

SOUTH AUSTRALIA

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

(HANSARD)

Third Session of the Fiftieth Parliament (2003)

Parliament, which adjourned on 17 July 2003, was prorogued by proclamation dated 31 July 2003. By proclamation dated 31 July, it was summoned to meet on Monday 15 September, and the Third Session began on that date.

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Monday 15 September 2003

The **PRESIDENT (Hon. R.R.Roberts)** took the chair at 12 noon.

OPENING OF PARLIAMENT

The Clerk (Mrs J.M. Davis) read the proclamation by His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor (Bruno Krumins) summoning parliament.

GOVERNOR'S SPEECH

His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor, having been announced by Black Rod, was received by the President at the Bar of the council chamber and by him conducted to the chair. The Speaker and members of the House of Assembly having entered the chamber in obedience to his summons, His Excellency read the opening speech as follows:

Honourable Members of the Legislative Council and Members of the House of Assembly.

I have called you together for the dispatch of business.

I would like to thank Elder, Lewis O'Brien of the Kaurna people, for his welcome onto this land today.

This is only the second time a South Australian Parliament has been welcomed in this way.

It is a tradition my Government hopes will continue.

It is with sadness that I note the passing of two former Members of the Legislative Council and one of the House of Assembly.

The Honourable Charles Murray Hill, a distinguished former Minister, was a Member of the Legislative Council between 1965 and 1988 and in 1990 was awarded an AM for services to the Parliament and to the community.

The Honourable Trevor Crothers, a former union official, served fifteen years, between 1987 and 2002 and passed away in July 2002.

Mr Leslie David Boundy, a member of the House of Assembly from 1974 to 1977, served for three and a half years and died in July this year.

During the past twelve months, my Government has continued its work to rebuild the State's economy, while at the same time, seeking to ensure every South Australian will share in the benefits.

It is working to ensure those benefits reach people no matter where they live and work, in the city or in rural and regional South Australia.

My Government wants to see a State in which children are given every available opportunity to learn and make the most of their potential.

It wants to see a community in which people feel safe in their homes and on the streets.

It wants to see sustained economic growth, more exports and growing job opportunities for South Australians.

And it wants a State with a greener and cleaner environment, with a revitalised River Murray.

My Government has good financial management among its highest priorities.

It is my Government's aim to reduce state debt through disciplined budget management, rather than asset sales, and to return the budget to a long-term sustainable position so it can provide the schools, hospitals and social services the community deserves and expects.

Social Justice and Social Inclusion

The Government's Social Inclusion Initiative is tackling some of our most pressing social issues.

Its centerpiece, the Social Inclusion Board, is chaired by Monsignor David Cappo, Vicar-General of the Catholic Church in Adelaide.

The Board recently released its second report: *Everyone's Responsibility: Reducing Homelessness in South Australia*.

It outlines my Government's initial response and a 14-point plan of immediate actions to help achieve a target of halving the number of people sleeping rough in this State.

It will also soon release its plan to increase school retention rates in our public schools.

My Government cares about the future of our children and is committed to the urgent improvement of protection for children and young people.

Major reforms are underway in our child protection and alternative care systems and the Government will be moving to progressively implement recommendations from the Layton Child Protection Review.

The Government will establish an *Aboriginal Lands Parliamentary Standing Committee*.

It will inquire into issues affecting Aboriginal people such as health, housing, education, economic development, employment and training.

The Government is honouring its commitment to hand back the 21 000 square kilometre L-Shaped Conservation Park to traditional owners in the State's north-west.

Legislation will be introduced to that effect this session.

Health

My Government will continue working on the major task of reforming and improving South Australia's public health system.

A clear way forward was outlined in the Final Report of the Generational Health Review, together with the Government's initial response entitled "*First Steps Forward*".

The Generational Health Review, conducted under the leadership of Mr. John Menadue AO, found that there is a need to change the way health services are planned, delivered, organised and managed.

The Government will introduce in this session amendments to the *South Australian Health Commission Act 1976* to accommodate these reform measures.

My Government will pursue the *Health and Community Services Complaints Bill*.

The Bill aims to provide a better system of complaints resolution against public or private health or community service providers.

The Government will introduce a revised *Medical Practice Bill* to address the need for public protection and the rights of privacy for health providers.

The Bill will also promote more transparent investigations by the Medical Board to increase protection for consumers and providers.

Education

Education and training are central to the future development of the South Australian economy and community.

For this reason, education is one of the highest priorities of my Government.

This year, there are smaller junior primary classes for more than 9 000 children, a new school leaving age of 16, new efforts to reduce truancy, and primary counsellors for an extra 32 schools.

The Government has also made permanent more than 1 000 school and pre-school teachers.

Community Safety and Protection

My Government is committed to honour its pledge on law and order to help South Australians feel safer in their homes and safer in the streets.

My Government intends to deliver the most significant advances to South Australia's criminal law in three decades.

It will reintroduce the *Summary Offences (Offensive Weapons) Amendment Bill 2003* which will impose higher penalties on offenders carrying offensive weapons, including knives, on licensed premises.

The Government will crackdown on outlaw motorcycle gangs, especially those involved in the manufacturing of drugs and other serious offences.

It will also reintroduce the *Statutes Amendment (Anti-Fortification) Bill 2003* to prevent motorcycle gangs from turning their clubrooms into suburban fortresses.

My Government will also introduce tougher penalties for crimes aggravated by using guns and knives, teaming up in gangs, torturing people or breaching restraining orders.

The changes will also deliver harsher punishment to criminals who pick on the elderly and the vulnerable.

This includes children and people with a physical or intellectual disability.

My Government will also give the courts the power to impose longer sentences against those who attack public officials, such as nurses, teachers and police officers.

It plans to expand the powers of the Parole Board so it will be able to refuse parole for sex offenders, including paedophiles, and set conditions for those parolees when they are eventually released.

Under existing law, prisoners, including sex offenders, get automatic parole if they are sentenced to less than five years prison.

The changes will also aim to give the Parole Board the power to make sure that other types of offenders are not automatically released at the end of their non-parole period.

The Government will also reform the parole laws to ensure that the protection of the community is of paramount consideration when a prisoner's release or parole is decided.

The Government will also introduce a new class of offences to facilitate the conviction of parents or caregivers who are criminally responsible for the death or serious injury of children.

The Government will also target those irresponsible drivers who misuse motor vehicles and endanger the community.

There will be tougher penalties for serious drug offences, including against those who use children to sell drugs.

The Government aims to make it harder for criminals to profit from crime, by tightening our laws, stripping them of the proceeds of crime and stripping their assets.

Identity theft connected with fraudulent behaviour and computer crime will be outlawed.

The Government will introduce amendments to firearms legislation to create stricter controls and to reduce the number of handguns in South Australia.

This legislation will initiate a handgun buy-back, forming part of a national plan to reduce the number of firearms in the community.

The statutory limitation on the time to bring prosecution for firearms offences will be extended and, in some cases, removed altogether.

My Government will also introduce, for the first time, a comprehensive range of prison based rehabilitation programs, at a cost of \$1.5 million a year.

My Government will introduce new emergency legislation in this session to update the *State Disaster Act*.

It believes now, more than ever, there should be a greater emphasis on planning to prevent or mitigate the effects of emergencies, whether natural disasters or man-made.

The legislation will also take account of the need to protect the State's critical infrastructure.

Economic Development

My Government has a commitment to long term, sustainable economic growth in South Australia.

In April, 280 delegates from across the community met here in Parliament House for the Economic Growth Summit.

Their deliberations on the *State of the State Report* helped formed the Economic Development Board's report: *A Framework for Economic Development in South Australia*.

The Government has accepted 70 of the 71 recommendations in that report, and has begun the process of implementing the recommendations, including the development of a whole-of-government *State Strategic Plan*.

This plan will bring all the worthwhile but separate plans of Government into a single framework.

Some of the Economic Development Board's other recommendations are already in place.

There will be a new Venture Capital Board and Fund to encourage investment and business development.

The Government has accepted the recommendation that the State should aim to near triple our exports to reach \$25 billion by 2013.

It is the Government's view that science, research and innovation is of critical importance in developing a higher performance State, skilled jobs and economic growth in industry and the research and development sectors.

The Government has accepted the Economic Development Board's recommendation to streamline Government.

