, nevertheless, undertake essential duties in regional South Australia. Examples of these types of boards would be the Apiarists Advisory Group, the Apple and Pear Growers Advisory Board and the Meat Industry Advisory Board. My questions, therefore, are:

1. Which specific boards under the minister's portfolio will he advise the Premier he will axe and how much money will be saved in doing so?

2. How does the minister intend to undertake the essential duties carried out by these boards once they have been abolished?

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY (Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries): The question of boards and committees within government departments is very important. Of course, one recommendation at the recent very successful Economic Summit, which was held in this building several weeks ago, was that there be a reduction in the number of boards. That Economic Summit discussion paper gave some examples comparing the number of boards that exist in this state in some portfolio areas (not primary industries, I might say) with those interstate, and it appears that there is a significant number of such boards. I believe that, essentially, that particular type of board referred to in the Economic Summit document is the target.

In relation to Primary Industries, the honourable member who asked the question is quite correct in that a number of boards exist and some boards such as the apiary advisory group have an important role under the primary industry funding scheme. Obviously those boards are important—

The Hon. A.J. Redford: Do you ever listen to them?

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: Indeed I do. In fact, in relation to areas such as dealing with diseases within industry those boards are absolutely essential. For example, the cattle advisory group and the sheep advisory group are responsible for raising many millions of dollars in relation to levying funds to address those problems. They simply would not function unless there was industry support and recognition for those particular boards—

The Hon. Caroline Schaefer interjecting:

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: That is right; those boards are required under legislation, if there is to be the funding. Obviously boards such as that will remain to continue the particular function which has been set out in legislation, but nonetheless a number of boards, committees and other groups within government have been established over many years. I have no doubt that a proportion of those may well have outlived their usefulness. The Premier has announced a process that will be undertaken by all departments, and this task is already under way in my department. We will certainly be going through all the boards.

Obviously the ones to which I have just referred will be retained to continue their particular function, but if other boards within the department are no longer serving a useful purpose they will be discontinued in accordance with the

majority view of the economic summit. This was one of the recommendations that was endorsed, but—

The Hon. A.J. Redford interjecting:

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: I will give an example. As the honourable member would probably be aware, one of the big movements in the agricultural area has been towards integrated natural resource management. Clearly if one is moving in that direction then one would be looking at new boards to take on the functions of other boards. There are many dozens of boards that look at those particular areas but, obviously, they are matters for my colleague. If the honourable member reads the economic summit paper, he will see—

The Hon. R.I. Lucas interjecting:

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: It does, actually, in one area. In the health—

The Hon. R.I. Lucas interjecting:

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: It does not nominate the boards by name but it certainly talks about areas, and that is what I was referring to. For instance, the example I gave is of an area where clearly there is potential for moving—

The Hon. A.J. Redford interjecting:

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: It is a pity the honourable member—

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Mr Redford will spend a little time in quiet reflection.

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: I do not think the honourable member should be reflecting in that way; after all it was businesses within this state that provided money for the summit and there was a considerable degree of enthusiasm for the work of that particular summit. I think the honourable member should have more respect for it—certainly this government will. In accordance with the Premier's promise, all ministers will be going through their committees—and there are 800 or more. In fact, one of the things we do not seem to know is exactly how many committees and boards there are within this state. As I said, I would be surprised if at least some of those boards have not outlived their usefulness because many have been sitting there for many years.

However, having said that, let me say that there are many boards and other advisory groups within government that do perform and will continue to perform significant work for the taxpayers of this state.

The Hon. CAROLINE SCHAEFER: I have a supplementary question. Given that the Premier has stated that he will be doing an immediate restructure of the boards in this state, how is it that the minister cannot give us any examples of boards that are for the chop in his department; and how soon will he be able to?

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: As I said, the work has already begun to review those boards, but we will get it right. It was only a week or two ago that the Economic Summit endorsed this as one of the recommendations.

The Hon. Caroline Schaefer interjecting:

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: The honourable member will have to wait until the process is completed. There will certainly be more than one, but it would be premature to speculate at this stage.

SUPERANNUATION

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Leader of the Opposition): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the minister representing the Treasurer a question about unfunded superannuation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: In the mid year budget review document released in February this year, the Rann government indicated that, in its first 12 months, the level of unfunded superannuation liability in South Australia had increased by \$1 billion, from \$3.3 billion to \$4.3 billion. At the time, I indicated that no explanation had been given by the Treasurer, either in the press release or in the mid year budget review document, of the background to the reasons for the billion dollar increase in unfunded superannuation in Treasurer Foley's first year of office. Treasury sources have indicated to us that, in the coming budget, there will be a further significant increase in the unfunded superannuation liability over and above the \$4.3 billion figure. My questions are:

1. In the calculation of the \$4.3 billion unfunded superannuation liability released in February this year, given that that calculation is reliant on the financial assets and management of those assets by Funds SA on taxpayers' behalf, or on behalf of South Australia, was there any discussion with the Funds SA board or management in relation to that calculation? If there was no consultation, why not?

2. The mid year budget review indicates that, in the first six months of this financial year, there was a negative 4 per cent return on funds invested in relation to this calculation. Treasurer Foley went on to assume a positive 7.5 per cent return on funds in the period from January to June this year, that is, from a negative 4 per cent return in the first six months to a positive 7.5 per cent return in the first six months of this calendar year. As was indicated at the weekend, a number of industry expert groups, such as Mercer Investment Consulting, have recently published surveys. In relation to investment, the Mercer Investment Consulting March quarter 2003 survey shows a negative return of 3.2 per cent on the median balance superannuation fund. In relation to the mid year budget review—and it has been indicated previously that the mid year budget review is the Treasurer's document and not the independent document of the Under Treasurer—did the Treasurer, or officers from Treasury on his behalf, consult with the Funds SA board or management in relation to this assumption that we would return to a positive 7.5 per cent return on funds invested in the six months to June 2003?

3. If the Treasurer did not consult with the Funds SA board or management before including that assumption, why did he choose not to go to the people with expert knowledge on this issue in relation to the likely funds performance for the six-month period?

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY (Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries): I will refer those questions to the Treasurer and bring back a reply. Of course, I note that some information was provided today to the honourable member in some answers to questions by the leader earlier this year that may well provide some of those answers. I will refer the questions to the Treasurer for his response.

GOLDMAN ENVIRONMENTAL PRIZE

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation a question about the awarding of the Goldman Environmental Prize.

Leave granted.

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: The Goldman Environmental Prize is an internationally prestigious award for outstanding commitment to addressing critical environmental issues. It

has recently been awarded to two South Australian Aboriginal women. Is the minister aware of recent reports regarding the presentation of the Goldman Environmental Prize to Mrs Eileen Kampakuta Brown and Mrs Eileen Wani Wingfield for their extraordinary commitment to campaigning to prevent the establishment of a radioactive waste dump in the Coober Pedy region? Will the minister inform the council of the details of this prize and the background to their campaign?

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation): I am aware of the Goldman environmental prize recipients. I met with the women earlier this year and congratulated them personally. They are two elderly Aboriginal women who have elder status within their community and certainly have worked hard for the recognition, although that was not their intention when they worked on issues in the north of the state in relation to their opposition to the disposal sites. The two South Australian Aboriginal women—Mrs Eileen Kampakuta Brown and Mrs Eileen Wani Wingfield—are the 2003 recipients of the Goldman Environmental Prize for outstanding environmental achievements in the category of island and island nations. They received their awards at two ceremonies: one in San Francisco attended by Mrs Wingfield and her daughter on Tuesday 14 April 2003, and one in Sydney on the same day attended by Mrs Brown. Those presentations got some media coverage.

The Goldman Environmental Prize is the world's largest prize for grassroots environmentalists and is awarded annually to environmental heroes from the six continental regions of Africa, Asia, islands and island nations, Europe, North America and South and Central America. 'Grassroots' refers to community based activism where positive change is created through citizen participation in issues that affect them. The prizes are awarded by the Goldman Foundation. Details of this foundation can be found on the website at www.goldmanprize.org. The prize is recognised as the Nobel prize for the environment, which makes it even more important for two relatively obscure, unknown and almost hidden Aboriginal women within this state. The purpose of the prize is to recognise sustained and significant efforts to preserve the natural environment, including but not limited to protecting endangered ecosystems and species, combating destructive development projects, promoting sustainability, influencing environmental policies and striving for environmental justice.

The prize consists of a cash award—this year around \$US125 000—and a bronze trophy. The winners are flown to San Francisco to receive their award and take part in a tour to publicise their outstanding work. All expenses are paid by the foundation. The recipients have been selected by a prize jury who feel that their work reflects extraordinary commitment to addressing critical environmental issues facing not only themselves but also the state and Australia generally. Mrs Wingfield and Mrs Brown are members of the Kupa Piti Kungka Tjuta and are senior Aboriginal women from the Coober Pedy region in South Australia. They are campaigning to stop the proposed radioactive waste dump being located around the Coober Pedy region.

In conjunction with the award ceremony to be held in San Francisco on 14 April, Mrs Wingfield and her daughter will take part in a tour organised to publicise the work of the recipients. The tour commenced on 9 April in San Francisco and included the ceremony on 14 April and culminated in Washington DC around 19 April. Mrs Brown was also

recently presented with the Order of Australia on behalf of the people of South Australia by the Governor, Her Excellency Marjorie Jackson-Nelson. A well supported bipartisan function was held in recognition of this award by a number of women parliamentary colleagues on 10 April in the Old Legislative Council Chamber. Awarding the Order of Australia is a demonstration of respect from the whole South Australian community. As a leader of the Aboriginal community Mrs Brown is well respected and these awards will help broaden the level of respect due to her and certainly people would agree that she has earned it.

Formal recognition of their leadership will help the Aboriginal community understand the level of respect due to Mrs Brown and Mrs Wingfield and through this respect will make the lessons and law they teach better understood by their communities and will help link the children of the communities with Aboriginal law and respect. Hopefully, reconciliation will be made a lot easier not only in that region but in the state generally.

This throws into the spotlight once again the federal Liberal government's desire to turn South Australia into the country's dumping ground for nuclear waste. Recently in this chamber the state Liberal government was defeated as it staunchly supported its federal colleagues, and even more recently we have seen that the federal government may not be proposing a nuclear dump on its preferred site, but I am sure that it will look for other sites in the area.

So, I pay my personal tribute—and, I hope, I speak on behalf of the Legislative Council—to these two elderly Aboriginal women who have received international recognition through their hard work and endeavours. I understand that a number of Legislative Councillors in the chamber have met these women. They will have seen that their determination and dedication is written into the whole of their lives and is almost etched on their faces.

EATING DISORDERS

The Hon. SANDRA KANCK: I seek leave to make an explanation before asking the minister representing the Minister for Health a question about treatment and support services for sufferers of eating disorders.

Leave granted.

The Hon. SANDRA KANCK: I was recently advised of a young woman suffering from anorexia nervosa. The debilitating physical effects of this disorder were witnessed with great distress by her family who, as time went by, felt unable to cope with the situation on their own. Having decided that hospitalisation was the only option available to bring about their daughter's recovery, her parents began an uphill battle to obtain treatment for her. They approached a leading Adelaide hospital which administers an effective treatment program. They were subsequently told that the hospital would not be able to admit their daughter and that she would be placed on a waiting list. My constituents finally succeeded in having their daughter admitted to the treatment program when her weight had plummeted to below 40 kilograms. My questions to the minister are:

1. How many South Australians are treated each year for eating disorders?
2. What is the average time frame that patients wishing to be admitted for treatment of an eating disorder can expect to face in South Australian hospitals?

3. What support services are available for patients suffering from severe symptoms of eating disorders and their families while awaiting admission for treatment?

4. Does the minister recognise the greatly increased risk of stroke and heart attack that sufferers of severe symptoms of anorexia face?

5. Assuming that some of these sufferers are still on hospital waiting lists, what support services are available for them?

6. How many beds have been allocated in South Australian hospitals for the treatment of eating disorders?

7. Will the minister advise what measures will be taken to address waiting lists for hospital treatment?

8. As it is often difficult to detect the presence of eating disorders in their early stages, what strategies have been put in place for early intervention and detection?

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation): I will pass on to the Minister for Health in another place those important questions asked by the honourable minister and bring back a reply.

FRONTIER SERVICES

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation): I table a ministerial statement on health services at Mintabie made by the Minister for Health in another place.

NORTH HAVEN MARINA

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the minister representing the Minister for Transport a question about the North Haven Marina Maintenance Fund.

Leave granted.

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: I have been approached by residents living in One and All Drive at the North Haven Marina who have concerns about the maintenance of their revetment wall and the fund established to pay for the work. Information supplied to my office shows that the North Haven Marina Maintenance Fund was established with an original deposit of \$620 000. It would seem with hindsight that that initial amount of money set aside for maintenance of the North Haven Marina was inadequate and certainly is insufficient for a self-sustaining marina maintenance fund. As a result, additional money has had to be sourced from Transport SA's own budget. However, priority has been given to dredging in order to maintain the required minimum channel depths.

Recently Transport SA has started revetment works at North Haven. The revetments—stone covered walls that stop the sea from eroding the beach and adjacent land—require 300 to 600 millimetre boulders to be added to the top of the current armouring. Residents of One and All Drive are concerned that some people have missed out on repair work to the revetment wall in front of their homes and that some of the work already completed is substandard. Apparently \$130 000 has been spent on the work so far, and I have been told that as much again may have to be spent to finish the job. My questions to the minister are:

1. What year was the North Haven Marina maintenance fund originally established, and what was the intent and purpose of the fund?
2. What amounts have been deposited into it?

3. Has any interest been accrued and, if so, where has the interest gone?

4. Are amounts in the fund sufficient to carry out the government's obligations regarding the completion of the revetment repair works?

5. If not, will the government make additional funds available so the revetment repair work can be completed?

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation): I will refer those important questions to the Minister for Transport in another place and bring back a reply.

MINERAL EXPLORATION

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Mineral Resources Development a question about access to parks by mineral explorers.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: In January this year PIRSA released its quarterly *Earth Resources Journal*, and within that journal was an interview with Keith Yates, the Executive Chairman of Adelaide Resources Limited. Mr Yates has over 40 years experience in mining exploration and mine development both in Australia and overseas and has held positions on several boards. Mr Yates is currently a member of the South Australian Resources Industry Development Board. In this interview Mr Yates makes a series of pertinent points in relation to the exploration of South Australia's parks and reserves. The process, known as dual proclamation, allows for the exploration of these lands under the strict supervision of the state. Mr Yates stated:

Any proposal to change this well-conceived, effective process, or policies relating to exploration and mining in existing dual proclamation parks, would be viewed with great concern by the industry. Changes of this nature would prove a disincentive to exploration in this state at a time when it is important to attract as much risk capital as possible.

He also said:

Investors are easily spooked and the risk to the investment dollar is very mobile.

In light of the comments made by Mr Yates in relation to the fragile nature of the mining dollar in this state, will the minister publicly reassure the mining industry today that the government will maintain all the access rights offered to exploratory geologists and mining companies in our state's parks and reserves and thereby ensure the continuing flow of investment capital into South Australia?

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY (Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries): Over the past 12 months there has been a significant increase in exploration in this state, as was reported in the press a week or two ago. I am very pleased that under this government there has been an increase in mineral exploration. That exploration has come about because of some success in recent times in relation to past exploration, and that past exploration has been built on some of the very important work undertaken under the various exploration initiatives of the primary industries department in the past.

The honourable member asked his question in relation to access to national parks. The honourable member is quite correct: there is a series of classifications of national parks and conservation parks in this state. Some of those are so-called singly proclaimed and do not permit mining; other parks do allow exploration and they are under a dual proclamation. Over the past several years spanning the terms

of both governments there has been some change in relation to that. This parliament had a discussion in relation to the Gammon Ranges National Park. This government supported the motion originally moved under the previous government that, given the importance of the Gammon Ranges, that park should be singly proclaimed.

There have been a few small parks on Kangaroo Island where the prospect for mining is low but the tourism potential is significant. In relation to those parks there have been some minor changes with respect to classification. However, that has happened as a process under all governments in the past and I suppose that, from time to time in the future, some adjustment will be made as necessary but, as far as this government is concerned, the current system is working well. At present, significant exploration is being undertaken within so-called dual proclaimed parks or regional reserves, which is another classification of reserves.

As the honourable member points out, any exploration in those areas must be carried out under strict provisions. I believe that the mining industry has shown a great deal of responsibility in adhering to particular strict requirements for their exploration to be environmentally sensitive and I would expect that to continue.

PORT STANVAC

The Hon. T.J. STEPHENS: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation, representing the Minister for the Southern Suburbs, a question about the Port Stanvac oil refinery.

Leave granted.

The Hon. T.J. STEPHENS: As members would be aware, the Port Stanvac oil refinery has provided over 400 jobs to the people of the southern suburbs and a further 1 500 indirectly. It has produced product worth \$900 million annually and exported up to \$100 million per year. Port Stanvac has provided over 95 per cent of South Australia's refined fuels and approximately 10 per cent of the national output. The decision taken by Mobil to close this facility on 8 April will have a devastating effect, particularly on the people of the Southern suburbs where, I am informed, a large number of employees and their families reside. My questions are:

1. Did the Minister for the Southern Suburbs play a leading role in the negotiations to keep the oil refinery open?

2. Given that these negotiations failed miserably, will the minister give details in his explanation as to the actual value in having a Minister for the Southern Suburbs other than for the title alone?

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation): I will refer those mostly important questions to the minister in another place and bring back a reply.

DROUGHT RELIEF, SOUTHERN MALLEE

The Hon. J. GAZZOLA: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries a question about the drought affected Southern Mallee.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J. GAZZOLA: I understand that the federal government has rejected an application for exceptional circumstances assistance for the Southern Mallee. Will the minister please advise the council what has been done by the

state government to assist the farmers and communities in the Southern Mallee?

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY (Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries): As members would recall, the state government drought assistance package, which was announced in October last year, included a provision to meet the state's share of business support assistance for exceptional circumstances on the expectation that exceptional circumstances would be declared in South Australia. In early December last year, I submitted detailed applications to the commonwealth seeking exceptional circumstances declarations for the drought affected areas of the state that, in the view of the government, should have been successful.

After examining South Australia's case the commonwealth announced that, while the central and far north-east of the state satisfied the exceptional circumstances criteria, its view, and that of the National Rural Advisory Council, was that the regional impact in the Southern Mallee was insufficient to justify declaring exceptional circumstances. As I have indicated in the past, I strongly disagree with the commonwealth's sentiments with regard to the Southern Mallee. This area has not only been severely affected by the drought conditions of last year but also, in many instances, suffered frost damage to crops in 2000 and 2001.

I was extremely disappointed in the commonwealth's decision to deny assistance to the Southern Mallee and immediately requested a reconsideration of its decision. Unfortunately, it appears that the commonwealth will not change its mind. As a result of this unexpected development, a component of the funding allocation became available for redistribution. The state government immediately took the opportunity to use this money to provide assistance to the drought affected farmers and communities in the southern Mallee.

On Saturday 5 April 2003, while opening the Karoonda Sheep Fair, the Premier announced \$280 000 in drought assistance measures to be directed to the Murray-Mallee. The additional support measures include a contribution of \$120 000 to assist councils in the Mallee to meet the cost of removing sand drift from roads. Members will recall that I have been asked questions in the past by the Hon. John Dawkins (amongst others) in relation to the problems faced by those councils in meeting the significant cost of removing the sand drift from roads as a result of the appalling conditions. Councils have indicated that they have already spent in excess of \$160 000, and I am informed that eventual costs may reach over \$700 000 to keep roads open and to return them to the condition they were in before the drought.

Sand drift has been extreme this year as farmers face one of the worst ever droughts, which also included above average wind speeds. This \$120 000 additional funding for roads is to be directed through the Murray-Mallee Local Government Association, which will determine the most appropriate way to support the affected councils. It is hoped that the Local Government Disaster Fund may also assist these councils in meeting some of the costs they face in restoring the damaged roads. The government also realises that some farmers may need assistance to rehabilitate land degraded as a result of the weather conditions, and \$60 000 has been targeted to help in this area. On advice from the Murray-Mallee Soil Conservation Board, and with the agreement of the Murray-Mallee Local Government Association, an agreement is being developed with the Murray-Mallee Local Action Planning Association—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: It is a pity that honourable members do not say that to their federal colleagues whose contribution was a big fat zero. Members of the Liberal Party should get their federal colleagues to cough up in relation to their own constituents in these areas. The Mallee Futures Program subsidises land-holders in earthworks and the seeding of degraded areas. By working through this group, we can expand a successful local program and increase the number of farmers who can be supported by stabilising areas sensitive to wind erosion.

In addition, \$80 000 is targeted to assist the Murray-Mallee Strategic Task Force in implementing its power shift community capacity building project. This project aims to encourage the community to grow their ability to influence and enact change for the improvement of their community and region. A further \$20 000 has been allocated to the task force to implement a youth and young farmer support initiative—

The Hon. A.J. Redford interjecting:

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: It is appalling that members of the Liberal Party should be interjecting when we are talking about one of the worst affected areas of drought in this country and into which this government has put \$280 000, yet their federal colleagues have not put in 1¢. A further—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! There is too much interjection on my left.

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: Further, this project will target the young in building their confidence and skills in agriculture and particularly in learning the lessons and overcoming the consequences of the drought. In conclusion, the \$280 000 of assistance announced by the Premier at Karoonda clearly shows the government's commitment to the drought affected farmers and communities of this state.

The Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS: I have a supplementary question. Will the minister bring back information about the amount of money spent by Transport SA on cleaning sand off main roads in the Mallee, including the Loxton to Swan Reach road?

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: I would imagine that most of the roads in the Murray-Mallee area are the responsibility of local government, but if there are roads—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: The honourable member can laugh—and perhaps he is laughing at his own ignorance. It is a fact that most of the roads in the area are the responsibility of local government. Of course, some major roads through that area are the responsibility of Transport SA. I will obtain the information from my colleague and bring back a reply.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: Further to the minister's comments about the importance of regional and rural roads, will he confirm whether he is aware that Transport SA, under this government, plans to cut \$27 million from the transport budget in the coming year, including the regional roads program and the sealing of the rural arterial roads program? If not, will he make himself aware of those matters and make representations to the Minister for Transport?

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: I have no intention of speculating on what might be in the budget. In any case, that is not really a supplementary question to matters relating to drought assistance, Mr President.

CORRECTIONAL SERVICES, CELL DESIGN

The Hon. IAN GILFILLAN: I seek leave to make an explanation before asking the Minister for Correctional Services a question about the Coroner's recommendations on cell design.

Leave granted.

The PRESIDENT: I am having trouble hearing the Hon. Mr Gilfillan. There is too much audible conversation on both sides of the council.

The Hon. IAN GILFILLAN: I will speak up, Mr President. On Thursday 20 March this year, the Coroner handed down his findings into the death of Alexander Varcoe. Mr Varcoe was found hanged in his cell at Yatala Labour Prison. In the Coroner's findings, he identified three other inquiries in which he recommended the removal of hanging points in cells: Damien Wakely, inquest No. 7 of 1995; Christopher Bonney, inquest No. 28 of 1996; and Laurens Adrian Keith Nobels, inquest No. 43 of 2000. He also quoted from recommendation 165 of the Royal Commission Into Aboriginal Deaths in Custody, which states:

... steps should be taken to screen hanging points in police and prison cells.

In point 8.19 of his findings, the Coroner highlights the lack of action that has been taken on these recommendations as follows:

It is obvious that little has been done to reduce hanging points in mainstream (as distinct from 'special' cells for 'at risk' prisoners) cells in South Australian prisons. I am sure that new cells built in recent years are an improvement, but there are many old cells, such as those in E division at Yatala Labour Prison, which are still in need of attention.

Recommendation 2 of the Coroner's report states:

As recommended in Bonney in 1996, the design of cells in E division at Yatala Labour Prison and, indeed, all older cells in the prison system in South Australia, should be the subject of a comprehensive review along the lines of the Victorian Building Design Review Project.

The Victorian study was conducted by the Department of Justice in November 2000 and undertook a detailed evaluation of design issues involved in constructing safer cells. The project developed a prototype cell. Highlighted from that report was the recommendation that grilles should have a 1.6 millimetre maximum hole—hence a diameter small enough to prevent a shoelace being passed through. One must contemplate the dreadful mental state of a prisoner who attempts to thread a shoelace through a grille to end his life. However, my questions are:

1. Is the minister aware of the Victorian study mentioned by the Coroner?
2. Has he instituted the review as recommended by the Coroner? If not, why not?
3. What immediate action was taken to safeguard inmates in older cells, such as in E division in Yatala?

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS (Minister for Correctional Services): I thank the honourable member for his very important questions. Certainly, deaths in custody are a serious matter for whatever government is in power at a particular time. Certainly, any minister with a position within the cabinet process feels that, if there are any deaths in custody on their watch, they have not carried out their duties strictly

by the book, because the royal commission and the recommendations within it have been with us for some considerable time. The jobs presented for governments to try to eliminate hanging points and minimise the avenues for loss of life are many, and certainly governments have a responsibility to work their way through them.

Having said that, some individuals within prisons make it very difficult for ministers, governments, prison administrators and even correctional services officers, who are on the spot, to stop the actions or activities of those who want to take their own life, because circumstances within prisons allow for lack of observation or circumstances where observation fails, that is, the personal observation of prison officers or electronic observations and monitoring within prisons.

As the honourable member describes, the way in which those people who are determined to take their lives invent ways to do so, in a lot of cases they are not able to be anticipated in order to prevent them, but there are certainly more obvious hanging points within prisons, and governments are working their way through them. All states in Australia are under the recommendations of the royal commission. As the honourable member states, there are also Coroner's reports that make recommendations about hanging points and the responsibility on governments to remove them. That is being carried out in a methodical way. My understanding from reports is that it is more difficult to remove them from the older prisons than it is to build in good architecturally designed new prisons and eliminate them through engineering design methods.

We have a number of new prison proposals being looked at within this state that will have recommendations within them for the elimination of hanging points, as per the royal commission and Coroner's reports, and we have a protocol for investigation, which I will describe. The state government, through the Department of State Aboriginal Affairs, has developed a protocol with the State Coroner that is implemented in the event of an Aboriginal death in custody, that is, after the death has occurred. Protocol allows DOSAA to review any relevant documents, reports, agreements and previous coronial recommendations.

Following these reviews, DOSAA prepares a written report for the Coroner that contributes to the inquest process. As well as DOSAA's role as a monitoring agency within government to outline potential breaches of the recommendations of the Royal Commission into Aboriginal Deaths in Custody, DOSAA distributes its reports to key stakeholders prior to any inquest. So we have DOSAA as a watchdog in relation to the Royal Commission into Aboriginal Deaths in Custody and that is one way in which direct contact with Aboriginal prisoners is maintained. It is not only Aboriginal prisoners, about whom the honourable member is concerned, but also non-Aboriginal prisoners who are suicidal. Women in particular in women's prisons are included in those who are vulnerable.

DOSAA is now revisiting these protocols to ensure all stakeholders are appropriately included. As is current practice, DOSAA can pass on to council assisting any relevant information, such as witnesses who could assist in the coronial investigation. A key initiative in respect of the implementation and recommendation of the Royal Commission into Aboriginal Deaths in Custody is the Aboriginal Justice Consultative Committee. This committee is hosted by the Attorney-General's Department and replaces the former Aboriginal Justice Interdepartmental Committee

(AJIC), which had been hosted by DOSAA. DOSAA will continue to monitor and report on any Aboriginal deaths in custody in South Australia and, as defined in the Royal Commission into Aboriginal Deaths in Custody, there has been no death in custody of an Aboriginal person in South Australia since May 2001.

Any death is disturbing. Sometimes you can say that it is a matter of luck than better management when we go for a considerable length of time without a death in custody, but at this point we are working our way through all the issues associated with hanging points. We have had the case of one woman in the women's prison who has made eight attempts. She has psychological problems and has a history of mental health problems. We have a prison that all of us within this chamber would declare as unsuitable for housing women in this day and age and we are trying to replace it. We have made a number of additions or improvements to the prison but we are looking at options for a new prison.

Despite the availability of qualified medical staff and the best efforts of prison staff, there have been 59 deaths in custody in South Australian prisons since the start of the 1990 financial year, with 20 (48 per cent) being from suicide, 21 (36 per cent) from natural causes, 6 (10 per cent) from overdoses and three (5 per cent) from murder. There are still issues to be dealt with. You cannot prevent deaths from natural causes in the main, but in relation to other preventable deaths we are still working on it and trying to eliminate those issues.

We are also aware of the depression suffered in the early stages of remand, which is a very complex system for people who come into contact with the correctional services system first up, and that needs special handling and observation. In some cases where parole is rejected or where the security status of a prisoner changes, then depression can set in within those prison confines that make prisoners vulnerable.

Like all other governments in Australia, we are working towards the elimination of the most obvious hanging points. We are trying to spend money on new prisons and extend the life of our existing prisons by eliminating obvious hanging points, and certainly a lot of work is being done to try to assist prisoners to overcome some of the impacts of depression within prison. Certainly we would like more funds available for psychological services, with prisoner assessment at entry and exiting, but again we have to stand in line with the rest of the community to get the benefits of the mental health dollar.

The Hon. IAN GILFILLAN: I remind the minister that in his lengthy reply he did not address the recommendation from the Coroner in March this year that South Australian prisons should be the subject of a comprehensive review along the lines of the Victorian building design review project. If he refused that recommendation, why? Will he undertake to give the council the physical detail of the safeguarding of the cells themselves, which is the basis of the Coroner's recommendation?

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: I will review the rest of the questions asked by the honourable member and bring back a detailed reply.