It will be eliminating some boards, statutory authorities and advisory bodies, which will require legislative change.

The Government will introduce legislation to amend the approvals process for public projects by lifting the level of expenditure requiring Cabinet approval and mandatory reference to the Public Works Committee from \$4 million to \$10 million.

Implementation plans for the other recommendations are now being developed.

The Economic Development Board, chaired by Robert Champion de Crespigny, will have an ongoing advisory role.

The Board will assist the Government to secure major projects, and work in partnership with the private sector on the economic development of the State.

Financial Accountability

The Government will continue to pursue amendments to the Public Finance and Audit Act that require not only this Government, but all future Governments, to produce a *Charter of Budget Honesty*.

This charter will contain the Government's financial targets and commits it to reporting on progress against these targets.

The legislation will require the Under Treasurer to produce a pre-election report upon the announcement of all future State elections.

The Government will also introduce a Bill to widen the powers of the Auditor-General so that he or she has all the powers needed to ensure transparency and accountability throughout Government and other matters of public interest.

Infrastructure

The Economic Development Board recommended a new Office of Infrastructure, and a new Minister for Infrastructure.

They are in place and will co-ordinate infrastructure development across Government.

The Government proposes to undertake projects with the private sector to bring the Port of Adelaide into the twenty first century and to place South Australia on a competitive trade footing with the rest of the world.

Investments include the construction of a new deep-sea grain port, and improvements to road and rail services to the port.

The construction of the final link in the Adelaide Darwin Railway is nearing completion.

The Government will work in partnership with industry and the Economic Development Board to develop an export strategy to build on the strong exporting performance of the past five years.

Agriculture, Food and Fisheries

The Government will introduce legislation to regulate the cultivation of genetically modified crops.

This legislation will be based on the recommendations of the *Select Committee on Genetically Modified Organisms* tabled in the previous session.

Its aim is for Kangaroo Island and Eyre Peninsula to take advantage of their unique situation of being discrete, separate cropping regions with the opportunity to elect for GM-free status.

My Government also intends to introduce new fisheries legislation to replace the *Fisheries Act 1982* which is more than 20 years old.

The existing Act has now fallen behind other legislation in Australia and overseas.

The legislation needs to be renewed to reflect contemporary management practices for fisheries.

Procurement

The State Government is committed to procurement reform to ensure best practice in Government tendering and contracts.

It will review the *State Supply Act* to ensure procurement across the public sector is coordinated and complies with best practice.

Environmental sustainability and energy

My Government has made an historic breakthrough on rescuing the River Murray.

The recent Council of Australian Governments' meeting in Canberra determined to return water to the Murray-Darling Basin system over the next five years.

This \$500 million agreement is crucial to restoring the health of the river.

South Australia's environment, economy and communities all depend on the way the State manages its natural resources.

The Government intends to introduce a *Natural Resources Management Bill*, landmark legislation to reform how we manage our natural resources.

My Government will also establish a Sustainability Roundtable in the next few months to ensure South Australia has an environmentally sustainable future.

The Sustainability Roundtable will develop an agreed vision of the long-term environmental sustainability of South Australia and how to achieve it.

The Government intends to introduce the *Adelaide Dolphin Sanctuary Bill 2003*.

It aims to provide a legal framework for the establishment and management of the Adelaide Dolphin Sanctuary in the Port River and Barker Inlet.

Legislation will be introduced into Parliament to establish Zero Waste SA as an independent statutory body, with its own source of revenue from increases to the waste levy.

It will coordinate efforts across the State to minimise waste as well as encourage recycling.

The Government will also introduce legislation to protect from mining the most environmentally important part of the Coongie Lakes wetlands in Innamincka Regional Reserve, in the State's far-north east.

It will also create a new 27 900 hectare National Park over the core of the Coongie Lakes wetlands which will exclude all mining operations and grazing.

Urban Development and Planning

My Government announced the Hills Face Zone Review in October last year in response to concerns about its future.

The Government is now working with local governments and the community to help ensure that the Hills Face Zone is adequately protected and correctly managed for future generations to enjoy.

In March 2003, my Government implemented the zoning for an Urban Growth Boundary around Adelaide's existing suburbs and nearby townships.

Work is now progressing on an Urban Growth Management Plan, which will be incorporated into the State's Planning Strategy to further complement the introduction of limits to Adelaide's urban growth.

Transport

The coming months will see significant progress in many areas of transport.

South Australia's first Transport Plan in 35 years will be finalised following strong community and industry involvement during its development.

The plan provides clear principles and objectives to guide policy and investment during the next 15 years.

It will integrate transport and land use planning.

Significant steps will be taken toward a number of infrastructure projects.

These include approvals to call tenders for the Port River Expressway road and rail bridges.

Arts

My Government believes that leadership in the arts is vital for South Australia's creative industries.

The 2003 Arts Summit provided an opportunity for the arts sector to come together over a day and agree on priorities and set a direction for the arts over the next 10 years.

The 2004 Adelaide Festival of Arts is shaping up once again to position South Australia as the premier Arts Festival State.

The Adelaide International Film Festival will build on the success of its impressive first event.

It will commission and invest in a select number of outstanding film productions which will premiere at the 2005 Film Festival.

Industrial Relations

My Government is committed to reducing work-related death, injury, illness and disease.

Reforms are underway to improve the safety of all South Australians at work, including an immediate 50% increase in the number of workplace safety Inspectors.

The Government has introduced the *SafeWork SA Bill* to allow for much needed improvements to the administration of workplace safety in this State.

In the wake of the Longford disaster in Victoria, my Government has re-examined the way 'major hazard' facilities in this State are managed.

Funding has been committed to make these important facilities safer and consultation has occurred on a new regulatory regime.

I now declare this session open and trust that your deliberations will be guided by Divine Providence to the advancement of the welfare of the people of this State.

[Sitting suspended from 12.50 to 2.30 p.m.]

BOUNDY, Mr L.D., DEATH

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY (Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries): With leave, I move:

That the Legislative Council expresses its deep regret at the recent death of Mr David Boundy, former member of the House of

Assembly, and places on record its appreciation of his distinguished public service and that, as a mark of respect to his memory, the sitting of the council be suspended until the ringing of the bells.

I move this condolence motion to mark the passing of David Boundy, the former member for Goyder. Mr Boundy was born at Brentwood on the Yorke Peninsula, a grandchild of pioneers of the district. Mr Boundy became member for Goyder in a by-election in June 1974, replacing the Hon. Steele Hall, elected to the seat as a candidate for the Liberal Movement. After the merger between the Liberal Party and the Liberal Movement, Mr Boundy stood as candidate for the Liberal Party for Goyder in the 1977 state election. He was defeated in that election by Mr Keith Russack who, after losing preselection to Mr Boundy, stood as an unendorsed Liberal candidate.

A farmer, Mr Boundy was an active member of the United Farmers and Stockowners SA Incorporated, serving on various committees, including the governing council (which included five years as state treasurer) and the wool and meat section executive. Mr Boundy was also a life member of the Agricultural Bureau of South Australia and the South Australian Farmers Federation.

Mr Boundy served the state's agricultural interests by participating in barley production trials with the Department of Agriculture for over 40 years. These trials assisted research in, among other things, weed and pest control and fertiliser use. The SARDI barley variety trials continue to be conducted on what was the Boundy property.

Mr Boundy gave a lifetime of service to his community, performing in many district and industry roles. Among positions held, Mr Boundy was a member of the Minlaton and District Hospital Board, a life member of the Central Yorke Peninsula Agricultural Society, Chair of the Port Giles Silo Committee, and a member of the Minlaton Schools council. On a broader scale, Mr Boundy was the National Chair of Farmsafe Australia and held positions with the Rural Training Council of Australia and the South Australian Rural Industry Training Committee, the Advisory Board of Agriculture, the Natural Resources Ecological Committee and the Native Vegetation Authority. In recent years, Mr Boundy became a conciliator under the Native Vegetation Management Act, a position which he held until last year.