AUTISM SPECTRUM DISORDER

The Hon. A.L. EVANS: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation, representing the Minister for Social

Justice, a question about the government's review on sufferers of autism spectrum disorder and their carers.

Leave granted.

The Hon. A.L. EVANS: Two constituents whose grandchild suffers from autism have been in contact with me. They provided me with a letter they wrote to the Premier (Hon. Mike Rann) in November last year seeking information about the government's attitude towards people suffering from autism and their families. The Premier responded in January 2003 that an administrative review of services for people with autism spectrum disorder and their carers was underway. These people have various questions of the Premier concerning the review which have not been answered despite correspondence sent in January, February and March to the Premier. The questions asked of the Premier were very valid, so I take the liberty of asking them again in this place on behalf of my constituents. I understand that the issue of autism falls within the Hon. Stephanie Key's portfolio. My questions to the minister are:

1. Who is conducting the review?
2. What are the terms of reference?
3. What is the completion date for the review?
4. Does the review process include consultation with parents and carers of autistic children?

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation): I thank the honourable member for his continuing interest in questions related to autism, which is a terrible affliction for young children and particularly for their carers who face a lot of frustration in getting early recognition and diagnosis and the framing of treatment programs both at home and within the health system. I will refer the honourable member's questions to the minister in another place and bring back a reply.

REPLIES TO QUESTIONS

STATE BUDGET

In reply to **Hon. R.I. LUCAS** (2 April).

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: The Treasurer has provided the following information:

1. The carryovers tabled relate to those items of expenditure and revenue deferred from 2001-02 into 2002-03. These carryovers are approved and finalised.
2. The movement in equity markets between now and 30 June 2003 cannot be predicted with any certainty. Treasury and Finance will continue to monitor the year to date returns on investment by Funds SA. In the 2003-04 Budget, the Government will update its assumption of earnings on investments for 2002-will update the Parliament on estimates of unfunded superannuation liabilities.

GENETICALLY MODIFIED FOOD

In reply to **Hon. IAN GILFILLAN** (1 April).

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: In relation to the transport of Victorian-grown GM canola into and through South Australia, I can advise that, should the Regulator issue a licence in time for any sowing of GM canola in 2003, that none will be transported into this State.

Details of the plans for release of GM Canola in 2003 are contained in documents such as the applications made by the Bayer CropScience and Monsanto for commercial licensing of their respective GM canola varieties.

These plans specifically state that in the initial year of commercial release that:

- Seed will only be offered to selected growers on a contract basis.
- All GM seed from these sowings will be harvested and sent to nominated receival points in NSW and Victoria dedicated to that purpose via transport that meets Australian Standards for load security.

All GM seed from the receival sites will be exported by a grain merchant to an arranged buyer—South Australia will not be the point of export for this grain.

It is pointless speculating about what might happen in any other year than 2003, as many things may change, including the regulatory climate here in SA, once the Government has had the benefit of the Report for the Select Committee on GMOs in another place.

In reply to **Hon. J.F. STEFANI** (1 April).

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: In relation to the honourable member's question about contamination occurring from experimental plantings of GM canola, and if so have they been reported to the department, I can advise the following.

Firstly, these experiments are conducted under a licence granted by the Office of the Gene Technology Regulator, not the Government of South Australia, under a national regulatory framework based on the Gene Technology Act 2000 (Cmth). The monitoring of these trial plots and their impacts is therefore the responsibility of, and a proper role of, the Regulator.

In the past the Regulator has notified the appropriate authority in this state of the occurrence of volunteer GM canola plants germinating in some plot areas in years following the trial plantings. In South Australia the proper authority is the Minister for Human Services, who is the state representative on the Gene Technology Ministerial Council. The occurrence of these volunteer plants, while a salutatory lesson in the need for vigilance, has not represented a risk of gene flow to neighbouring crops of canola as they were destroyed before they able to flower.

As for contamination of neighbouring crops by pollen from the trial plantings themselves, one needs to take into consideration the advice provided by Bayer CropScience in relation to their trial area in South Australia. This involves experimentation with their InVigor variety using a special hybridisation technique. The seed for these experiments is bred on-site. For their own crop purity and quality control reasons they have sought sites that are isolated from conventional canola to minimise the risk of contaminating their own seed production. This outcome would be mirrored in the risk that conventional canola in the district was also unlikely to be contaminated. Also, about 75 per cent of the GM canola grown within this trial area is summer grown under irrigation, and therefore represents no risk, as there are no non-GM canola crops flowering at the same time to enable gene flow to occur.

ROFE, Mr P.

In reply to **Hon. A.L. EVANS** (20 February).

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: The Hon. T.G. Roberts: The Attorney-General has provided the following information:

The government will not appoint an independent officer to oversee the functions or conduct of the DPP.

As I made clear in my Ministerial Statement to the House on 18 February, 2003, the South Australian DPP is, in common with the position in other jurisdictions, independent of direction or control by the Executive Government.

The issue of 'misbehaviour' is dealt with in section 4(8)(a) of that Act, which provides for termination of the DPP's appointment by the Governor on the ground of 'misbehaviour'. As I said in my Ministerial Statement to the House on 18 February, 2003, I have been advised by the Solicitor-General that Mr Rofe's conduct does not constitute grounds for statutory termination of his appointment.

Mr Rofe has also provided me with a written undertaking that during normal office hours he will:

- not engage in telephone betting, attend the TAB, purchase lottery scratch tickets or any other form of instant gambling, such as Keno;
- not actively obtain race results or access form guides;
- limit his time spent on lunch and coffee breaks.

In addition, Mr Rofe has agreed to undergo counselling about his gambling.

Any failure to meet the undertaking will be viewed seriously and is likely to be viewed as 'misbehaviour', not just because of the repetition of the behaviour but most importantly, because it would be a breach of his undertaking.

ROAD SAFETY STRATEGY

In reply to **Hon SANDRA KANCK** (5 December 2002).

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: The Minister for Transport has provided the following information:

1. *Are the circumstances where motorists disobey current laws relating to level crossings likely to be improved by increased policing and not just road signs?*

The government is committed to ensuring adequate policing with respect to level crossings. In addition, I am pursuing mechanisms to assist this resourcing issue through the use of photographic enforcement.

The final Vince Graham Report into the Salisbury Incident was released to the public on 7 January 2003 and I am actively pursuing all recommendations.

One of the recommendations of the report is the re-constituting of the State Level Crossing Strategy Advisory Committee. Accordingly, at my invitation, key stakeholders have nominated their representatives to be members of the Committee.

At the first meeting of the Committee held on 31 January 2003, terms of reference were discussed and the committee is currently preparing recommended terms for my approval. I expect the terms of reference to include, but not be limited to:

- Initiate a comprehensive short-term risk assessment of level crossing locations where traffic networks, systems and congestion may cause a queuing back of traffic onto rail level crossings
- Develop and implement risk management strategies including the potential for level crossing closures, standard traffic signage and pavement marking at all identified risk locations and put in place processes for the ongoing maintenance of this signage and markings.
- Develop a comprehensive database of all level crossings within South Australia including road and rail factors, risk assessment and risk mitigation actions.
- Develop enforcement strategies to influence driver behaviour on SA level crossings
- Assess the technical viability of photo enforcement for road traffic queuing on rail level crossings and make recommendations to government as a priority.

In addition, I have asked Transport SA to establish a Level Crossing Unit to assist the Committee to expedite Mr Graham's recommendations.

2. *Has he reviewed the literature, including internet resources on the Operation Lifesaver project (including the statistical information that shows its effectiveness in the US and Canada)?*

The literature and other information on Operation Lifesaver is being reviewed by a number of organisations including Transport SA and, I understand, the rail industry. In addition, I expect that the Level Crossing Unit will review the literature associated with this initiative to enable the State Level Crossing Strategy Advisory Committee to brief me on the effectiveness of this initiative.

3. *Is he aware that as recently as March 2001 the Seventh International Symposium on Railroad Highway Grade Crossing Safety and Research was held at Monash University and that Gerri L Hall, President, Operation Lifesaver Incorporated, presented a paper outlining the success in the US of this campaign? Has he considered obtaining a copy of Mr Hall's paper as a cheaper alternative to sending a group to visit?*

I am aware that the Seventh International Symposium on Railroad Highway Grade Crossing Safety and Research was held during early 2001. The symposium was well attended by representatives from South Australia, and I understand those that attended have obtained copies of the symposium papers.

4. *How many people would be involved in the tour and what is their current expertise in the area?*

5. *What is the projected cost for the proposed interstate and overseas fact-finding tour for fares and accommodation?*

6. *Does he consider that the cost of an interstate and overseas fact-finding mission on level crossing safety could be better spent on increased enforcement of current laws in South Australia?*

Whilst the interim Vince Graham report recommended that a small group visit appropriate interstate, USA and Canadian organisations to inspect best practice facilities, the final report advocates a coordinated national approach to researching and reviewing international best practice initiatives such as 'Operation Lifesaver'. I will be advocating this approach through Australian Transport Council and Standing Committee On Transport. The adoption of this approach is likely to obviate the need for a South Australian group to travel overseas.

In reply to **Hon. A.J. REDFORD.**

Will the minister advise whether any minister or member of parliament will be participating in that trip?

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: Refer to the answer above for questions 4, 5 and 6.

WESTERN DOMICILIARY CARE

In reply to **Hon. KATE REYNOLDS** (24 March).

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: The Minister for Health has provided the following information:

1. The Dunn Report has not been tabled because of unresolved issues about named individuals. The contents are being acted upon. 19 specific areas for remedy have been identified and actions are being taken by the Metropolitan Domiciliary Care Service.
2. The Mildren Report contains sensitive information about named individuals that I am considering.
3. No action on criminal charges or recouping of funds has been taken.
4. There are 19 specific areas that have been identified for action. A new structure of governance for the new service, Metropolitan Domiciliary Care which incorporates the previous Western Domiciliary Care Service has been set up.

HANCOCK ROAD

In reply to **Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS** (23 October 2002 and 19 March 2003).

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: The Minister for Transport has provided the following information:

1. *Why has the entire Hancock Road upgrade come to a halt?*
It was necessary for Transport SA and the City of Tea Tree Gully to review the project to re-evaluate its scope. Agreement between Transport SA and Council has now been reached on cost sharing arrangements and the project can proceed.
2. *Will the government ensure that its share of funding for the project will be provided and that the already delayed upgrade will be completed without any further delays or inconvenience to traffic on this major route?*
Transport SA will provide its share of funding for the Hancock Road upgrade. It is anticipated that construction will recommence in April 2003.
3. *Will the minister provide information to the north-eastern suburbs community about this project as a matter of urgency?*
Transport SA and the City of Tea Tree Gully have undertaken a joint community information program. This included media advertisements in the local 'Messenger', direct mail to residents and public displays at the City of Tea Tree Gully office.

ADELAIDE HILLS WINERIES

In reply to **Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY** (20 February).

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: The Minister for Environment and Conservation has advised that:

The Mt Lofty Ranges Watershed is of critical environmental significance being the source of about 60 per cent of Adelaide's potable water supply. The Government is committed to protection of the Watershed and particularly to careful maintenance of an appropriate balance between economic development and containment of risk to our catchment and reservoirs.

In April 2002, Eco Management Services Pty Ltd and subcontractors were engaged by the Environment Protection Authority to conduct a study of the water pollution risks associated with winery, cellar door sales and restaurant developments outside of towns in the Watershed. The study was designed to focus on existing developments and a range of possible future development scenarios. The study was to be undertaken in three stages. The first stage involved information gathering and development of the risk assessment methodology. The second stage involved conducting the water quality risk assessment while the third stage will involve assessment of the planning and infrastructure implications of any potentially viable development scenarios derived from the second stage.

1. The report of the second stage of the study was completed in February 2003. This is the report referred to by the Hon Ridgway.

The Hon. Ridgway states that the study found that the risk of environmental damage to the Adelaide Hills is less than 1 in 10,000. The finding was, in fact, as follows: 'There is an unacceptable risk of spills entering watercourses from at least two existing wineries in the watershed. However, through the adoption of best management practices and retrofitting existing wineries with detention basins to contain any spills, the probable frequency of spills entering watercourses could be reduced to less than 1 in 10,000 years'.

A considerable amount of work and continuing stringent controls are required to achieve an acceptable water quality risk at existing wineries let alone any potential future wineries in the Watershed.

The report into the second stage of the study has been given in confidence to the members of the steering committee, which includes the Adelaide Hills Wine Region Inc representing Adelaide Hills wineries.

The third stage of the study is being developed. Progression to this stage will enable the broader planning, socio-economic impacts associated with a possible expansion of winery and ancillary activities in the watershed to be properly considered along with the water quality risks. Little would be gained by making a partly completed study available to the public.

2. Development in the Adelaide Hills will not be affected by maintaining the report's confidentiality at this stage. Relevant stakeholders, including the wine industry, have been advised of the content of the report.

3. The report has not been released for public discussion as the study has not been completed. Relevant stakeholders such as the local wineries that need to know details of the study so far, have access to the findings of the report to enable them to consider early management options.

GOVERNMENT SERVICES REPORT

In reply to **Hon. R.D. LAWSON** (19 February).

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: I advise the following:

It is difficult to draw any significant conclusion from the particular data referred to. The rate of recidivism, as calculated by the Department for Correctional Services is actually a measure of many factors. Fundamentally the data measure the percentage of persons returning to Correctional Supervision within a two-year window of release after a period of Correctional Supervision. From this calculation however there is no way to arrive at any statistic that might indicate:

- the success of police effort in detecting and arresting previous offenders;
- the number of offenders who did not receive a Department for Correctional Services sanction;
- the success rate of the Department's rehabilitation programs;
- whether an offender has moved interstate and committed a further crime elsewhere; or,
- whether or not there is any measurable rehabilitation success difference that can be linked to the type of sentence passed by the Courts.

The Productivity Commission accepts that recidivism is an outcome measure of the effectiveness of the Criminal Justice System as a whole. For this reason the rate of recidivism that is published in the report on Government Services has always been placed within the Justice Preface of the COAG document (page C15 in the 2003 document), not in the Corrections Section of the Report.

The Attorney-General has provided the following information:
Courts Administration Authority

1. Reasons for a Lower Rate of Conviction in the South Australian Higher Courts.

I do not believe that the Authority can be expected to answer this question. It is a question that requires research that be beyond the charter of the Courts or the Authority. However, you might wish to note that the ABS reports into the activities of the Higher Court Criminal Jurisdictions across Australia have shown that South Australia has the highest rate of initial Not Guilty pleas.

2. Reasons for the South Australian District Court having the highest cost per Criminal Disposal in Australia

An examination of the gross costs of each Jurisdiction indicates that, on a per-head-of-population basis, the cost of South Australia's District Court is comparable to that of equivalent courts in other States.

This means that the difference in cost per disposal is primarily caused by a difference in the number of disposals per head of population.