I had the pleasure of meeting David Boundy on several occasions during the period I was shadow minister for primary industries and more recently as the Minister for Agriculture. He was a friendly and courteous man, enthusiastic about the future of agriculture and highly regarded by the many officers of the Department of Primary Industries and Resources who knew him personally. Mr Boundy is survived by his wife Erica, five daughters and nine grandchildren. On behalf of the government and the Department of Primary Industries and Resources I extend my sincerest condolences to David Boundy's family.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Leader of the Opposition): On behalf of the Liberal members in the chamber, I rise to support the motion and to pass on our condolences to David Boundy's family. I knew David Boundy from my early days in the parliament but, since he left the parliament, it is fair to say that I saw him only occasionally at the odd function here or there. I was privileged to represent the party at his funeral service at which glowing tributes were paid to David Boundy from a number of the people representing some of the organisations which the Leader of the Government has already placed on the public record.

The Hon. Mr Holloway referred to Mr Boundy's work with Farmsafe. The library has provided us with a number of press clippings. It is perhaps true that one's own personal experience leads one to develop interests in certain areas, because there is a lovely (in retrospect; not lovely at the time) story in 1974 under the headline 'Feet broken, walks home' which states:

A member of parliament walked 150 yards for help after a 1½ ton weight fell and broke both his feet on Saturday afternoon. Mr Boundy [who was then the Liberal Movement member for Goyder] was carrying out maintenance on a rotary mower on his farm at Brentwood. . . when the accident happened.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Yes. A hydraulic ram on the mower snapped, dropping a 1½ ton guard on his feet. 'If it had been on a level surface my feet would have been cut off', he said. He crawled 30 yards to a tractor and then started yelling for his wife. He then walked on his heels to the farmhouse 150 yards away.

As is sometimes the case—or often the case—one's service in an area is guided a little by one's personal experiences, and clearly his work with Farmsafe in some way might have been guided by his personal experiences and his knowledge of other experiences of friends and colleagues on farms; I am sure some of my colleagues can tell a number of stories, although I am sure they are much safer in their practices these days than in the 1970s—says he with tongue in cheek.

On a previous occasion, I said that David Boundy's period in the parliament mirrored a tumultuous time for the Liberal Party. The formation of the Liberal Movement, then the merging of the two parties and the changing of the name from the Liberal and Country League to the Liberal Party of Australia (SA Division) occurred in the period between 1972 and 1973 to 1976. As the Hon. Mr Holloway indicated, David Boundy was first elected in the by-election in 1974. He was a friend of Steele Hall, and the Liberal Movement at that time was at the peak of its popularity. It polled significant votes in by-elections and in the subsequent election in 1975.

As I said, the merger in 1974-75 meant that there was the difficult issue in a number of seats of endorsing candidates from the merged Liberal Movement and LCL (as it then was). In the area of Goyder and Gouger, there was the dilemma that the seat of Gouger, which was Keith Russack's seat, was abolished and a significant part of the seat of Gouger was amalgamated or merged with the seat of Goyder, which was based on the Yorke Peninsula and which was the seat David Boundy had won. That was the only seat, I think (although there might have been one other), where we had two members who were contesting, but there were a number of seats where we had candidates.

As I have recounted on a previous occasion, the solution at the time was to construct an electoral college with equal numbers from the Liberal Movement and the Liberal Party. I have recounted the story of the metropolitan seat where there were 15 from the Liberal Movement and 15 from the Liberal Party and under the party's constitution they all held firm—if one can put it that way—and there were three votes of 15-all and the successful candidate for that seat was determined in accordance with the constitution by lot.

In the seat of Goyder—the amalgamated seat about which we are talking—there were 30 delegates from the Liberal Movement and 30 from the Liberal Party—a college of 60. There was some trepidation that there might be an occurrence of 30-all. As is sometimes the case, someone switched and

the final vote was 31 to 29. So one of the Liberal Party delegates (if I can term it that) switched and supported David Boundy. I am not sure whether that person has been identified in despatches since then. It was legendary at the time as to whom the person might be. As I said, I am not sure—and even if I were sure perhaps today is not the occasion to put it on the public record. Anyway, by the narrowest of margins—31 to 29—David Boundy won preselection. It was a tragedy because one could not think of two nicer people than David Boundy and Keith Russack. Sometimes in political battles there is a party favourite or family favourite in terms of, 'He's a nicer person,' or 'He's a better person,' but, basically, they were two lovely people who well represented their country constituencies, and it was a tragedy that we had these two people going head to head in a most unusual set of circumstances.

As the Hon. Mr Holloway has indicated, what transpired then was that Keith Russack, under the then provisions of the constitution of the Liberal Party, was entitled under, I think, then section 128 of the constitution to stand as an unendorsed Liberal for the next election (I am not sure of the reasoning behind all of this), with the support of Labor Party preferences at the time. I suspect that, in today's circumstances, it is more likely that the Labor Party preferences would go to Mr Boundy rather than Mr Russack. But Mr Russack was successful. As I said, it was a tragedy. Two nicer people you could not have met and, unfortunately, by the merging of the political parties, they found themselves in that set of circumstances. There was a brief career in terms of parliamentary representation (as the Hon. Mr Holloway has indicated), but the people who spoke at the funeral service highlighted David Boundy's continued community service to a number of organisations, and he did that for many years after his formal period of community service in the parliament.

On behalf of the Liberal members in this chamber, I formally pass on the condolences of the Liberal Party to David Boundy's family. We pay tribute to his public service in the parliament but, more particularly, to the many years of community service that he offered to many organisations and the broader community generally.

The Hon. IAN GILFILLAN: On behalf of the Democrats, I express our support for the motion and pass on our condolences to the family of David Boundy and the acknowledgment of his unique and valuable contribution to state politics. I think it is indicative of the personality of David Boundy that he gave so much of his political life to support the Liberal Movement, which was really a breaking up of the cast mould of the two traditional parties, and that he looked for other forms of political expression—an ability that he held, I believe, until his death. I would like to share with the chamber, and perhaps with his family, that the Democrat candidate for Goyder, Richard Way, was very motivated to refer to David Boundy, above all others, as a reaction to the consequences of what he was prepared to do, what were the best interests of the area to represent, and I think it is testimony to David Boundy that he broke out of this stricture of the party versus party mould.

I regard it (with warm recollections) as a privilege to have known David. He was a likeable—in fact, I would say lovable—person to whom one could turn for an honest, unbiased view on issues. He kept his loyalties, but he had a wider vision of the world and his community than just party loyalty. I think it is sad that David, in comparison, was taken from us earlier than perhaps he could have been, because I

believe that he was able, and would have continued, to contribute not only to his area but also to the state, as someone who really saw a bigger vision and was a big enough personality to contribute to it. As Democrats, we regret his passing but acknowledge his enormous achievements.

The Hon. R.K. SNEATH: I had the pleasure of serving on the South Australian Rural Industry Training Council when David was chairman of that body, and also on the Farm Safe committee when David was a member of that committee. I found him to be a very pleasant gentleman to work with, and a very good chairman. He certainly had the interests of young farmers and young country people at heart.

He did a lot of work to make sure there were provisions in the training area and lobbied governments to make sure that money was available to train young farmers and people on the land. I learnt of David's passing in the *Advertiser* only on Saturday, unfortunately, and I was saddened, because he was still only a young man. I pass on my condolences to his family.

The Hon. CAROLINE SCHAEFER: I add my condolences to those of the previous speakers on behalf of most of the farming community of South Australia. As the Hon. Rob Lucas has indicated, David's contribution to South Australia was relatively brief in parliamentary terms, but I think it was a symbol of the man that for the rest of his life he continued to give an enormous amount of time and effort to agri-politics in South Australia.

He offered parts of his farm for field trials. Those of us who have done that know that often there is considerable financial loss in field trials, for barley in particular. I understand that he made that voluntary effort for his community for 40 years without a break. As has already been said, he was part of the Rural Industry Training Council of Farmsafe. He was also a life member of the Advisory Board of Agriculture and of the South Australian Farmers Federation. As well as that, however, he made contributions to his community on Yorke Peninsula in a number of ways.

I understand that he was a member of the school council; he was a justice of the peace and was involved with regional arts. Obviously, he was involved with the Port Giles silo committee. He is held in great respect by the sometimes opposing groups of grain traders within AusBulk, the Barley Board and the Wheat Board. Again, it indicates the stature of the man that he was always able to give his advice warmly and in a manner that we could all accept, even if we did not agree with him, until the day he died. He was committed to rural South Australia and to agriculture in particular. I offer my condolences to his wife Erica and his five daughters.

The Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS: I would like to add some brief comments to those made by my colleagues around the chamber in relation to the late Mr Leslie David Boundy. In mentioning his full name I note that he is one of many past and current members of this place who have used their second name as their commonly used Christian name. As has already been mentioned in this place, Mr Boundy was a well respected farmer and member of the community of southern Yorke Peninsula, living at Brentwood. I think he was involved in pretty much everything going in that region of the state. He was heavily involved with the United Farmers and Stock Owners, as they were called in those days (now SAFF), the Advisory Board of Agriculture, which is the governing

body of the Agricultural Bureau of South Australia, and many other community organisations. My first memory of David Boundy was when I travelled with my father to Yorketown in the early 1970s to a public meeting at Yorketown Town Hall, which was packed out with many hundreds of local farmers, because a new Labor government was bringing in some terrible laws about the weight of grain they could carry in the trucks—

The Hon. R.I. Lucas interjecting: Socialists!

The Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS: That's right. David Boundy was a very emotional key speaker at that rally. I cannot recall whether it was successful in getting the government to change, but I remember very well the emotion in the room that evening as David Boundy delivered an exhilarating speech. As a member of the Liberal Movement, he went on to represent most of Yorke Peninsula, and some areas beyond, for a brief period in this parliament. My leader has spoken about the way in which the Liberal Movement and the old LCL, the then Liberal Party, came together and the sort of arrangements that applied—where there were two sitting members standing for a seat. I well remember the events of that time when some Liberal Party people, as they might be described, voted for David Boundy and David Boundy got the endorsement for the seat of Goyder.

The late Keith Russack, who had previously been a member of this place, decided to run as an unendorsed candidate and subsequently won the seat on the preferences of the Labor Party and the National Party, which also stood a candidate. Despite the fact that Mr Boundy lost his seat to Keith Russack in those circumstances, he remained committed to many of the activities in that electorate and also kept up a fairly reasonable relationship with the late Keith Russack, and, in fact, some years ago attended Mr Russack's funeral in Kadina. As I said, he remained committed to the industry he had grown up with and the community throughout Yorke Peninsula and beyond.

We have heard from other members today about his commitment to farm safety and many other aspects of the agricultural industry. He was enthusiastic, as the Leader of the Government said, about the future of agriculture and, I should add, about the future of rural communities and was one of those people who was very keen to promote and encourage young leaders in the community. I extend my sympathy to the Boundy family.

Motion carried by members standing in their places in silence.

[Sitting suspended from 2.58 to 3.10 p.m.]

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the President—

Register of new Members' Interests—June 2003—
Registrar's Statement. Ordered—That the Statement be printed. (Paper No. 134A)

Register of Members' Interests—June 2003—Registrar's
Statement. Ordered—That the Statement be printed.
(Paper No. 134)

Members' Travel Expenditure, 2002-2003, pursuant to
Members of Parliament Travel Entitlement Rules, 1983

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

Police Superannuation Scheme Actuarial Report, 2002

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

City of Mount Gambier By-law No. A4(6)—Exemption
for Election Moveable Signs
District Council of Coober Pedy By-laws—
No. 3—Local Government Land
No. 4—Roads.

STATUTORY AUTHORITIES REVIEW COMMITTEE

The Hon. R.K. SNEATH: I bring up the report of the committee on the management of the West Terrace Cemetery by the Adelaide Cemeteries Authority.

Ordered to be printed.

STANDING ORDERS SUSPENSION

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY (Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries): I seek leave to move a motion without notice concerning the suspension of standing order 14.

Leave granted.

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: I move:

That standing order 14 be suspended.

This procedure has been adopted in recent times to allow consideration of other business before the Address in Reply has been adopted.

Motion carried.

PARLIAMENT, PRACTICE AND PROCEDURES

The PRESIDENT: Before I call on questions, I want to make a presidential statement to the council. Honourable members would remember that just over 12 to 18 months ago, when I had the great honour of being elected as President of this Legislative Council, I committed to maintaining the practice, procedures and protocols and to trying to maintain the dignity of this council at all times. These principles I have tried to apply in every station which I hold and which I hold on behalf of the Legislative Council, including the deliberations of the Constitutional Convention.

In line with the integrity of holding this high office, I intend to report to the council, as I know this is a matter of some public interest at the moment, that in the proceedings that have been widely reported involving Mr Randall Ashbourne, Mr Ralph Clarke and the Hon. Mr Atkinson, I was interviewed as part of those deliberations. It is a matter of which I have made no secret; and I have discussed it with many members. In line with the integrity of the practice of this council, I want it on the record so that whatever decisions I may make with respect to procedures in this council at some later date will not be prejudiced by the fact that I could be a witness, or have been a potential witness, in those matters.

In respect of those matters there are some matters sub judice, on which I have taken some advice, and I will report this to the council at this stage. Parliament and its committees have traditionally upheld the principle of sub judice as follows:

Notwithstanding its fundamental right and duty to consider any matter if it is thought to be in the public interest, the house imposes a restriction on itself in the case of matters awaiting or under adjudication in a court of law. . . The convention is that, subject to the right of the house to legislate on any matter, matters awaiting adjudication in a court of law should not be brought forward in debate, motions or questions.

The rule is a rule of practice adopted by the parliament. It is not a rule of law. The essence of the decisions that have been followed in the House of Commons and also in Australian parliaments is that there should not be a real and substantial danger of prejudice to proceedings. The *House of Representatives Practice* states:

Matters awaiting or under adjudication in all courts exercising criminal jurisdiction shall not be referred to in motions, debate or questions from the moment a charge is made.

I understand that a summons has been issued in regard to the matters that I referred to earlier. Therefore, as chair, I will not entertain any questions that may interfere with the course of justice.

The Hon. R.D. LAWSON: Sir, I seek a point of clarification. I take it that the test that you will be applying is that no matter should be discussed if it will create a real and substantial danger of prejudice to proceedings before a court.

The PRESIDENT: That is the advice that I have been given, and that is the course that I intend to follow.

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: May I inquire as to who you obtained your advice from?

The PRESIDENT: My advice was provided, as always, by parliamentary counsel. These are matters about which I sought advice. I was not advised by anyone else. It is a matter of public interest, which I had an interest in, and, as the presiding officer, I felt it my duty to take advice from my parliamentary advisers. I have sought no other advice from anyone else.

MURRAY RIVER

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY (Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries): I lay on the table a copy of a ministerial statement relating to the COAG agreement on the Murray River made earlier today in another place by the Premier.

ASHBOURNE, Mr R.

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY (Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries): I lay on the table a copy of a ministerial statement relating to the Attorney-General made earlier today in another place by the Premier.

QUESTION TIME

ASHBOURNE, Mr R.

The Hon. R.D. LAWSON: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries a question about the Ashbourne/Atkinson matter.

Leave granted.

The PRESIDENT: You are aware of the advice that I have provided?

The Hon. R.D. LAWSON: Indeed. On Thursday 11 September, the Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries issued a news release concerning 'an independent inquiry into the Ashbourne/Atkinson matter'. The news release of the minister stated, 'I will be assuming ministerial responsibility for this matter for its duration.' My questions are:

1. What action will the minister take to ensure that all arrangements regarding the appointment of the proposed inquiry referred to in his media release will occur in his office and under his direction?

2. What steps will the minister put in place to ensure that decisions regarding the establishment and conduct of this inquiry are taken under his direction?

3. Will the minister undertake that he will not have discussions with the Attorney-General or the Attorney-General's officers or with officers of any other minister concerning the establishment and conduct of the independent inquiry for which he has, in his own words, assumed ministerial responsibility?

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY (Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries): Mr President—

The Hon. A.J. Redford: Will you be a witness?

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: No—well, I do not know. Not as far as I am aware. I thank the honourable member for his question. It is great to be back in parliament after the winter recess. In relation to the duties that I have assumed, according to the statement that has just been tabled from the Premier, the Premier indicates:

I have appointed the Hon. Paul Holloway, Leader of the Government in another place, to be the sole point of ministerial contact with the prosecution authorities. The appointment of the Hon. Paul Holloway avoids the possibility of the Attorney-General's involvement in connection with the prosecution other than as a potential witness.

I think that really anticipates the later parts of the question asked by the honourable member. Obviously, I will be the point of contact between the Office of the Director of Public Prosecutions and the government. Of course, I will not be discussing with the Attorney any matters in relation to the case. Beyond that, I do not wish to say anything further.