In the New South Wales District Court, the 2003 report indicates:

- 3856 non-appeal disposals
- 5367 appeal disposals

In Victoria, the comparable figures are:

- 1831 non-appeal disposals
- 1650 appeal disposals

By contrast, the South Australian District Court does not deal with appeal matters and in 2002-03 finalised 1192 non-appeal matters. Appeals are heard much more quickly and the large number

of appeals in Victoria and New South Wales inflates their disposals and deflates their cost per disposal.

In Queensland there are obviously important differences (when compared with other States) in non-appeal activity and in the way they count disposals. At face value, Queensland's Court workload is by far the highest in the country (including a much higher level than New South Wales). This is not able to be explained.

There is a similar, but not as severe, situation in Western Australia. The 2003 report shows that its District Court disposed of 2988 non-appeal matters and, like South Australia, no appeal matters. This is 2.5 times South Australia's number of disposals—again, a number that is impossible to explain on a population comparison.

Motor Vehicle Theft

The Productivity Commission's report on government services indicates that during 2001 calendar year South Australia recorded the highest rate of motor vehicle theft (per 100,000 population) in Australia. Specifically, the report indicated that South Australia had a recorded vehicle theft rate of 842.9 thefts per 100,000 population compared to the Australian average of 722.0. The source of this statistic is the Australian Bureau of Statistics' publication 'Recorded Crime, Australia, 2001' Catalogue No. 4510.0.

There are a number of factors that explain South Australia's high rate of vehicle theft namely:

1. Statistics from the Australian Bureau (ABS) confirm that South Australia has the oldest vehicle fleet in mainland Australia. The 2002 Vehicle Census reveals that the average age of a passenger vehicle in South Australia is 11.7 years, which is 18 months older than the Australian average. The impact of this age differential means that in South Australia 48.2 per cent of our passenger fleet was built before 1991 (when immobilisers were introduced into Australian manufactured vehicles) compared to only 38.4 per cent throughout the rest of the country. Thus, there is a significantly larger proportion of vehicles in South Australia that are not fitted the latest security devices such as engine immobilisers, deadlocks etc., and are therefore less protected from vehicle theft. One consequence of an older fleet is that the value of many of these older than post-1991 cars is such that owners are reluctant to spend the money required to fit engine immobilisers to reduce the risk of theft.

2. In addition to having a very old vehicle fleet, South Australia has the highest rate of passenger vehicle ownership in Australia. The ABS' 2002 Vehicle Census indicates that in South Australia there are 567 vehicles registered per 1,000 people compared to a national average of 514. Therefore, not only is there a larger proportion of older unprotected vehicles in South Australia, but also a greater number of potential theft targets from which thieves can choose. The National Motor Vehicle Theft Reduction Council's (NMVTRC) 2001-02 'National CARS Report' reveals that expressed as a rate per 10,000 registrations, South Australia's had a theft rate of 114.4 which is lower than both New South Wales (123.7) and the Australian Capital Territory (117.7).

3. Although South Australia's vehicle theft problems are higher than we would like, South Australia does have the highest recovery rate in mainland Australia. For example, the National CARS report indicates that during the 2001-02 financial year South Australia recorded a recovery rate of 89.0 per cent compared to the Australian average of 79.0 per cent. It also reveals that almost two thirds of all vehicles were recovered within two days. This suggests that South Australia's vehicle theft problem is more to do with opportunistic theft and probably related to the large quantity of older unprotected vehicles. By contrast, the statistics also suggest that South Australia's level of professional theft is roughly 50 per cent lower than the Australian average.

4. More recent statistics suggest that South Australia's level of vehicle theft has fallen during 2002. Statistics due to be released shortly by the NMVTRC indicate that during the 2002 calendar year, South Australia recorded an 11.5 per cent reduction in motor vehicle theft. Based on this more recent 2002 data, South Australia's vehicle theft rate is now at 694.7 per 100,000 population, compared to the 842.9 during the 2001 year quoted in the Productivity Commission's report.

The Minister for Police has provided the following information:

The Report on Government Services is compiled by the Secretariat for the Productivity Commission, through the Steering Committee for the Review of Commonwealth/State Service Provision.

When allocating the mix of activities to Service Delivery Areas (SDA), jurisdictions are able to exercise a significant degree of discretion with respect to those activities that are included or

excluded from the SDA. This depends on their organisational structures and approach to service delivery. As a consequence, there can be variations between the mix of activities included in a particular SDA by jurisdiction.

In the Northern Territory, the SDA of 'crime investigation' includes categories of 'personal safety, property crime and illicit substances', whereas in South Australia, the SDA of 'crime investigation' does not include all these activities as some are included in the SDA of 'community safety and support'.

This variation is highlighted in the Report by the inclusion of a footnote stating that 'for SA, the crime investigation activities exclude a wide range of crime prevention, reduction and response activities'.

It is for this reason that the Report cautions against comparison between jurisdictions given variations in counting rules and in reporting the mix of activities for particular SDAs.

SAPOL has applied a consistent methodology to completing the Report on Government Services over past years, with the relative apportionment of funding between 'crime investigation' and 'community safety and support' remaining stable over the past few years.

It should also be noted that funding arrangements for police services are different in the Northern Territory than for South Australia. Northern Territory funding reflects a larger allocation of funding per capita within a tri-service structure of police, fire and emergency services. On this basis, the total Northern Territory expenditure across all SDAs in the category of 'Police Services' is listed at \$541 per person. The relevant data for other States and Territories ranges from \$225 per person in Victoria to \$260 per person in Western Australia. As a consequence, it is difficult to compare Northern Territory funding with any other jurisdiction.

The issue of the number of police raised by the Hon Robert Lawson (quoted as 31 police officers for every 10000 people) requires clarification. For the year 2001-02, the correct SA data is 244 sworn (police) and 64 unsworn staff per 100,000 persons. The Australian average is 218 sworn and 63 unsworn staff per 100,000 persons respectively.

ROFE, Mr P.

In reply to **Hon. A.J. REDFORD** (19 February).

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: The Attorney-General has provided the following information:

1. No.
2. As presently advised, the Government does not intend to undertake an independent assessment of the performance of the DPP's office.
3. In the period 1 September, 2001, to 28 February, 2003, 15 people have left the Office of the DPP. Of these, eight were legal officers, six were administrative officers and one was a professional services officer. These staff members left for a variety of reasons, including contracts expiring or not being renewed, promotion, transfer and resignation.
4. Yes. The members for Mount Gambier and Chaffey have raised concerns with me about the DPP and the DPP's office. Also public servants and lawyers, both public and private, have told me the DPP has been affected by a stroke he suffered in 1999. The member for Mount Gambier raised his concerns about the DPP with the Hon. K.T. Griffin when he was Attorney-General.

I have also been told by a number of people that the DPP and his office perform well. For instance, the questioner has told me that the Office of the DPP 'runs on the smell of an oily rag', which I took to be a commendation of its efficiency within difficult budgetary constraints.

5. I do not consider that giving directions or furnishing guidelines to the DPP on the issue of potential 'misbehaviour', as expressed in 4(8)(a) of the Director of Public Prosecutions Act, 1991, is an appropriate use of section 9(2) of the Act. 'Misbehaviour' is dealt with in section 4(8)(a), which provides for termination of the DPP's appointment by the Governor on the ground of 'misbehaviour'. As I said in my Ministerial Statement to the House on 18 February, 2003, I have been advised by the Solicitor-General that Mr Rofe's conduct does not constitute grounds for statutory termination of his appointment.

Mr Rofe has also provided me with a written undertaking that during normal office hours he will:

- not engage in telephone betting, attend the TAB, purchase lottery scratch tickets or any other form of instant gambling such as Keno;

- not actively obtain race results or access form guides;
- limit his time spent on lunch and coffee breaks.

In addition, Mr Rofe has agreed to undergo counselling about his gambling.

Any failure to meet the undertaking will be viewed seriously and is likely to be viewed as 'misbehaviour', not just because of the repetition of the behaviour, but, most importantly, because it would be a breach of his undertaking.

STED SCHEMES

In reply to **Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS** (18 February).

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: The Minister Assisting in Government Enterprises has advised that:

1. This Government is committed to improving the management of natural resources in rural South Australian communities through the use of effective waste water systems.

The Minister Assisting in Government Enterprises will examine the proposal as part of the 2003-04 Budget process amongst the many competing infrastructure priorities presented to the Government.

WASTE WATER, RECYCLING

In reply to **Hon T.G. CAMERON** (18 February).

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: The Minister Assisting in Government Enterprises has advised:

1. The document 'Vision for Reuse of Waste Water' is not as stated by Mr Cameron a 'western metropolitan council study'. That document is a summary document prepared solely by the City of West Torrens with the stated aim to 'initiate discussion of sustainable solutions to the problems resulting from stormwater and effluent discharge from the central metropolitan coast to the Gulf of St Vincent'.

A considerably more detailed study was prepared by a consultant in 1999 for a Steering Committee comprising western metropolitan councils, Local Government Association, Patawalonga Catchment Management Board and SA Water.

That study, entitled 'Glenelg WWTP Effluent Reuse Report—Feasibility Study for Extending Reuse of Effluent from Glenelg WWTP and Harvesting Stormwater' has become a public document. At least one copy resides in the Parliamentary Library.

An initial project has been undertaken following on from that report. A combined filtration and UV disinfection plant, costing approximately \$1.0 million has been constructed at Glenelg WWTP. This plant treats nearly half the effluent supplied to irrigation from the treatment plant to Class A standard, improving the overall utilisation of this effluent.

2. The study 'Glenelg WWTP Effluent Reuse Report—Feasibility Study for Extending Reuse of Effluent from Glenelg WWTP and Harvesting Stormwater' did contain an estimate of \$0.65 per kilolitre (not \$0.55/kL) for the cost of reuse water for the scheme proposed. However it was recognised in the study that further work was necessary to refine costs. A somewhat simplistic analysis that ignored depreciation and other key cost components was used to derive the cost. It was inadequate for the preparation of a full business case.

3. SA Water's commitment to wastewater recycling and reduction in discharges to the Gulf of St Vincent is demonstrated by a number of projects, including projects costing more than \$100 million to cease discharge from Port Adelaide treatment works, and to separate high salinity effluent to enhance the opportunities for reuse from the upgraded Bolivar plant. Substantial reuse schemes already exist from the Glenelg and Christies Beach plants.

SA Water is moving toward targets of 30 per cent reuse from metropolitan plants (at 15.1 per cent as at June 2002).

4. The \$1.8 million study 'Waterproofing Adelaide' will address considerably wider issues than the study 'Glenelg WWTP Effluent Reuse Report—Feasibility Study for Extending Reuse of Effluent from Glenelg WWTP and Harvesting Stormwater'. It will examine total water demand across all of metropolitan Adelaide, and wastewater and stormwater issues over a wider area than that covered in the previous study.

The stated aim of the City of West Torrens' April 2000 paper was to 'initiate discussion of sustainable solutions to the problems resulting from stormwater and effluent discharge from the central metropolitan coast into Gulf St Vincent'. SA Water is therefore confident that Council would be supportive of the Waterproofing Adelaide initiative as it is intended to advance discussion of issues

related to stormwater and effluent discharge to the Gulf. As well as that it will evaluate future options for water supply to Adelaide by examining the relative merits of using stormwater and recycled wastewater compared with ongoing use of River Murray water.

5. The then Chief Executive of SA Water chose not to release the summary document to which you refer for public comment. For this reason he sought the return of copies of the summary document.

SA Water, in conjunction with United Water, has recently commenced a feasibility study of opportunities for further recycled water schemes including potential use of stormwater, in the metropolitan area. This includes re-evaluating the potential for further re-use from Glenelg Wastewater Treatment Plant

An overview of this recent work was presented at the Local Government Forum on 11 March 2003.

FLINDERS UNIVERSITY HEALTH AND COUNSELLING SERVICE

In reply to **Hon. SANDRA KANCK** (18 February).

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: The Minister for Employment, Further Education & Training has provided the following:

The Parliament has established the State's universities as corporate bodies with the power to make decisions in their own right. The questions raised are internal decision-making matters and are more appropriately handled by University management.

I am confident that the Flinders University has acted responsibly in regard to maintaining the student health and counselling services. The external review of the service consulted broadly with students and staff and the University has made its decisions commensurate with the best advice.

MOBILONG PRISON

In reply to **Hon. R.D. LAWSON** (17 February).

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: I advise the following:

1. *How much of the \$2.8m of proposed expenditure will, in fact, be incurred on this project in this current financial year?*

The projected expenditure in 2002-03 is expected to be in the vicinity of \$200 000. However, additional expenditure may be incurred dependent on progress achieved.

2. *When will construction begin?*

Construction is scheduled to commence in the second half of 2003.

3. *What is the estimated date of completion?*

Commissioning is expected in July 2004.

4. *What is the reason for the delay in this project?*

When Mobilong was first identified as a possible site for the construction of 50 new prison beds, the Department for Correctional Services commenced detailed planning to determine the most efficient and effective strategy for configuring, resourcing and using those beds.

In January of this year I announced that the additional beds would be placed at Mobilong in consultation with key stakeholders. The time required for planning and consultation naturally can vary in projects of this nature and that has been the case in this project. I expect that within reason, the time needed for an appropriate process with respect to proper procurement and consultation in key projects such as this should be taken to get the best result and value for money outcome.

TAXIS

In reply to **Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW** (5 December 2002).

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: The Minister for Transport has provided the following information:

1. Yes the Government is intending to implement the policy.

2. As the Honourable Member is aware by the detail of her questions, allowing taxis to use Bus Lanes in peak hours raises a number of legislative and technical issues. Transport SA is working through these issues to ensure the government policy is implemented.

The timing for implementation, is dependent upon resolution of these issues. It is not expected that a trial will be necessary.

3. Consultation with the PTB and bus operators is considered essential to determine the implications for bus services. Transport SA has been liaising with the PTB regarding this policy initiative. As Transport SA's investigations progress, formal consultation will occur with the PTB and bus operators.

Furthermore, the Premier's Taxi Council has been briefed recently on this issue. The Council has been established by the

Premier to provide high-level advice on issues impacting on the taxi industry in South Australia.

4. The ultimate cost will be dependant on the technical solution adopted.

EQUAL OPPORTUNITY

In reply to **Hon. R.D. LAWSON** (20 November, 2002).

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: I have received this advice from the Attorney-General:

1. The Attorney-General and Minister for Social Justice have agreed to collaborate in the job of reviewing both the Equal Opportunity Act and releasing a discussion paper on same-sex couple law reform.

The review into removal of discrimination against same-sex couples deals with some 54 different Acts of the South Australian Parliament and seeks comment on matters broader than reforms only to the Equal Opportunity Act. The public have been invited to comment and the period for submissions ended on the 7 April, 2003.

2. The framework paper will consider many aspects of the 1994 Martin Report including those not included in a Bill to amend the Equal Opportunity Act that passed the Legislative Council in 2001. A discussion of the Bill passed by the Legislative Council in 2001 will be incorporated in the paper.