The Hon. R.D. LAWSON: As a supplementary question: does the ministerial responsibility to which the minister's news release referred include not only responsibility for the criminal prosecutions to which the Premier refers but also the establishment and conduct of the inquiry referred to in the news release issued last week?

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: In relation to the inquiry, the statement that has just been tabled on behalf of the Premier sets out the detail in relation to that. Members will recall that on his return from overseas the Premier made a statement announcing that an inquiry would be established when it was appropriate to do so. There is a significant amount of detail in relation to that in the statement that the Premier has just tabled. If I can quickly paraphrase the statement made by the Premier, the undertakings are that the inquiry will be independent; it will be conducted by a senior counsel; the government will consult with parliamentary leaders, including the Leader of the Opposition, on the appointment of the person who will conduct the inquiry; the terms of reference of the inquiry will be determined after the criminal proceedings are completed; and they will be determined on motion by the House of Assembly. While it is not possible to determine the terms of reference of the inquiry at this stage, it will be sufficiently broad to consider the matters that were brought to the attention of the Premier in November 2002.

Further on the Premier states that the powers of the inquiry will be the same as those granted by the parliament to Mr Dean Clayton QC, as he then was, when he conducted his inquiry into, among other things, whether material evidence was not supplied to Mr Cramond in his inquiry into whether the then Premier made false or misleading statements in parliament. I think those essentially address the matters that were raised in correspondence to the Premier from the Leader of the Opposition and other Independent members last week.

Obviously, the terms of reference for that inquiry will have to wait until an appropriate time, but they will ultimately be determined through the parliamentary process.

The Hon. A.J. REDFORD: As a supplementary question: further to the minister's reference to the ministerial statement made in another place today by Premier Mike Rann in which he referred to 'arrangements to ensure that ministers and others who are potential witnesses in this case have no involvement in the prosecution other than as witnesses', will the minister tell us which persons and which ministers are potential witnesses in this matter?

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: I believe it to be quite inappropriate to give that information because, obviously, that relates to the legal process that is being conducted. The Director of Public Prosecutions will prosecute this case and will ultimately make that determination.

The Hon. A.J. REDFORD: As a further supplementary question: based on that answer, does the minister now assert that it was inappropriate for the Premier to disclose for the first time today that ministers and others will be potential witnesses in this case?

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: It is one thing for individual members such as the President to declare that they may be witnesses, but I do not believe it would be appropriate for me to provide that information. As I said, at the end of the day it will be up to the Director of Public Prosecutions.

CORRECTIONAL FACILITIES, OAKDEN

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Leader of the Opposition): I seek leave to make an explanation before asking the Minister for Correctional Services a question about a women's prison and youth detention centre.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Some members have received a number of letters protesting over potential government decisions in relation to the proposal to build a women's prison and a youth detention centre at Oakden. I refer to correspondence I have received from Tania and Stuart Jones and quote in brief from their letter of 2 September as follows:

I am writing to you to express our outrage at the proposal to build another women's prison and youth detention centre at Oakden. We bought our property knowing that Strathmont Centre, James Nash House, Yatala and Hillcrest Hospital were located in the area. However, no information was known by anyone about a proposal to build more correctional facilities.

Further on, the letter states:

As far as we are concerned, these are not valid sites for TWO correctional facilities to be located. Most areas only get hit with one ghastly proposal. . . the residents of Oakden get TWO!

The letter goes on, in a number of other paragraphs, to highlight residents' concerns about the government's proposals in these areas. Similarly, members would be aware of statements that have been made by members of the government and the government backbench in relation to this issue. My questions are:

1. Will the minister place on the public record the status of government decision making in relation to the proposal to build a women's prison and a youth detention centre at Oakden?

2. Can the minister also indicate, if he contends that a decision has not been made, what time line or process is being undertaken by the government, and by him in particu-

lar, in relation to the possible location of a women's prison and youth detention centre at Oakden?

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS (Minister for Correctional Services): The government has recently announced its intention to construct a new purpose-built women's prison to accommodate the growing number of women prisoners. That has been known, and I have made mention of that in this council. At this stage, Minister Conlon, as the Minister for Infrastructure, has conduct of this project. However, in relation to the new women's prison, I am aware that no decision has been made by government, and all options and locations are being considered. Any decision—and that will include full consultation, as was done with Mobilong and the previous Labor government did in the building of the Mount Gambier prison—is some weeks away. I cannot put any other time line on it than that.

The decision to provide a new women's prison reflects this government's commitment to law and order and the effective and humane supervision and rehabilitation of offenders. It also reflects the need for women prisoners to have their special and unique needs met to better achieve justice outcomes.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I have a supplementary question. In relation to the youth detention centre, will the minister confirm that the Department of Correctional Services has recommended that Oakden be the location? I understand that the minister is saying that there is a process now of consideration, but can he confirm that the Department of Correctional Services has recommended that Oakden be the location or site for the women's prison and the youth detention centre?

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: I cannot confirm whether it is the department's preferred position. The PPP, or the process now being carried out, is in the hands of Minister Conlon. All the relevant bodies will be contacted in relation to their design features for what is required as a facility for a women's prison. The site itself—

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: Is the minister saying that he has received no advice at all from the department?

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: I have not recently received—

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: From anyone?

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: The only advice I have received is by way of an examination of possibilities: no recommendation for a preferred site has been proffered to me. It may have been a position the department has indicated to the PPP unit. The youth detention centre is not my responsibility, but my understanding is that the same applies to the youth detention centre. The circumstances will be known in a reasonable time frame. I understand that the announcement is some weeks away.

My understanding is that the circumstance in which the situation became public was an announcement made not by the government but by a manager of one of the facilities at Oakden. The government's position is that all options will be considered. There is no preferred site. I understand that the options for sites are still under consideration and that the design features of a particular prison and a particular facility will be determined by the site on which the buildings will be placed. I can confirm nothing in relation to this issue, as the responsibility lies within the PPP unit.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: As a supplementary question: will the minister indicate whether or not his officers within the Department for Correctional Services are required to

provide him, as Minister for Correctional Services, with copies of advice that they provide to the PPP unit, which is in Treasury, or is he indicating that they operate completely independently of him and can provide submissions directly to the PPP unit in Treasury without his knowledge?

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: The PPP unit operates independently of me. The presentation of the documents in relation to the requirements of the department is worked with departmental officers and with the PPP unit.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: Yes, but do you see them?

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: No.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: They act independently of the minister?

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: The PPP process is under the control of the Minister for Infrastructure—

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: Yes, but the Department for Correctional Services is under your control.

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: The Department for Correctional Services is under my control, but the building of the facility is in the hands of the PPP unit.

POLITICAL DONATIONS

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY (Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries): I table a ministerial statement made in another place by the Treasurer on the Hindmarsh federal electorate fundraiser raffles.

GUERIN, Mr B.

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: I table a copy of a ministerial statement made in another place by the Treasurer on the settlement of the Guerin claim.

ROSEWORTHY CAMPUS

The Hon. CAROLINE SCHAEFER: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries a question about the Roseworthy campus of the University of Adelaide.

Leave granted.

The Hon. CAROLINE SCHAEFER: The University of Adelaide web site describes Roseworthy campus as an internationally renowned centre for learning in dryland agriculture and animal production. It states:

The campus is located on a 1 600-hectare property 50 kilometres north of Adelaide and includes a working farm on which students gain practical experience and training.

It is my understanding that it is the first such property and place of agricultural learning in Australia and has some considerable heritage value in its own right, as do the buildings. The campus has many technical partners, including TAFE, PIRSA and SARDI; as well as the Pig and Poultry Production Institute; what used to be—and still is on the web site—the Sheep Industry Development Centre (but of course we know what happened to that: it got the chop last year); and the Roseworthy Information Centre. However, there are recurring rumours that there is a plan to sell the Roseworthy farm and possibly the entire campus. My questions are:

1. Will the minister assure this council that the current government will not sell the Roseworthy campus of the University of Adelaide?

2. Will he assure the council that there are no moves afoot to do so?

3. If in fact there are such moves afoot by the university, will he give his commitment to oppose such a sale?

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY (Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries): As the honourable member says, the Roseworthy campus is very important for agriculture and certainly for the Department of Primary Industries and Resources. In particular, SARDI obviously has a strong interest in what happens at that campus. Rumours may be going around in relation to what the University of Adelaide intends to do. I will endeavour to find some information.