The Government considers amendments to the Equal Opportunity Act merit public discussion and debate, therefore we will seek comment on potential amendments to the Equal Opportunity Act, as well as the recommendations of the report of Mr Martin in 1994.

3. The Government intends to carry out policies to introduce legislative amendments addressing unjustified discrimination against same-sex couples after an examination of the submissions in response to the discussion paper.

4. The Review Group, of which the Commissioner for Equal Opportunity is a member, has asked the Commissioner to provide specific information about the response times for complaints. This information will be provided in the course of the review as part of the Review Group's enquiries.

ROAD SAFETY CONTRACTS

In reply to **Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW** (14 November 2002).

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: The Minister for Transport has provided the following information:

1. Currently there are 26 community road safety groups. They have all received an administration grant of \$500.00 and have received notification of their community road safety grant, which is being administered by Transport SA.

2. The Mount Gambier and Districts Road Safety Group introduced the 'Home Safely' program in May 2002, for which Transport SA provided a grant of \$4900. This operated in Mount Gambier High School over terms three and four in 2002 and is currently being evaluated by the Group. All community road safety groups work closely with the South Australia Police in their areas. Furthermore, South Australia Police have initiated many programs and road safety initiatives in collaboration with their local community road safety group.

The Mount Gambier and Districts Road Safety Group undertook the survival contract as its own project and it is understood that other community road groups are contemplating promoting these contracts as a means of involving youth and the community in road safety.

3. The concept of a 'Driving Contract' has been used in a number of locations in the United States of America (eg. Maine, New York and Georgia) and numerous samples of driving contracts can be obtained from the Internet. Driving contracts contain various conditions that are agreed to by both the teenager and the parent(s) and which offer alternatives to high risk driving or when a passenger is with a high risk driver. Some driving contracts include family sanctioned withdrawal of driving privileges for breaches of the conditions that are not enforceable at law. Additional conditions that pertain to the family circumstances also can be included on an individual need basis.

Driving contracts can be used either between parties, within a family, or between management and an employee within a company, without the need for any involvement of licensing authorities or other Government agencies. However, all drivers of motor vehicles, when applying and qualifying for a driver's licence, are effectively accepting an agreement with the community through the licensing authority, that they are responsible for the operation of a motor vehicle without danger to the public and to comply with all road

rules. Any additional driving contracts would extend the conditions of use of vehicles for specific circumstances or purposes that are generally not covered directly by legislation.

Some possible benefits of family-based driving contracts could be to improve communication between parents and teenagers in regard to the conditions of use of a vehicle, so long as teenage drivers are living with the family. However, there is little research available indicating that the use of driving contracts provides tangible road safety benefits.

Rather than requiring the licensing authority to administer driving contracts, they would be more effectively promoted through the insurance industry (possibly accompanied by insurance rebates), high schools (for using a vehicle to travel to and from school), Police and local community road safety groups (through Community Service Clubs), rather than the licensing authority. In particular, the SA Police Youth Driver Education Program and community road safety groups that are involved with local schools would be able to provide the necessary educational support when introducing driving contracts to youth, and in fostering the necessary acceptance by their families, in order for the concept to work.

SUPERANNUATION LIABILITIES

In reply to **Hon. R.I. LUCAS** (19 February).

The Hon P HOLLOWAY: The Deputy Premier, and Treasurer has provided the following information:

1. The increase in unfunded superannuation liabilities in the 2002-03 mid year review compared to the 2002-03 budget was \$448 million. Estimates of these liabilities as at 30 June 2003 increased from \$3,883 million as at the 2002-03 budget to \$4,331 million in the 2002-03 mid year review. The increase in unfunded liabilities due to lower than expected investment earnings was referred to on page 5 of the mid-year budget review.

The \$1 billion increase mentioned by the Honourable member arises from comparing the estimated level of unfunded superannuation liabilities for 30 June 2002 (\$3,314 million) as presented in the 2001-02 mid year review, with the estimated level of unfunded superannuation liabilities for 30 June 2003 (\$4,331 million), as presented in the 2002-03 mid year review. This comparison ignores the fact that the government has updated its estimates of unfunded liabilities twice since the 2001-02 mid year review (2002-03 Budget and 2001-02 Budget Results). In both cases the government fully disclosed the increased level of liabilities and reasons for the increases.

The increase in unfunded superannuation liabilities was disclosed in the 2002-03 Budget with specific reference given to the \$385 million impact of lower than budgeted earnings (see pages 1.11, 3.22 and parts of Chapter 6 from the 2002-03 Budget Statement). The increase was disclosed also, in the 2001-02 Budget Results. The mid year review also made reference to the increase in nominal superannuation interest expenses arising from lower than expected earnings by Funds SA (page 2) and the increase in unfunded superannuation liabilities (page 5).

2. The mid-year review is a Government document presented by the Treasurer. Accordingly, a draft of the document is considered by the Treasurer before being released.

3. I can report a number of key performance indicators for Funds SA. Because Funds SA has a long-term investment strategy, its investment performance is best measured over the longer term. For the eight years to 31 December 2002, Funds SA's defined benefit product returned 7.9 per cent per annum, 5.1 per cent in excess of the rate of inflation and 0.6 per cent in excess of its real return target.

A short-term indicator of Funds SA's performance is its investment return measured against applicable benchmarks. The applicable benchmark is defined as the return recorded by the relevant market index for each of the markets in which Funds SA invests, weighted by the strategic allocation to that market.

The following table shows that for all Funds SA's products, its investment performance outperformed benchmarks for both the last six months and for the last twelve months (and for the 10 months from 1 March 2002).

Investment Returns vs Benchmark
Periods to December 2002

	6 Months	10 Months	1 Year
	%	%	%
Funds SA 'Defined Benefit'	-3.9	-7.6	-8.2
Benchmark	-4.8	-9.3	-10.1
Value added above benchmark	0.9	1.7	1.9
Funds SA 'Balanced'	-2.5	-5.5	-5.9

Benchmark	-3.4	-7.1	-7.8
Value added	0.9	1.6	1.9
Funds SA 'Growth'	-5.6	-10.2	-11.1
Benchmark	-6.3	-11.7	-12.8
Value added	0.7	1.5	1.7
Funds SA 'Conservative'	1.8	1.0	1.4
Benchmark	0.9	-0.2	-0.1
Value added	0.9	1.2	1.5
Inflation	1.4	N/A	3.0

Funds SA's defined benefits product has also exhibited sound performance relative to other funds in the Australian superannuation marketplace. In comparisons adjusting for differential tax treatments (to ensure 'like for like' comparisons), for one and five year periods ending 31 December 2002, Funds SA's defined benefit product performed better than the median surveyed fund from a William M Mercer survey of 40 'balanced funds'. For the one-year period to 31 December 2002, the William M Mercer survey median fell by 7.3 per cent compared to a fall of 7.1 per cent for Funds SA's defined benefits product (adjusted for tax). Funds SA's balanced product (adjusted for tax) fell by 5.1 per cent over the same period.

In summary, given the very difficult market environment of recent times, Funds SA's investment performance has been superior to benchmark and superior to the majority of other funds managers.

4. For all Funds SA's products, investment performance outperformed benchmarks over the ten months from 1 March 2002 to 31 December 2002. Refer to the table provided for the previous question for figures.

5. The movement in equity markets between now and 30 June 2003 cannot be predicted with any certainty. However, international equity markets have generally performed poorly since the Mid Year Review was released. Treasury and Finance will continue to monitor the year to date returns on investment by Funds SA. In the 2003-04 Budget, the Government will update its assumption of earnings on investments for 2002-03 and will update the Parliament on estimates of unfunded superannuation liabilities.

YUMBARRA NATIONAL PARK

In reply to **Hon. J.F. STEFANI** (24 March).

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: The honourable member asked me to provide the house with the number of Mineral Exploration Licences issued since the Labor Government took office.

The Labor Party formed Government in SA on 6 March 2002. Between that date and 26 March 2003, the Government issued 169 exploration licences for minerals.

ABALONE FISHERY

In reply to **Hon. T.J. STEPHENS** (24 March).

The Hon P HOLLOWAY:

1. The Fisheries Act, 1982 under Section 44 covers 'Offences with respect to the sale, purchase and possession of fish'. Any person, who sells or purchases fish taken in waters to which the Fisheries Act applies, but not pursuant to a license, is guilty of an offence.

For offences involving abalone the penalty for the sale or purchase of abalone draws a Division 1 fine, being a maximum of \$60,000, or a Division 5 imprisonment, being 2 years, or both.

Section 66 of the Fisheries Act allows further penalties to be applied, based on the value of the fish taken unlawfully. An amount 5 times the amount determined by the convicting court to be the wholesale value of the fish at the time at which the offence was committed; or \$30,000, whichever is the lesser amount.

The Department of Primary Industries and Resources (PIRSA) Fisheries have had success recently with the apprehension of abalone poachers in the South East. Two men were recently given a three month suspended jail sentence after pleading guilty to various abalone offences, including the charge of taking abalone for sale. In this particular instance, the two men were in possession of 55 abalone, being a prescribed commercial quantity, 45 above the legal bag limit of five per person.

The two men each received a three-month suspended jail sentence in addition to each being fined \$5,555 including court costs and charges.

PIRSA Fisheries have also detected three separate instances of reef pickers taking abalone from the protected intertidal reef areas of the southern suburbs over the last couple of months, in addition to the seizure of a significant illegal haul of abalone taken from the

vicinity of Cape Elizabeth. These alleged offences are yet to be heard in court, but briefs are in the process of being completed.

In terms of penalties handed down by courts, it is up to the Judiciary to consider each case on the evidence presented, taking into consideration the severity of the alleged breach, prior to determining an appropriate penalty.

The current Fisheries Act does allow for penalties up to a maximum of \$90,000 (which includes the additional penalty of \$30,000) and 2 years jail. However, it is up to the convicting court to determine the appropriate penalty.

2. The current review of the *Fisheries Act 1982* will examine the level of penalties and their use as a deterrence factor to counter the illegal possession and sale of fish, including abalone poaching.

MAGNESITE EXPLORATION

In reply to **Hon. SANDRA KANCK** (previously Hon. M.J. Elliott) (28 November 2002).

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: SAMAG recently announced that it intended to focus its exploration effort on an area, known locally as Collaby Hill, at the southern extremity of the Southern Flinders Ranges. This area is approximately 10 km south of the Beetaloo Valley area, which, as the honourable member mentioned, is causing some concern amongst the local residents. A public meeting was held on 21 January 2003 to form a Community Focus Group to resolve community issues relating to exploration and potential mining in the Southern Flinders area. The committee consists of a broad cross-section of the community, including Beetaloo Valley residents, local landowners, including the owners of an adjacent quarry and also local Council representatives.

1. At the time the government assistance was committed, SAMAG held a number of mining leases with proven ore reserves in the Leigh Creek area as well as two Exploration Licences in the Southern Flinders Ranges, east of Port Pirie.

The government has provided a commitment of \$25 million towards the provision of infrastructure facilities to the Port Pirie regional area in general, not specifically to the SAMAG project. The money will be allocated to develop roads, power and water access to the Port Pirie Industrial Park, which has the potential to attract down stream processing industries and other commercial ventures to the area.

2. Whilst the bankable feasibility study shows the SAMAG operation to be financially sound utilising magnesite ore sourced from mining leases near Leigh Creek, I am advised that SAMAG is currently investigating the potential to reduce mining costs, which include the costs of transport to the magnesium plant at Port Pirie.

3. Before any mining can take place in the Southern Flinders area, an exhaustive approval process must be followed.

The Exploration Licences taken out by SAMAG over this area of the Southern Flinders Ranges allow for low impact geoscientific investigations, such as the review of geological data, geological mapping and surface rock sampling.

Before SAMAG may undertake any ground disturbing activities such as trenching or exploratory drilling, further approval would be required from the Minerals, Petroleum and Energy Division of the Department of Primary Industries and Resources (PIRSA). This would involve the preparation of a Declaration of Environmental Factors addressing the impact of these activities and appropriate rehabilitation measures.

In the event that SAMAG proposes to proceed to mining, requiring the grant of a Mining Lease, a comprehensive environmental impact assessment process involving input from the community and local interest groups, as well as Government agencies and industry must take place before such a lease could be granted.

In addition, the exploration area lies within the Southern Flinders planning zone. The Development Act 1993 requires any application for a mining production tenement in this zone to be referred to the Minister for Urban Development and Planning for advice. The Planning Minister, or the Minister for Mineral Resources Development, may consider the proposal to be of major social, economic or environmental significance and therefore require an Environmental Impact Statement for assessment of the application.

SAMAG has not applied for approval to carry out any specific exploration drilling or sampling programs. The Minerals, Petroleum and Energy Division of PIRSA is committed to monitoring the development of this project to ensure all due consideration is given to potential impacts on the environment and the concerns of the community are fully taken into account.

The Minister for Environment and Conservation has provided the following information:

4. The government does have a policy of identifying government land holdings (including those of Forestry SA), and where appropriate, transferring those holding to National Parks and Wildlife SA. There are no current plans for the amalgamation of Telowie Gorge Conservation Park and the Wirrabara Forest (referred to as the Range Forest Reserve).

CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION

In reply to **Hon. A.L. EVANS** (16 July 2002).

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: The Attorney-General has provided the following information:

1. The citizens will learn about constitutional and parliamentary issues from a range of experts who will present background information as well as answer the specific questions of the citizens at the Convention. The experts will be chosen so that together, they will represent a balance of opinion on the issues to be considered at the Convention.

The randomly selected citizens will be sent a copy of the Constitutional Convention Discussion Paper as background reading before they attend the Convention. The unit cost of the Discussion Paper is around \$3.50.

2. \$250,000

3. A representative random sample of the South Australian population will be selected to attend the Convention by standard sample survey procedures.

One criteria for selection is that attendees must be on the electoral roll.

4. To consider the issues specific to the 5 Questions in the Discussion Paper.

To provide a report for the Parliament on the findings of the Convention.

The terms of reference have been set by the Parliamentary Steering Committee

5. There is no Constitutional Advisory Board.

Members of the Discussion Paper panel of experts were: Dr Clement Macintyre, Chairman, Senior Lecturer in Politics, University of Adelaide; The Hon. Trevor Griffin, Former Attorney-General for South Australia; Associate Professor Peter Howell, Author, former Head of History Department, Flinders University; The Hon. Len King AC QC, Former Attorney-General for South Australia and former Chief Justice of Supreme Court of South Australia; Dr Geoffrey Partington, Author and Visiting Scholar, School of Education, Flinders University; Professor Judith Sloan, Economist, Productivity Commissioner, Board Member of the Australian Broadcasting Corporation; Dr Jenny Tilby Stock, Former Lecturer in Politics and currently Visiting Research Fellow, University of Adelaide; Professor Emeritus Geoffrey Walker, Constitutional Lawyer, former Professor of Law, University of Queensland.

DAIRY INDUSTRY

In reply to **Hon. CAROLINE SCHAEFER** (17 February 2003).

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: I undertook to obtain an update on progress with negotiations on funding for rehabilitation of the Lower Murray Reclaimed Irrigation Areas. The Minister for the River Murray has advised that:

- the proposed public contribution to the restructuring and rehabilitation of the 27 reclaimed irrigation areas in the Lower Murray is \$22m, which is a significant commitment towards the future of the dairy industry in this region;
- some areas will not be viable to rehabilitate, being too high cost or too low productivity to warrant the investment;
- also, some irrigators are understood to want to sell water and retire from the industry, and have only been 'holding on' until their new water allocations are issued later this year;
- to avoid wasted investment it is essential that we allow a period of restructuring before we proceed with rehabilitation, so irrigators can make land use and ownership changes to reduce costs, and/or to retire land or from farming if that is their choice;
- some of the public funding will be used to facilitate restructuring over the next 12 months, by providing grants for land purchase (of about 50 per cent of the unimproved land value), so irrigators can consolidate or relocate on better land within the area, and for retirement of farms from irrigation (of up to \$45,000);

- the Government is also funding farm business planning support, so that individual farm businesses can work through their options;
- the proposed public funding contribution to rehabilitation works will cover 90 per cent of the cost of the supply to the farm boundary and the cost of reuse infrastructure, up to a cap of \$3,135 per hectare;
- this level of funding was determined through an independent study commissioned during the period of the previous Government of the private and public benefits of rehabilitation, and is based on the principle that any public funding should be based on achieving public benefits;
- through restructuring, irrigators can reduce total rehabilitation costs, and hence the size of their contributions to the total cost of the works;
- following negotiations with irrigator representatives, the Government has agreed to accommodate their requests to manage the project themselves and be given greater flexibility in the scope of required works and use of the project contingency provision;
- as a result, the Government agreed to increase the cap from \$2,600/ha to \$3,135/ha on the basis that irrigators are taking on the full project responsibility and risk;
- following restructuring over the next year, there will be area-by-area negotiations on the final rehabilitation plans, funding and self-management of each irrigation area;
- if the irrigators do not take up the package on offer, then the Government will have to use regulatory mechanisms as it is committed first and foremost to improving the quality of the water in the River Murray.

TAFE SYSTEM

In reply to **Hon. KATE REYNOLDS** (19 February 2003).

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: The Minister for Employment, Further Education and Training has provided the following:

The previous Liberal government's attempts to corporatise TAFE were doomed to failure (as recognised in the Kirby Report). Allegations have been made regarding enrolments in VET in schools and these are being investigated.

Annual audits of TAFE data a conducted under national standards prescribed by Australian National Training Authority. The audits focus on student enrolments and include investigation of result codes, which in turn are linked to the issuing of parchments.

Apart from these data audits, TAFE institutes are also audited under the national standards of the Australian Quality Training Framework, in particular standard 10, 'Issuing Australian Qualifications and Framework qualifications and statements of attainment.'

Over the past four years the SA publicly funded VET system has earned the reputation nationally of having data of the highest integrity.

In addition to these measures, a specific investigation regarding the recent allegations by the President of the AEU has now been commissioned.

FIREARMS ACT

In reply to **Hon. IAN GILFILLAN** (18 February 2003).

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: The Minister for Police has provided the following information:

Prior to the commencement of the Firearms Act in 1980 many managers on pastoral leases were issued with a pistol licence. From 1980, the Firearms Act allowed for the issue of handguns where a person was of good character and considered to be fit and proper. There were very few restrictions in the legislation on who could obtain a pistol licence or the reasons it could be used for.

Various changes to the Firearms Act have seen the restrictions on the issue of handguns tighten. It was never the case that handguns were widely used in primary production, and the Registrar of Firearms has generally limited access only to primary producers on pastoral lands. A great deal of work on large properties is done on a motorcycle as it is more versatile than a four wheeled vehicle and is able to reach more remote and rugged places that may be beyond the capability of other vehicles. As such there are dangers in carrying long arms. Firearms carried on a motorcycle may fall off, catch on scrub, accidentally discharge in the event of a crash, or if carried across the rider's body, could be the cause of an injury to the rider.

A handgun is far more easily carried safely on a motorcycle and can be easily protected from the environment although its use may have some limitations.

The long distance covered on properties necessitates being prepared for all possibilities. If a pastoralist needs a firearm to destroy injured and suffering stock or vermin it would be impractical to have to return to the homestead to obtain a firearm every time that it was needed.

Regulations came into force on 20 February 2003 which strictly limit the issue of handguns to persons for the use in primary production on properties which are 15000 hectares in area or larger. This will effectively maintain the control on the issue of handguns in primary production.

BRANCHED BROOMRAPE

In reply to **Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY** (18 February 2003).

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: The Minister for Environment and Conservation has provided the following information:

1. The \$2.3 million budget referred to in the question, is the national funding allocation for the eradication program for the current financial year agreed to at the Primary Industries Ministerial Council meeting in March 2002. The expenditure allocated for fumigation is sufficient to achieve the planned outcomes for the projects and amounts to \$414 000, or 18 per cent of the national budget. An additional \$120,000 is earmarked for research into alternative fumigants to methyl bromide.

Expenditure on fumigation this financial year has been approximately \$145 000, however it is anticipated that a considerable amount of activity will occur during the Autumn season. The current level of expenditure is within expectations given the unseasonably dry conditions experienced during Spring. Moist soil is required for the fumigants to be effective.

2. A Community Focus Group was established as part of the eradication program management structure in February 2000. This group, comprising landowners, Local Government and local business representatives has been meeting every 6-8 weeks following its inception and provides a conduit for communication with the community. The Focus Group has held discussions concerning the provision of appropriate levels of assistance to landholders.

The state government has provided \$922,000 this year in additional funding to meet its commitment to the landholders of Hammond and the program is delivering two schemes for all landholders within the quarantine area. The first of these programs provides assistance with the cost of implementing a compliance arrangement with an annual grant of \$250 per property. The second program provides assistance of \$2.50 per hectare for the development and implementation of a farm plan aimed at eradicating branched broomrape.

FISH STOCKS

In reply to **Hon. CAROLINE SCHAEFER** (19 March 2003).

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: Between May 2000 and April 2001, a national survey was undertaken to gather definitive sets of data on the extent and impact of recreational and indigenous fishing in all States. It obtained estimates of the level of participation, fishing effort, fishing methods and catch by recreational fishers. It also sought fisher demographic information and information on the economic activity associated with fishing and the attitude of recreational fishers to prominent fisheries issues.

The survey was coordinated by a national project team, with the project officer based in New South Wales Fisheries. While the survey was completed in April 2001, it took about eighteen months of data analysis before some preliminary information was made available to State fisheries agencies.

In South Australia, the South Australian Research Development Institute Aquatic Sciences were provided with some broad information about fishing effort and participation in this State. However, under the instructions of the national coordinator, this information was to remain confidential until data checks and standard error calculations had been completed. We were informed by the Fisheries Research and Development Corporation (FRDC) that a formal release of the results of the Survey was delayed until a more complete analysis of the statistics had been finalised.

However, because of the public importance of information relating to recreational fishing and its relevance to the review of the Fisheries Act, the Department of Primary Industries and Resources (PIRSA) decided to release the preliminary information it had been

provided by the national project coordinator. Statements were made by the Director of Fisheries at a number of community meetings held across South Australia in early February announcing the imminent release of the survey information. This was confirmed in my News Release of 12 February 2003 (attached), in which I provided the available broad results of the survey. As I understand it, South Australia and New South Wales are the only States to have released any results of the survey prior to the final report being published.

A more comprehensive summary of the survey information available to PIRSA Fisheries featured in the March edition of *Southern Fisheries*, which appeared in newsagencies on 17 March. PIRSA Fisheries are still waiting for a more complete analysis of the survey data, including regional information of recreational fishing. It is expected that this will become available within the next three months from the Project Coordinator and will be publicised again in a future edition of *Southern Fisheries*.

It is very disappointing that all States and the Territory have had to wait so long for the survey results. However, the data analysis has not been under our control. It is up to the FRDC and the Federal Minister to release the national survey report.

SUPERANNUATION LIABILITIES

In reply to **Hon. R.I. LUCAS** (20 February 2003).

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: The Treasurer has provided the following information:

1. There is no plan to produce an updated graph consistent with that in figure 6.1 of the budget papers as all the figures relevant to an updated estimated position of the total superannuation liabilities as at 30 June 2003 have been released in the mid year budget review. An updated version of figure 6.1 will be included as part of the 2003-04 budget papers to be released when the budget is presented in May 2003.

2. It is correct that there has been a significant increase in the actuarial valuation of the government's superannuation liabilities over the last 12 months due entirely to the negative returns on invested superannuation assets. The negative returns have been experienced by nearly all superannuation funds, particularly those with the traditional mix of asset classes in their portfolio. Due to the poor and extremely depressed investment markets over the last 12 to 18 months, all superannuation funds, government and those in the private sector, have experienced similar reductions in the value of their assets. In defined benefit schemes this has resulted in an increase in liabilities to employers.

3. In determining an investment strategy for defined benefit schemes, trustees and investment managers are always aware of the possibility of negative returns. Investment strategies for defined benefit schemes are determined on an understanding that there is a real possibility of investment returns being negative in one or two years every seven or so years. Such investment strategies are determined on the basis that even taking into account the real possibility of returns being negative every so often, the more regular positive real rates of return offset the negative returns and combine to produce longer term average positive real rates of return on invested assets. In the circumstances there is nothing new in having to acknowledge an increase in superannuation liabilities will occur in those years when investment returns have been negative for defined benefit schemes.

SPEED CAMERAS

In reply **Hon. T.G. CAMERON** (19 February 2003).

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: The Minister for Transport has provided the following information:

1. The Department of Transport and Urban Planning has not undertaken any studies to determine how many additional speeding expiation notices could be issued, how much additional revenue could be collected, or how many people may lose their licence as a result of demerit points for offences against the new 50km/h built-up area speed limit.

No consideration was given to the preparation of such a report as the matter has been introduced as a road safety measure, not a revenue raising measure. There is excellent documentary evidence from New South Wales and Victoria attesting to the significant reductions in serious pedestrian injury crashes resulting from similar changes in those States. The National Road Transport Commission also has prepared a comprehensive report recommending the introduction of a 50km/h default built-up area speed limit which is available on their web site www.nrtc.gov.au.

The Australian Transport Council (all State, Territory and Commonwealth Transport Ministers) is expected to approve uniform national changes to the Australian Road Rules later this year, incorporating this change.

A 50km/h limit on local streets is a long overdue good safety policy put into practice by this Government.

2. See response to question one.

3. Major roads are taken to be arterial roads maintained by Transport SA. There are no arterial roads in the metropolitan area which have a lowered speed limit as a result of this policy. The speed limit on arterial roads maintained by Transport SA in regional cities and country towns also is currently 60km/h, although these limits are being progressively reviewed by Transport SA against the speed limit criteria agreed between Transport SA and the Local Government Association.

Many country Councils have requested that the speed limit on arterial roads through their towns be reduced to the default built-up area speed limit of 50km/h. Transport SA has undertaken to have these speed limit recommendations finalised by June 2003.

PUBLIC FINANCE AND AUDIT (HONESTY AND ACCOUNTABILITY IN GOVERNMENT) AMENDMENT BILL

In committee.

(Continued from 3 April. Page 2104.)

Clause 6.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I move:

That progress be reported.

I seek from the Leader of the Government a final indication as to whether the government (after three separate requests) is still refusing to allow the Under Treasurer to provide advice. If that is the government's final position, I indicate that the opposition will this week consider its position regarding further amendments relating to the role of the Auditor-General as has been flagged in debate. Having considered our position as to whether to move further amendments, we will not seek to further report progress but will accept the government's position regarding its refusal to make available the Under Treasurer to answer our questions.

I again place on the record—I hope for the final time—the reasons why the opposition believes this to be critical. First, this is a series of questions which can be answered only by the Under Treasurer. As competent as other officers within Treasury may be, they are not responsible for the final decisions on the charter of budget honesty (as it is called) prior to an election. Secondly, the charter of budget honesty will obviously be a critical document which will influence the decisions of many people regarding which party they choose to form government at the next election. How that document is framed, the assumptions that are made and the reasons for those assumptions will be critical factors for people in determining which political party they choose to form government at the next election.

Thirdly, as I have indicated before, there is a series of questions to which we have had no direct reply from the Under Treasurer. These are simple questions. In the construction of the charter of budget honesty, will the Under Treasurer reserve for himself the right to make deliberate decisions contrary to explicit cabinet decisions—I have instanced examples of those in the past and I will not go over the details again—and contrary to explicit decisions by the Treasurer

relating to certain issues? For example, if a department such as the education department, which has been told to spend within its budget but overspends, and the Treasurer and the cabinet specifically direct that department and the education minister to repay over the next four years that overspending, and if that is incorporated into the forward estimates, will the Under Treasurer reserve for himself the right to say that that is politically unacceptable and that he will not accept the decision of the cabinet or the Treasurer of the day in relation to those particular decisions?

The second series of questions which I have placed on the record and to which we have had no response relate to critical enterprise bargaining negotiations with key public sector unions. The current position is that the cabinet signs off on an appropriate negotiation strategy. It is only a cabinet decision for these key negotiations with, for example, teachers, nurses or medical officers—and there are others. The cabinet signs off on the negotiation strategy and the final allocations in relation to those particular negotiations. Is the Under Treasurer reserving for himself the right to indicate that he does not accept the negotiating position endorsed by the cabinet as being appropriate and that he will therefore amend or alter those particular allocations when he constructs the charter of budget honesty?

With reference to the other series of questions—and there are many others—if the government for the third and final time now is going to indicate that it will not provide the Under Treasurer to answer these critical questions, it appears sadly that the parliament will have to look at alternative options in terms of how it might construct this charter of budget honesty. As I said when we last debated this issue, the critical questions relate to what I call the smoothing assumptions made by treasurers in relation to the current financial year and the forward estimates years. Will the Under Treasurer use his own smoothing assumptions in relation to the construction of the charter of budget honesty or will he follow exactly the smoothing assumptions made by the Treasurer in his mid year budget review if the mid year budget review has only just been concluded in February of the financial year?

Without going through the detail again, this particular assumption is critical in the production of the charter of budget honesty document, because it can easily turn a \$100 million deficit on the accrual accounts into a balanced budget depending on the timing and the smoothing assumptions that the Under Treasurer makes in relation to the charter of budget honesty: for example, if the Under Treasurer was to assume that money to be taken out of SAFA or the South Australian Asset Management Corporation (SAAMC) in any particular year can impact on whether it be the accrual accounts result or the cash accounts result. As we have seen in the financial year, an assumption not to take into account \$300 million from SAFA and SAAMC accounts has turned a \$300 million cash surplus into a \$20 million cash surplus (using ballpark figures), basically a balanced budget with similar impacts on the accrual account result as well.