I do not think that the university would consider such major change without discussing it with other interested parties. I am not aware of its being raised. At this stage it certainly has not been raised with me by constituent groups, but that is not to say that something is not going on within the university. I agree with the honourable member that it is a very important campus, and I expect that it would continue to play an important role. Whether the university is looking at selling off part of the campus, as I assume she is suggesting, I could not say, but I will ask my department to contact the university and get a statement from it as soon as possible.

The Hon. CAROLINE SCHAEFER: By way of supplementary question, is the minister aware of any other significant buildings within his portfolio being considered for sale?

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: The honourable member is probably aware, in relation to Struan House, which is not owned by the Department of Primary Industries and Resources but is a DAIS property on PIRSA land, that a proposal was put by a developer in relation to that property some time last year, so a cost benefit study is being undertaken in relation to the benefits of the department either retaining or selling that property. It is a magnificent heritage property, but it has serious structural problems. I looked at it earlier this year. It was given a major upgrade about 15 years ago, but there is significant salt damp in part of the building and it is crumbling. There are concerns about occupational health and safety issues with that building. A developer expressed some interest in the property last year.

I believe there have been no recent expressions of interest in relation to it. My department and DAIS have been looking at the cost benefits in relation to retaining that building, but I think the honourable member was asking for any other properties. I think some minor properties—a couple of houses at Turretfield—were sold off in the past couple of years, but I will ask the department to check whether there are any other properties.

The Hon. J.S.L. Dawkins interjecting:

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: There were a couple of properties with it.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas interjecting:

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: Not at all. SARDI is a very important research body, but it is a matter of which is the best body to look after a heritage building like Struan House. Struan House is not of itself a particular asset for agriculture. It has value as a meeting place in the region, and I indicated on the ABC when I spoke about this last week that before the government would ever contemplate any such sale of a building like that that it would have to acquire other facilities. At this stage the department is simply looking at the cost benefits of retaining a building such as that.

We saw a similar situation with the previous government and the hotel down there. The current government in opposition did not attack that arrangement but supported it

because it was a matter of finding a solution for preserving a heritage building in its best use. Unfortunately, some of the older heritage buildings are extremely expensive to maintain and, if one is to have a proper research effort, which agriculture needs in this state, spending money on maintaining old buildings for their heritage value is not necessarily the best use of the funds that the government gets, particularly through some of its industry levies. That is why the government is looking at more appropriate uses in relation to some of the old buildings. However, I assure the council that the research facilities at Struan are under no threat whatsoever.

The Hon. CAROLINE SCHAEFER: Having said that there may be more appropriate bodies to look after the heritage listed Struan House, and having conducted a cost benefit study which we have not had access to, is the minister suggesting the most appropriate body is a developer?

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: There were some suggestions that an approach was made in relation to using that wonderful old heritage building as some sort of guest house in the area, for which it would have been very well suited and it would have enabled that wonderful building to be preserved for its appropriate use without the significant costs involved impacting on agricultural research. A debate is going on in relation to Struan House and that should continue. It has some importance because of its meeting facilities for the region. I have given the assurance that the government will not contemplate such a sale of that building unless there is some capacity to replace that important role that Struan House has played.

It is much too premature to suggest at this stage that the property will be disposed of. I understand that it will be some months before the cost benefit study is completed. Obviously we would need to look at that information before any decision is made. It is appropriate that the government, with all its assets, should look at them and ensure that we have the best assets available and working at maximum level for the benefit of the departments concerned.

The Hon. A.J. REDFORD: In weighing up the pros and cons of the sale of Struan House (and I am not opposed to it), will the government consider not only the benefits financially to PIRSA but also the community, regional and tourist benefits when reaching its decision?

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: That is self-evident. Obviously one could get a positive benefit to cost ratio only if a developer was to use that property in a way that would enhance the tourism potential. There are a whole lot of issues to be settled, including the fact that adjacent to the heritage building would be the research infrastructure and whether it is compatible with the activities that might be applied in the house. It is premature to suggest it at this stage.

The Hon. Caroline Schaefer interjecting:

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: The Hon. Caroline Schaefer just asked whether the government is looking at any other properties. Because I know a study has been under way in relation to that, I would not wish to mislead the council by not providing that information. It is certainly far too premature to suggest that that sale is a possibility at this stage. I again make the point that the particular developer who approached the department in the first place did not express further interest.

The Hon. A.J. REDFORD: Will the minister assure us and the people of the South-East that any benefit that might

accrue through the sale of Struan House will be delivered to the people of the South-East rather than be transferred into general revenue or to the people in the metropolitan area?

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: Any decision on the future of Struan House depends on the cost benefit analysis. There would have to be some benefit and, first, a buyer and, secondly, there would have to be a positive—

The Hon. A.J. Redford interjecting:

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: I was on the ABC last week in relation to the matter down in Mount Gambier. It is well known that a cost benefit study has commenced, but it is far too premature at this stage to suggest that the building would be disposed of—much too early.

ROCK LOBSTERS

The Hon. CARMEL ZOLLO: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries a question about rock lobster tail fan clipping.

Leave granted.

The Hon. CARMEL ZOLLO: Recently, there has been community concern that the practice of tail fan clipping is causing pain to lobsters and that it should cease. Has the minister made a decision on this issue?

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY (Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries): Yes, I have. As a result of community concern, Primary Industries and Resources undertook research into this issue. A report was written by Dr Colin Johnston, Manager of Aquatic Animal Health in PIRSA. A histological examination of rock lobster tail fans indicated that the prevalence and size of nerve bundles decreases closer to the edge of the fan. In the last five millimetres of the fan none was found. A review of the current available scientific literature indicates that, in all likelihood, any response to the clipping of the tail fan is a reflex escape response and not conscious emotional awareness of pain.

Further, the report states that it is likely that the central nervous system of the lobster does not support the complex neuronal networking and specialised regions necessary to allow conscious emotional awareness of pain. Whilst the clipping requirement may be reviewed at a later date should other scientific research indicate that this is desirable, I have taken the decision to continue the requirement that recreational catch lobsters have their fans clipped prior to landing. It is important for the proper management of the fishery that recreational catch lobsters are easily identified.

NUCLEAR WASTE STORAGE FACILITY

The Hon. SANDRA KANCK: I seek leave to make an explanation before asking the minister representing the Premier a question about the possible use of South Australia Police during any nuclear waste dump protests.

Leave granted.

The Hon. SANDRA KANCK: The federal coalition's plan to locate a national nuclear waste dump in South Australia has been stridently opposed by the Rann government. There is also considerable community opposition to the federal government's plan to locate this dump in South Australia. If the dump overcomes all the legislative and legal hurdles that have been put in front of it so far, it is probable that a non-violent community blockade will be organised to attempt to prevent the transport of nuclear waste across the South Australian border.

Should such a community blockade eventuate, it is likely there will be a request by the federal government for SAPOL assistance to control the protest. My question is: will the Premier guarantee that SAPOL officers will not be used to prevent South Australian citizens from protesting against the establishment of a national nuclear waste dump in South Australia; and, if not, why not?

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY (Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries): I will refer the question to either the Premier or the Minister for Police and bring back a response.

WOMEN, FUNDING

The Hon. A.L. EVANS: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the minister representing the Minister for the Status of Women a question about funding for women.

Leave granted.

The Hon. A.L. EVANS: The government currently funds a number of services for women. These services cover a broad section of areas of the community. My question is: will the minister advise what level of government funding is currently being directed to the Women's Information Service, women's health centres, domestic violence services, Women's Health Statewide, women's legal services, and any other services specifically for women in our state?

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation): I will refer that question to the Minister for the Status of Women in another place and bring back a reply.

ATTORNEY-GENERAL

The Hon. A.J. REDFORD: I seek leave to make an explanation before asking the Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries a question about the Ministerial Code of Conduct and the Attorney-General's credibility.

Leave granted.

The Hon. A.J. REDFORD: On the last Wednesday of sitting I asked a series of questions of the then attorney-general about the conduct of the then former (now current) attorney-general. In my explanation, I told you, Mr President, that the attorney-general had made a number of comments about Professor Tony Thomas, a qualified forensic pathologist, on 1 April 2003. In my explanation I said:

... the former attorney made a number of assertions about Professor Thomas. They included:

Professor Thomas was not a forensic pathologist when he appeared on *Four Corners* and, I am told, he had not carried out a post-mortem investigation on a homicide case in South Australia.