So, simple decisions that the Under Treasurer can make in constructing a charter of budget honesty can significantly impact on what is produced. A Treasurer will not want to go to an election with the Under Treasurer producing a document which for example showed that in the following year or the year afterwards there would be a \$100 million accrual deficit—or even cash deficit for that matter. Depending on what assumptions he makes, within those parameters of this charter of budget honesty the Under Treasurer of the day has

the capacity to produce whatever results he might want to produce.

Whilst it is another matter in debate, the opposition has raised concerns at statements the Treasurer has been making around town about the political associations of the two deputy under treasurers. To my knowledge from 30 years of working with Treasury, this is the first time concern has ever been raised about the political complexion or leanings of the three senior positions in the Treasury. These are statements being made by the Treasurer and the head of the Treasurer's own faction, Mr Don Farrell, in discussions with various people that I have outlined about the backgrounds of the two deputy under treasurers. They are statements being made not in the first instance by the opposition but by the Treasurer himself (and I note that he has refused to respond to those questions) and also the head of his own faction in relation to—

The Hon. P. Holloway interjecting:

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: If that is the case let him respond and indicate that, but there has been no response from him. This is the first time. We are to have a charter of budget honesty where for the first time we have a Treasurer who—

The Hon. P. Holloway interjecting:

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: You speak to the Treasurer about it. He is the one making the statements. You speak to Don Farrell about what he is saying about one of the deputy under treasurers. That is why this issue is so important to the parliament and the community. If this charter of budget honesty is to have integrity and be transparent and accountable, everyone needs to have confidence in the numbers that are being produced. This government has refused to allow the Under Treasurer to even present it to parliament or provide advice through the minister. We accept that we cannot question the Under Treasurer directly but, as is the case in the estimates committees, through his minister or minister's representative (in this case the Leader of the Government in the Legislative Council), the opposition would seek answers to these critical questions and others that we have now been seeking on three separate occasions.

I will state the opposition's grave concerns that at this stage there are many other issues and that we want to know how the Under Treasurer will approach the construction of the charter of budget honesty. We had hoped that with the passage of three weeks the government may have seen reason and in the spirit of compromise been prepared to offer some answers from the Under Treasurer or at least the presence of the Under Treasurer to give a response to these questions and many others that we would like to put.

If the Leader of the Government now stands up and says he again refuses, then in the interests of progressing the debate on this bill I indicate that my party will have to canvass with the Independents further amendments to the charter of budget honesty section in addition to the provision that we have already flagged. Accepting that the government will steadfastly refuse to provide any answers from the Under Treasurer to the questions we are putting on this issue, I indicate to you as Chairman of Committees that when parliament reconvenes in two weeks time we will either proceed with just the amendments that we have already flagged or possibly move some further amendments in relation to these issues.

If we do not proceed with further amendments we would outline explicitly the questions I have already highlighted and also some further questions and indicate our very strong opposition and concern over the fact that this government has treated the opposition and also, more importantly, this

chamber—the Legislative Council—with contempt in refusing to provide answers to critical questions about a document for which I can think of no other precedent, where an unelected public officer will be solely responsible for the construction of critical assumptions, critical documents and critical figures which will potentially significantly impact on decisions people make in relation to which parties should govern for the following four year period.

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: Let us go over this all again one more time. The opposition had every opportunity to bring the Under Treasurer before a committee. If it wished to, it could have moved at the second reading stage to have this bill go to a committee where it could have called witnesses and dealt with it as other bills have been dealt with if at the time it felt that it needed to question particular witnesses. However, given that this bill is going through the ordinary second reading debate process, it is the government that will determine who its advisers are. In the ordinary debate during the committee stage of a bill there is no capacity for members of the opposition to cross-examine a public servant. It is not the way that these stages are conducted in this chamber. If members wish to resort to that course of action and if they want more advice, at the second reading stage the bill should have been referred to a committee, at which stage the opposition and other members would have had the opportunity to do that. Particularly at this time, when the Under Treasurer is at a very critical stage of developing the state budget, the government does not believe it is necessary to bring him here in relation to a bill in relation to which, after all, he or any future Under Treasurer will have to abide by whatever this parliament decides to do in the legislation that is subsequently passed in this chamber.

The Leader of the Opposition asked whether the Under Treasurer will make his own decisions. In relation to the avoidability of costs, of course he will; that is what he is asked to do. New clause 41B provides that the Under Treasurer must prepare and publicly release a pre-election budget update report within a certain time of the issue of writs. The purpose of the report is to provide an updated statement of the current and prospective fiscal position of the government. Then if one looks at subclause (3)(b) one sees that it provides that the economic and other assumptions for the current financial year and the following three financial years that have been used in preparing those updated fiscal estimates must be contained in the pre-election budget update report. When the Leader asks questions about smoothing assumptions and so on, under the provisions of this bill—yes, under (3)(b)—if he makes those assumptions the Under Treasurer will have to make them clear in the budget update report. It is clearly set out within the legislation before us.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: That's nonsense! You don't even understand the budget documents.

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: It provides that the economic and other assumptions for the current financial year must be set out. If the Under Treasurer wishes to—

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: We're still finding errors in the last set of budget documents.

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: The previous Treasurer was certainly an expert when it came to obfuscation within the budget, and we know exactly how much information he provided to the parliament in the four budgets he brought down; it was absolutely nothing. This government is proposing to bring in an innovation; an important new era in budget accountability by for the first time getting a senior officer of the Public Service—the Under Treasurer—to present a pre-

election budget update report. Essentially, the terms in which the Under Treasurer will be required to prepare this report are exactly what is required in some other states and by the commonwealth of this country.

The Leader of the Opposition has indicated that he will move an amendment to make that report within 10 days rather than 14 days. The government is prepared to accept that amendment if necessary. It should be said that if that is to occur the quality of information will obviously be somewhat less. The heads of departments will obviously have to get that information in to the Under Treasurer four days quicker than would otherwise be the case, so the quality of information will inevitably be less.

Nevertheless, if the opposition wishes to make this mirror the commonwealth legislation in relation to time, the government will be prepared to accept that. The important point is that whether or not the Under Treasurer is sitting here makes absolutely no difference to the fact that, when it comes to preparing this report in March 2006, or whenever the next election is called, he will have to abide by what is set out in this legislation, and there is nothing that any of us can say here in parliament that will change that fact. He is required to abide by the legislation.

The Leader of the Opposition made some absolutely scurrilous comments in relation to the political leanings of the Under Treasurer. As I understand it, there are two new deputy under treasurers, and one of them worked in the commonwealth Treasury for some years. It is my understanding that his work in the commonwealth Treasury was highly regarded by members of all governments that were in power during the time he served the department; and the other new deputy under treasurer, who came from Victoria, is similarly highly regarded. To suggest that these people are some how politically compromised is absolutely outrageous.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas interjecting:

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: Well, you claim it is, but I think it is absolutely outrageous and irrelevant to this particular legislation. The Under Treasurer will be required, if this bill is passed, to report on state finances when the next election is called. If the state opposition does not want that, if it wants to keep it the way that it was in the past under the previous treasurer, if it does not want this particular measure, if it does not want pre-election budget updates to try to improve the accountability of the government of the day so that the public can make an informed choice at election time, let it keep on opposing this bill.

As far as the government is concerned, it is about time we got on with the job and passed this bill. If the opposition wants to amend it, let it do so. If it wants to reject it, let it do so but, for heaven's sake, it is about time we took a decision on this bill. It is, after all, straight forward enough. The commonwealth and the other states adopted similar measures long ago. Why can we not do it now?

The committee divided on the motion:

AYES (12)

Cameron, T. G.	Dawkins, J. S. L.
Evans, A. L.	Laidlaw, D. V.
Lawson, R. D.	Lucas, R. I. (teller)
Redford, A. J.	Ridgway, D. W.
Schaefer, C. V.	Stefani, J. F.
Stephens, T. J.	Xenophon, N.

NOES (9)

Gago, G. E.	Gazzola, J.
Gillfillan, I.	Holloway, P. (teller)
Kanck, S. M.	Reynolds, K. J.

NOES (cont.)

Roberts, T. G.	Sneath, R. K.
Zollo, C.	

Majority of 3 for the ayes.

Progress thus reported; committee to sit again.

RIVER MURRAY BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 3 April. Page 2098.)

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: The lead speaker for this bill on behalf of the Liberal Party will be the Hon. Caroline Schaefer, and it is my understanding that she will speak to this bill in detail and broadly later this week. I wish, at this stage, however, to make comment on just two matters that are of particular interest to me. I note also that many questions will be asked during the committee debate on this bill. Many of the matters that arise from this bill require questioning, and the committee stage is the appropriate forum in which those questions should be asked.

I indicate a very strong and long-term interest in the health of the Murray River, having earlier been a member of a family business with irrigation rights and a vineyard along the Murray River. That property was at Markaranka between Waikerie and Morgan. Certainly, as a young child and through my teen years I spent a lot of time in the lower reaches of the Murray River and the Coorong. My grandparents had an old wooden houseboat based at Goolwa, which is where we went for our holidays. I have always enjoyed water-skiing and, so, for a variety of reasons, the issues of water levels and flows have been of great interest to me for most of my life. Certainly today there is very intense concern—and justifiably so—about the health of the River Murray and the issues of flows.

I was pleased to be able to participate in the River Murray Forum that the government hosted recently as a bipartisan effort with the opposition. It was troubling to learn that, notwithstanding the increased flows that the former government and this government are keen to ensure come to this state, even if we gain those flows, many of the river gums and other vegetation along the course of the River Murray and its tributaries are unlikely to survive because of the current state of the river. The death of the gums along the river and its tributaries is a major concern not only to the environment of the area, the amenity and its effect on all parts of the ecosystem but also on the livelihood of towns and people living in areas adjoining those towns along the length of the River Murray.

There is no doubt that there needs to be a major change in the way in which we think, talk and deal with the River Murray, and it is from that perspective that I address this bill. There will be many sensitivities arising from change, and it is how one manages change that will be critical in this matter in terms of the health of the River Murray, as it is indeed with any issue of change. The government has opted in terms of this change to give unprecedented powers to the minister. The position it has created is the Minister for the River Murray. In terms of planning powers, this bill undoes the work that the parliament and the state have pursued for years; that is, to position all planning and development powers under one act, the Development Act, to be the responsibility of one minister, the Minister for Planning.

Our approach to planning in this state with the one-stop shop with the Minister for Planning was an initiative started

by the former Labor government, with the Minister for Planning at that time being the Hon. Greg Crafter. The approach has been strongly supported over the years by all members in this place, and I think it is highly regrettable that, as a reaction to the dramas that we face in terms of the River Murray and its health, this government at this time has sought to fix one problem but essentially launch another.

The other problem I see is the disintegration of the one-stop shop, the all embracing Development Act for planning and development purposes in this state. I do not like this approach and I note that in the other place amendments were moved to address this matter in terms of the preparation of plan amendment reports (PARs) by councils. The fact that this bill effectively provides veto rights to the Minister for the River Murray over and above the roles and responsibilities provided for in the Development Act to the Minister for Planning, adds a complex and I think unacceptable change to planning.

If it is not working as well as it should along the length of the River Murray—and I would argue for change—I do not think that change should come in the form with which we have been presented by this government in this bill. There is plenty of opportunity, if one reads the Development Act, to find that there is reason for input through a very extensive consultation process, and it is at that time that the EPA, the minister and his officers should be taking a very keen interest in the preparation of the council PARs. Of course, the minister can also implement the process of preparation of PARs—that is, the Minister for Planning—and again the process of consultation and the gathering of ideas and input from across the community is very extensive as provided for in the Development Act already. I think it is a bad approach for the Minister for the River Murray to have the right of veto, not the Minister for Planning.

Equally, I think it is coming at the wrong end of the consultation process. What I found when I was Minister for Planning was that too few government bodies took the planning process seriously enough and they would be seeking last minute change rather than embracing the consultation processes provided for in the act and seeking change and input at the early stage. As I have indicated, I do not like the approach in this bill and I will be supporting change. I think this bill also misses a key opportunity to pursue provisions provided for in the Development Act for regional planning across councils. This bill still proposes that councils prepare their own PARs in terms of the River Murray and its tributaries. It would seem to me that the River Murray is an ideal forum for coordinated planning across council areas and using the regional planning provisions within the Development Act. To me it is a lost opportunity that this approach is not being taken at this time by this government to address an issue that is so important to this state, that is, the health of the River Murray.

I feel that it is most unfortunate that the government has chosen this enhanced role for the Minister for the River Murray in terms of planning processes when throughout his second reading speech and the debate in the other place the minister talked about the need for consensus and working with the community and adapting and adopting ministerial change yet, in the planning implications of this bill, he comes in with a heavy hand to veto a process which this government, through regional planning and earlier serious input by his office and the EPA, if necessary, could undertake to improve community understanding at the local level in councils and across the broader community. What is outlined

in this bill in terms of planning amendment seems to be at odds in terms of the consensus for change and community change about which the government speaks in broad terms.

I also highlight that, in terms of planning law and the Development Act in this state, I believe that there are at least questions, if not contradictions, in terms of part 5 of this bill and the minister's powers for implementation. The bill provides that the minister must prepare and maintain a plan to be called a River Murray Act Implementation Strategy. It is not clear to me whether it is this implementation strategy or the regional planning strategy which is authorised under the Development Act as the guide for the preparation of development plans and planning amendment reports in this state that will predominate. Are councils to prepare their development plans and plan amendment reports on the basis of this implementation strategy, the state water plan, or the planning strategy? On one or all of these counts can the Minister for the River Murray override a planning process undertaken by a council in terms of a plan amendment report?

There are some basic questions of how this approach will work from a planning and development perspective. It seems to me that this bill has been prepared and driven by water resource officers without an understanding of the planning processes that apply in this state, or how the Development Act already provides mechanisms for better planning than is being exercised at the present time by councils and government officers generally.

Last, in terms of my broad comments on this bill and the two matters about which I indicated I wanted to express particular concern, I refer to the provision that was incorporated in the bill in the other place for a new natural resources committee. I notice that this arises from an amendment moved by the member for Mitchell, Mr Kris Hanna. I note, too, that my colleague the Hon. Mark Brindal, the member for Unley, had an amendment on file that provided for a committee structure of this parliament to oversee the implementation of this bill.

I admit that I was not present in the Liberal party room when this measure of a committee structure was considered; had I been, I would have certainly spoken against the implementation of a parliamentary standing committee for the River Murray. I would have supported a select committee approach, or a referral to the ERD Committee of this place. Our party room, as I understand it, never supported a natural resources standing committee: it supported a River Murray standing committee. I believe that a number of issues are to be considered, one being the relationship of this natural resources committee to the ERD Committee and that committee's powers that have been voted in 1991 for that committee to pursue.

Secondly, I believe that, in terms of costs, it is not appropriate for this very expensive committee structure to be established at this time. As I understand it, it is proposed that not only would the members be paid standing fees but also that the chair would be granted a car and a driver. There would be officers, a secretary and a research person, plus travelling fees and other expenses. I do not believe that that expense is justified, nor do I believe that a broad term of reference in terms of natural resources can be sustained.

Lastly, in relation to table officers or parliamentary counsel, I point out that there is an error of printing in this bill. The index in the schedules refers to No. 17 as an amendment to the Petroleum Act. The body of the bill, however, under section 17, refers to the Parliamentary Committees Act. Likewise, in the index, under schedule 18,

there is a reference to an amendment to the Soil Conservation and Land Care Act. In the bill, 18 refers to the Parliamentary Remuneration Act. I think that there needs to be an amendment to tidy up the index and the bill.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: You say no? In the schedule, why is there not a reference to the natural resources committee? Perhaps that can be answered when the minister sums up this bill. It seems to me that the index has not been changed since the bill was before the other place and that it does not incorporate amendments that were passed there.

The PRESIDENT: It is automatically amended.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: That concludes my comments at this stage on this important bill. As I indicated, I think that it is a committee bill, at which time there will be hosts of detailed questions about the working relationship. In speaking to this bill briefly at this time, I certainly recognise the importance of a stronger focus on the River Murray but believe that, in doing so, it is important to use measures that are already provided for in the Development Act and to use them more effectively. Certainly, in terms of officers, from my experience as a former planning minister, they should be taking their responsibilities and provisions for consultation more diligently, rather than proposing a new unprecedented—and I think unfortunate—new structure which will have many other implications to the performance of planning and development in the state in the long term.

The Hon. CARMEL ZOLLO: I guess that we will go from the declaration of ownership of vineyards, to houseboats, to something quite different. My first memory as a young child was a country trip to Mannum in my father's new FJ Holden. My father took his family for a drive to show us where he and many others had worked on the river pipeline as part of the then E&WS work force. He was part of the work gang that worked along the River Murray to help build the pipeline, and Mannum was used as its base. I will always remember the sweeping road as you come into the picnic area at Mannum and see the Murray River. My father subsequently went to the E&WS workshop at Kent Town and finished off his working life there, just before the beautiful piece of parkland opposite the now Wine Centre was reclaimed. I am sure that the Hon. Ian Gilfillan is very pleased to hear me say that.

Like all South Australians, I recognise the importance of water to the state—in particular, the River Murray, the lifeblood of our state. It is fair to say that for many years now, through various organisations, three levels of government and various pieces of legislation (20 in all in the state), we have seen a consensus that the river needs special attention. Many have been working to further the cause of the river.

This is historical legislation which for the first time allows one minister to be responsible for a designated Murray River zone. The bill is all about halting the decline of the Murray River, and hopefully it will ensure that everyone works together in the best interests of the river. The health of the Murray River has the support of all sides of politics. I was one of the attendees at the recent Murray River forum where I saw the commitment of many people to a better future through changes that will result in increased water flows for our state. The declaration that resulted from that forum in particular proposed an immediate first step of restoring additional flow in the Murray River system of 500 gigalitres in the next five years, and it urged the Murray Darling Basin

Ministerial Council to agree to cost sharing arrangements as a matter of urgency.

More importantly, the forum initiative will give Minister Hill the opportunity to take a clear message to the Murray Darling Ministerial Council in October. South Australia's commitment to the rehabilitation of the river is well documented. The passing of this legislation further strengthens our cause with the eastern states to get a better deal for us. South Australia has shown great leadership and responsibility in the management of the Murray River system. The flood irrigation rehabilitation of the Lower Murray is a good example of the necessary readjustment that our dairy industry is going through to meet our responsibilities in terms of environmental flow. The rehabilitation of that section of the river has the support of the dairy farmers, although it is obviously not without some uncertainty for some of them as there is of necessity a high cost in rehabilitation. This project, which has attracted bipartisan support, will go a long way towards rehabilitating that part of the river. I know there has been consultation between Minister Hill and the community, and no doubt that will continue.

Whilst the Murray Mallee strategic task force that I chair does not necessarily concern itself with the Murray River, it is obvious that the well-being of the Murray Mallee community is affected to a great extent by the fortunes of the river. There is genuine interest to ensure that the river is sustainable so that it can support the dairy industry in the long term. The Riverland saw similar adjustments, with a great deal of work still being undertaken. At a recent cabinet meeting in the Riverland we saw the work undertaken by the Central Irrigation Trust. The trust works closely with primary producers to ensure the best outcome for the growers and the environment using the latest available technology for the benefit of growers.

We visited a number of sites to see practical applications of this technology, including Century Orchards at Loxton East, which uses computer watering, soil moisture testing and so on to ensure that water is administered in the best scientific way to ensure maximum crop growth and yield without wastage. Century Orchards is of some significant size, and that has enabled it to invest in the infrastructure required to competitively grow almonds and grapevines. Gone are the days of small blocks. We did a fair bit of searching to find a typical soldier settler block. Most of them have been bought up to become part of larger holdings. We saw little evidence of irrigation by overhead sprinklers.

In his second reading speech Minister Hill pointed out that the object of this bill is to achieve a healthy working Murray River system, sustaining communities and preserving unique values. South Australia has already demonstrated a strong commitment over many years to improve the quantity and quality of water flow. This historic bill gives the river special protection under its own legislation in recognition of the significance of the river to all South Australians. The importance of good water management is crucial to the survival of this state, our economy, our way of life and our social fabric. Whilst only 7 per cent of South Australia is in the Darling Basin, its future goes hand in hand with the environmental fortunes of the state because, apart from providing water for Adelaide and other cities to the north, an important area, the annual farm gate income is in excess of \$506 million.

As convener of the Premier's Food Council, the contribution of the Riverland representative on that council, Mr Clifford Ashby, the Managing Director of Yandilla Park

Ltd, is highly valued. Yandilla Park and Vitor Marketing Pty Ltd grow, pack and market citrus and avocados for Australian and export markets. They also provide horticultural services to the growers themselves. Plans for regional food initiatives in the Riverland are well advanced with the formation of the Riverland Food Group. The food, wine and tourism industries are very important to the region and their success ultimately depends on a healthy Murray River. At the Regional Food Group's workshop this April Mr Brian Francis from the Riverland Development Corporation discussed the number of projects the group has launched in order to enhance the value adding and quality points of difference in the region, and they include developing a food and wine trail brochure and web page, seeking out partnerships for the Riverland Wine and Food Show in October, the Barmera Market, the Berri company and Angus Park, in order to provide retail outlets for local food and raise the profile of the food culture in the region.

As well, I understand that the food group is hoping to be engaged in an exciting new project involving the slow food movement. It is an initiative of Stefano De Pieri, who is well known to us all as the chef from the Gondola on the Murray and a strong advocate of the movement, and he will be championing a slow river project. The minister also points out that the basin supports significant economic activity based on irrigation, dry land farming and associated food processing and tourism. When you hammer home statistics indicating that unless enough rehabilitation occurs by 2020 South Australia's water will become undrinkable two days in five because it will fail World Health Organisation safety standards, such statistics make people take notice and realise the time for action has arrived. I made a contribution to parliament at the time of the audit release and pointed out that the consequences for agriculture, wildlife, industry and our towns along the river would be catastrophic. The audit recognised the need for an integrated approach because, whilst salinity is a basin wide issue, it will increasingly link river valleys, irrigation and dry land areas because of its off-site impacts.

The audit outlined a grim forecast if nothing was done. It pointed out that dry land salinity will challenge the entire basin community on how to manage the environment over the next 50 years. It also focused thinking on what agricultural and production systems are sustainable, as well as where to plant more trees and other vegetation. The wider Murray Mallee and Riverland regions alone generate gross regional product of over \$1.5 billion or 4 per cent of the gross state product.

The economy of the basin in South Australia is substantially based on the primary industry sector, particularly grapes, cereals and irrigated horticulture. I am not surprised to learn that more than 70 per cent of the economic activity in the Riverland is based on the irrigation industry. Like many other members of parliament I am a member of the Murray Darling Association. It was probably one of the first associations I joined when I became a member. I do not get the opportunity to attend too many meetings, but I try to follow the work of the association as closely as I can. I notice that a foundation has now also been established.

I was looking through the file the other day and was reminded that the Murray Darling Association named the main meeting room in its Adelaide office after Ralph Jacobi, a former federal member from South Australia and truly one of the greatest champions of the river in this state. Ralph Jacobi was the driving force behind the establishment of the

Murray Darling Freshwater Research Centre in Albury. Several years ago I was very impressed with the work of the Murray Darling Association when it undertook the promotion of the salinity audit I have just mentioned. The association and the government (as a partnership) were truly able to bring home to the wider community the degradation facing the Murray Darling Basin.

The bill establishes the objects for a healthy River Murray. I am pleased to see amongst its aims the establishment of a parliamentary standing committee to focus on the River Murray, a committee which will be able to look at the health of the river in an integrated manner. I note that the Hon. Diana Laidlaw does not agree with the establishment of a committee to look at natural resource management in that way, but I think that natural resource management is now very much viewed in a more holistic manner, as I think it should be. The committee can act as an important assessor of government commitment to the river; it is our greatest natural resource and without it this state could not exist.

The bill also builds on and improves existing legislation to help control and reverse the problems facing the river. In the last week we have seen further publicity about the very sorry state of the mouth of the river at Goolwa. Debate on the value of dredging is a popular topic in the community. Headlines such as 'Futile task' and '\$2 million dredging project can't save the Murray mouth' are not necessarily an exaggeration in this case. Whilst the worst drought in 100 years has exacerbated the problem, to quote Minister Hill again, it also points to the need for additional water.

The minister will impress on federal and state ministers at next month's Murray Darling Basin Ministerial Council meeting that the state of the mouth is the direct result of lack of flow in the river. The government has given a clear indication that it will persevere with the dredging, as the dredging which began last October was successful in keeping the mouth open over the summer.

The long-term health of the Coorong is also at stake as well as the river with two channels at the Goolwa end and the Coorong side being dredged. Minister Hill reminded us that without the dredging program water levels in the Coorong would have been too high for migratory wading birds which come into the area during summer. These waders were able to use the Coorong this year but the ecosystem is severely stressed. There were other environmental factors also to be taken into consideration.

The state government has welcomed the news that the Murray Darling Basin Commission supports the continuation of efforts to keep the Murray mouth open with a further commitment of an extra \$500 000 which will keep the work going as well as a commitment from the Murray Darling association of \$1.1 million for the project to continue next year. The health of the River Murray is a national issue and of national importance. Keeping the mouth open is a good example of the sort of issue requiring leadership from the commonwealth government and support from the upstream states.

This bill, which I understand has been amended and improved in the other place, will go a long way towards demonstrating the united commitment of the states to see a healthy and sustainable River Murray. I am pleased to add my support to this bill. I congratulate the minister in the other place for his commitment to ensuring that this legislation comes to fruition.

The Hon. SANDRA KANCK secured the adjournment of the debate.

GENE TECHNOLOGY (TEMPORARY PROHIBITION) BILL

Second reading.

The Hon. IAN GILFILLAN: I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

As members will recall, this bill seeks to institute a five-year moratorium on the introduction of genetically modified plants and crops in South Australia. As such, it is a protective measure, I would argue, primarily to protect South Australian export markets, and there is also the ancillary argument that the science surrounding many of the genetic modifications is not sound in that the precautionary principle has not been followed. There are still unanswered questions and quite profound doubts.

As I have said previously on frequent occasions, there may well be—and I expect there to be—benefits from genetic modification in the years ahead after proper research and testing and proving-up of not only the plants and the way in which they are developed, planted and harvested but in the markets. This issue has concerned a proportion of the farming community in South Australia, with over 80 per cent voting in favour of a moratorium when the South Australian Farmers Federation instituted a survey some time earlier this year.

So, although I was unsuccessful previously with this bill at the second reading stage, it is with more confidence now that I move the second reading of this bill because farmers have been surveyed and the introduction—I regard it as the premature release—of genetically modified canola is just around the corner. Despite the assurances of the government and the minister I do not believe South Australia is safe from the planting of genetically modified canola this year. Bayer Crop Science has said publicly that it will irrigate trials. There is no reason why, if it is released commercially, some growers may not grow by irrigation genetically modified canola in South Australia.

So, the threat is immediate and therefore the urgency for implementing the five-year moratorium is extreme, and I am hopeful that in this place we can move my bill into the committee stage. As members know only too well, that is not necessarily a commitment that the bill will pass the third reading, but in committee it can be further discussed and amendments can be moved. A constructive government rather than a reluctant and dilatory government would see this as an opportunity (even today) to bite the bullet and start to move to protect South Australia from unwanted intrusion of genetically modified crops before we are ready. I do not think I need to argue any further than that.

My argument to both the Labor and the Liberal members of this place is to support the second reading. So much legislation has been supported in the second reading stage so that members have a chance to discuss it in committee. I have heard many times people indicating that they will support the second reading, that they will only do so so that the matter can be discussed and debated and possibly amended in committee, but they do not intend to support the third reading, and their support for the second reading should not be taken in that light. So, even for those people who have serious doubts about the legislation, surely there can be no argument to prevent this bill moving into the committee stage. On that basis I urge support for the second reading.

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY secured the adjournment of the debate.

WATER RESOURCES (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 27 March. Page 2002.)

The Hon. SANDRA KANCK: I find this to be a somewhat strange bill. It is a private member's bill and therefore one is dependent on second reading speeches to give guidance on what it is about, because we do not get the departmental briefings that are available, for instance, for government bills. So, as I read the second reading speeches that have been made, I found that they appear to be saying that conflict of interest provisions that would normally apply will be removed. The bill provides that the Water Resources Council, the catchment water management boards and water resources planning committees, which are covered under schedule 2 of the act, will have the conflict of interest provisions that currently exist in the act removed.

The arguments that have been given seem to relate specifically to the South-East Catchment Water Management Board, although I detect from what was said in the couple of speeches that have been given that the bill is meant to apply across the state. Maybe when the summing up occurs it will be explained whether it applies right across the state. Regardless of whether it is just the South-East Catchment Water Management Board or whether it applies across the state, I find it very strange that in the whole of an area covered by a catchment board there are no people who have a conflict of interest. That is almost the way it looks.

The speeches that have been given indicate that at times there will be no quorum at the meetings of the South-East Catchment Water Management Board, because basically everyone at the meeting will have a conflict of interest. If it is the South-East, surely there are more people in the South-East who do not have a conflict of interest than there are people on the board. I look for instance at the Stock Exchange; I understand that the head of ASIC (or whatever it is that manages the Stock Exchange here in Australia) is required to have no shares. That seems to me to be a reasonable provision, so how is it that here in South Australia we cannot find people in a region who have no conflict of interest?

Rather than go looking for people who have no conflict of interest, this bill seeks simply to remove the provision in the schedule that relates to conflict of interest. I must say I am uncomfortable with that. I have provided a copy of the bill to the Conservation Council and am looking for feedback from that group and from other interested persons to determine what we should do in regard to this. At this stage I indicate support for the second reading. We await further feedback and explanation before we determine whether we give our support to the bill as a whole.

The Hon. R.K. SNEATH secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

At 4.41 p.m. the council adjourned until Tuesday 29 April at 2.15 p.m.