The former attorney went on and asserted that in 1998 Professor Thomas was called as an expert witness, and in that case magistrate Baldino found that Professor Thomas was not unbiased and therefore his evidence was unreliable and unsatisfactory. On any analysis, a substantial attack on Professor Thomas's integrity and expertise was made under parliamentary privilege. It has now been brought to my attention that the former attorney-general was not entirely frank in his comments about Professor Thomas. First, despite the former attorney's comments, I am informed that Professor Thomas had undertaken some 300 autopsies in South Australia.

Secondly, Professor Thomas was retained by the Coroner as an independent expert in the babies' death inquiry. Thirdly, magistrate Baldino's judgment was appealed against in the Supreme Court and, in a decision delivered in 1999, Justice Mullighan stated:

These are very serious findings so far as Professor Thomas is concerned. He is a specialist in his profession and holds senior and important positions at the Flinders Medical Centre and the Forensic Science Centre where he is an honorary senior consultant. He has a long history of working in forensic pathology

overseas and in this state. The finding of the learned magistrate reflects poorly upon him. He gave no reasons for his conclusions. His Honour Justice Mullighan further said:

Certainly no suggestion of lack of impartiality or independence or bias was put to Professor Thomas during his evidence by the prosecutor or the learned magistrate. There is no hint of any of these matters in his evidence. His observations and opinions appeared to have been recounted in an entirely appropriate manner. In my view, the learned magistrate erred in his dismissal of Professor Thomas's evidence from his consideration.

As a consequence of that, I asked a series of questions including, first, why the former attorney did not refer to the remarks made by Justice Mullighan and, secondly, whether there was in fact a prima facie case of misleading the parliament. The Ministerial Code of Conduct states (page 2):

In the discharge of his or her public duties, a Minister shall not dishonestly or wantonly and recklessly attack the reputation of any other person.

The Ministerial Code of Conduct goes on to state:

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

By way of explanation, the code of conduct states:

It is a Minister's personal responsibility to ensure that any inadvertent error or misconception in relation to a matter is correct or clarified as soon as possible and in a manner appropriate to the issues and interests involved.

In the light of that, my questions are:

1. What did the minister do to get the answers to the questions that I asked of him on Wednesday 16 July?
2. Did the minister whilst he was attorney-general get any briefing to the effect that the then former (now current) attorney-general's statements to the parliament made on April Fools' Day were misleading?

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY (Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries): I recall the questions. I asked the officers of the Attorney General's Department to furnish a response, but I did not receive one prior to my relinquishing that office. I will take up the matter with the current Attorney-General to see whether a response has now come through.

The Hon. A.J. REDFORD: I ask a supplementary question. Given the extensive delay—that is, from 16 July to 16 September (two months)—am I correct in assuming that it is not 'inadvertence' should it be proven that the then attorney-general misled this parliament in the statements that he made on April Fools' Day?

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: My understanding from the brief discussion I had at the time was that this was a fairly complex matter, and the issues were somewhat more involved than what the Hon. Angus Redford referred to in his question at the time. I will follow up the matter and see whether a response is now available.

The Hon. A.J. REDFORD: I have a supplementary question. Will the minister explain the complexity about what was said by the Attorney-General on 1 April and the delay in the response to my questions asked on 16 July?

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: It is simply the fact that there is a lot more to the particular issue—

The Hon. A.J. Redford interjecting:

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: I am not familiar with the background to it. My advice was that the department would look at the matter.

The Hon. A.J. Redford: Some might think he misled the parliament.

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: I do not concede that is the case, but we will get back with a response.

The Hon. A.J. REDFORD: I have a further supplementary question. Why does the government think there is a lack of urgency in relation to the matters I raised on 16 July and the very serious prospect that the Attorney-General may have misled parliament on April Fools Day?

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: I do not concede that there has been—

The Hon. A.J. Redford interjecting:

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: The matter was raised on the last day of the session. Today a number of answers have been brought back to questions that were asked at the end of the previous session. I will see where this particular matter lies in the system, and I will endeavour to get an answer to the honourable member as soon as possible.

GOLDEN GROVE EMERGENCY SERVICES FACILITIES

The Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, representing the Minister for Police, a question about police and emergency services facilities at Golden Grove.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS: The *Leader* Messenger newspaper recently included an article entitled 'Government promises Grove five station'. The article states:

The state government has pledged \$3 million to build a fire station at Golden Grove. Emergency services minister Pat Conlon said the station would provide quicker response times and improve residents' safety. MFS spokesman Bill Dwyer said the move was needed because of the dramatic increase in housing and industry in the area. Mr Dwyer said the Ridgehaven station was on the edge of the seven minute limit and was set up more than 20 years ago. Wright MP Jennifer Rankine said Golden Grove was the most populated area of Tea Tree Gully and under constant threat from bushfires and arson.

The article goes on to quote Ms Rankine as follows:

In the last 12 months there have been in the vicinity of 250 incidents the MFS has been requested to attend in the Golden Grove area. Twenty-two have been brush-fence fires. A little over 12 months ago, the ambulance service relocated onto Golden Grove Road because they recognised the need to improve response times in Golden Grove. The same applies to the fire station.

It is worth noting at this point that the member for Wright was a strong advocate for a Golden Grove police station when Labor was in opposition, and she took credit for such a station when it was announced by the former government. However, she has been silent on the issue since the 2002 election. I welcome the budget announcement about the fire station and emphasise the various comments in the *Leader* newspaper about the growth in Golden Grove and the need for quicker response times. Members may recall that on three occasions—in October 2002 and twice this year—I have asked questions about the government's addressing the need for a police station at Golden Grove. I acknowledge that in recent days the Leader of the Government has provided a response to my question of 27 May this year, which states:

The Minister for Police has provided the following information: a number of factors have to be balanced in decision making with respect to location of police stations. There is a finite amount of government resources and they must be used in a way that will benefit South Australia most effectively. The government will

consider Golden Grove, along with other locations, for police stations in the future.

I have yet to receive a response to my two earlier questions to the former Minister for Police. Given that the population growth of the area and the associated consideration of response times are just as relevant to policing as they are to emergency services, will the Minister for Police consider establishing a police presence at Golden Grove as a matter of urgency? In so doing, will the minister take account of the increasing community concern about the lack of a police station in the area?

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY (Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries): I missed part of the honourable member's question, but I think I tabled an answer to the honourable member earlier today. Jennifer Rankine, the member whose electorate covers that area, has been absolutely assiduous in terms of pushing for greater facilities in her area.

The Hon. J.S.L. Dawkins interjecting:

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: That is not the case. She has been pushing assiduously since the election. There are a number of other areas where police facilities were poorly placed when this government came to office. A classic case is Mount Barker, where the police facilities are absolutely atrocious—and the government is dealing with those matters. There is a backlog, but I am sure the government will do what it can in relation to addressing this obvious need in relation to providing greater facilities for police as soon as resources are available.

UNITING CHURCH SYNOD

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 Uniting Church Synod of South Australia.

Leave granted.

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: I understand that on Friday 12 September the minister helped launch an indigenous information web site, which was put together by the Uniting Church. Will the minister outline the service offered by this web site and explain how it will contribute to the process of reconciliation?

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation): I was pleased to be invited to help launch the web site, which has been put together by the Uniting Church Synod. The project originated with Ivan Copley, coordinator of indigenous employment for the Uniting Church Synod in South Australia. The web site is sponsored by the Uniting Church Synod of South Australia and is a Work for the Dole initiative funded by the federal government. I acknowledge the letter of support and congratulations from the Hon. Phillip Ruddock, federal Minister for Indigenous Affairs, and also pay homage to another member of the Liberal Party, Joe Scalzi, who was at the launch.

The web site was launched by Josie Agius and the Moderator of the Uniting Church SA Synod, Jan Trengove. The site has been established to assist indigenous people of South Australia access services, and some contemporary stories were told by some people who were in on the ground floor of the program to build up the web site about how the establishment of the web site assisted them. It is there to assist community organisations to provide advice to indigenous people on the availability and location of specialist

services which are designed for Aboriginal people. The web site is structured to provide a user friendly format with information provided clearly with a brief description of and contact details for associated organisations. Information provided includes employment, education, health, family contact, legal advice, cultural information, emergency accommodation, and addresses and phone numbers.

While the Department for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation does an outstanding job in assisting indigenous people in the state, any further help by community or church groups is always welcome. In the spirit of reconciliation, a number of church groups are now starting to pick up the reconciliation theme and are broadening reconciliation activities out through the membership of those churches. Local government is also picking up the bit, and I am pleased to be associated with local government activities in reconciliation programs that are being built into local government formats. In many cases, given the way in which the reconciliation process has been structured, there is keen development and keen interest at local government level to make things a lot better than they have been in the past.

I have been pleasantly surprised with some of the local government areas in relation to the levels of activity and the progress that has been made, particularly in such areas as Ceduna, Port Lincoln, Whyalla and Port Augusta. Some pleasant steps forward have been made regarding reconciliation. I would also like to especially thank and congratulate Mr Ivan Copley whose longstanding commitments in the area of Aboriginal affairs and advancement is a credit to him and to the church that he represents.

It is not only the Uniting Church that has been active in the reconciliation field. The Lutheran Church is certainly cooperating in putting together a lot of information for web sites—and, in particular, for Bringing Them Home—to address some of the deeds of the past, where families were split up. They are trying to address some of those issues of bringing family members together, providing that information for histories and providing documentation so that people can trace their lineage and find out where they were from originally, who their parents were and what connection they have to land and to language groups. The Lutheran Church has developed a very healthy program in being able to achieve that, and the Catholic Church has been working in a progressive way towards reconciling the differences of the past within and throughout the broad community and with the Aboriginal community.

I commend people such as Father Tony Pearson and others in relation to the activities that have been developed within the Catholic Church with Otherway Centre, which is doing some work with Aboriginal prisoners and, in a true reconciliation spirit, trying to put together programs on the modest budgets they have, with government, where cooperation can be developed. The initiatives certainly are coming from these organisations, church groups and local government. It is a pleasing facet of my reconciliation portfolio to have a broader number of groups, organisations and individuals participating in the reconciliation spirit. I hope that the commonwealth takes notice of the progress that has been made at a community level and starts looking at some of the funding regimes that come with some of these specialty programs.

PORT STANVAC OIL REFINERY

The Hon. IAN GILFILLAN: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Agriculture, Food

and Fisheries, representing the Treasurer, a question about the Port Stanvac Oil Refinery.

Leave granted.

The Hon. IAN GILFILLAN: As part of the rates reduction deal made last year to keep Mobil's refinery at Port Stanvac, an assistance deed was signed between the state government and Mobil for some \$800 000. It is my understanding that the majority of this money has, in fact, been handed to Mobil. On Wednesday 13 April this year, Greg Kelton of the *Advertiser* wrote an article entitled 'My ultimatum on refinery: act now'. The article appeared on page 2 of that paper, and spoke of a letter that the Premier had sent to Mobil regarding the mothballing of the Port Stanvac refinery. The article states:

[The] letter said the total assistance due to Mobil under an assistance deed signed last year was \$814 388. 'I am advised that, to date, Mobil has already received \$714 388 and has applied for payment of the balance sum of \$100 000,' it said. 'As a result of the announcement of your intention to cease operations, the government will not pay the balance of the assistance under the deed. Further, I confirm that I am seeking reimbursement from Mobil of the \$714 388.' Mr Foley said the money should be repaid by Mobil to 'demonstrate its good faith with the public of SA'. Mr Foley said later, outside parliament, that the government was on a collision course with Mobil. Any suggestion that the company could have an open-ended time frame for reopening the refinery was 'unacceptable'. 'We are not going to leave that plant there year after year as a dirty, putrid industrial site,' Mr Foley said.

Further to this, on Friday 2 May this year, the Treasurer was reported as saying:

The company [Mobil] knows if they can't reach agreement with the government, the government will move swiftly and decisively to have the company removed from the site.

It is now 15 September, and the company still occupies the site. My questions to the Treasurer are:

1. Given that the company still occupies the site, does this mean that the government has reached an agreement with the company?
2. If an agreement has been reached, what are the terms of that agreement?
3. Has the government received the \$714 388 that the Premier requested Mobil return?
4. Has the government received an assurance from the company that that money will be returned? If so, what is the nature of that assurance and the terms of the repayment?
5. Will the government be moving to alter the level of rates paid by Mobil?

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY (Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries): I will seek to obtain a response from the Treasurer for the honourable member as soon as possible.

DRUGBEAT PROGRAM

The Hon. NICK XENOPHON: I seek leave to make an explanation before asking the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation, representing the Minister for Health, questions in relation to the Drugbeat program.

Leave granted.

The Hon. NICK XENOPHON: The Australian Drug Treatment and Rehabilitation Program Inc. (ADTARP Inc.) operates the Drugbeat program at premises known as Shay Louise House at Elizabeth Grove. It has been operating since 1999 with public funding provided in October 2000 as a result of strong support from then human services minister, the Hon. Dean Brown, with initial funding of \$250 000, as I understand it, on an annual basis. I understand that the program is abstinence based, with participants not being on

alternative drug maintenance programs such as methadone. Funding for the program was increased with \$60 000 additional funding from the Youth Diversion Fund, so the budget for Drugbeat was \$325 000 in 2002 plus an amount, as I understand it, for indexation.

I have a statutory declaration of Ms Ann Bressington, the Executive Officer of ADTARP Inc. of 4 August 2003, which she declared before me. Ms Bressington, in paragraph 4 of her statutory declaration, states that some 80 per cent of clients have completed the program, and for that they need to be drug free. This level of success compares very favourably with other programs, which have a success rate of 10 per cent or less. Ms Bressington, at paragraph 5 of her statutory declaration, also states that, even with the additional \$60 000 annual youth diversion funding that the Drugbeat program was receiving, Drugbeat staff still often worked after hours without pay, and used their own resources to provide services—such as motor vehicles, mobile phones, computers and the like—but that, overall, staff were able to cope and provide a basic service.

Ms Bressington, at paragraph 6 of her affidavit, refers to a meeting with the Hon. Lea Stevens in her capacity as shadow health minister on 12 October 2001 at Shay Louise House. At that time, Ms Stevens told Ms Bressington (according to her statutory declaration) that a Labor government, if elected, would give much more funding, and said words to the effect of 'If my party gets in, Shay Louise House will get far more funding than you've got under Dean Brown, and I promise you that.' Ms Bressington, in her declaration, says that nothing has happened in relation to that promise since Labor was sworn in, in terms of increased funding. Ms Bressington, in paragraph 8 of her declaration, also states that, in September 2002 ADTARP had, by administrative oversight (for which Ms Bressington took responsibility as executive officer), missed the tender for the Youth Diversion Funding Program.

At paragraph 8 of her statutory declaration, Ms Bressington indicates that, on 15 November 2002, she went to see the health minister at her electorate office and explained the problem, and was told that \$15 000 per quarter would not be hard to find, and she said words to the effect that there was money around that could be pooled from other sources, and told Ms Bressington not to worry.

At paragraph 9 of the statutory declaration Ms Bressington states that she did not hear from the minister for a number of months. She made another appointment on 6 June 2003 at her electoral office and asked what was happening with the \$15 000 per quarter. According to the statutory declaration, the minister apologised for not getting back to her and stated that she did not remember the conversation last November and that there was only so much money to go around. She referred the matter to Keith Evans, Director of the Drug Strategy Branch. At paragraph 10 Ms Bressington's statutory declaration states that DrugBeat is currently operating on some \$261 000 a year, that there has been increasing demand for services, that staff members have been cut, that remaining staff have been working at half wages and that 'Shay Louise House is in an unsustainable position with current funding levels.' I seek leave to table the statutory declaration of Ann Marie Bressington of 4 August 2003.

Leave granted.

The Hon. NICK XENOPHON: My questions to the minister are:

1. Does she agree with the substance and accuracy of the matters referred to in paragraphs 6, 8 and 9 of Ms

Bressington's statutory declaration and, if not, in what specific respects does she differ from the matter as set out in Ms Bressington's declaration?

2. Will the government honour the minister's commitments to the DrugBeat program, particularly in relation to the \$15 000 per quarter funding shortfall referred to?

3. Will the minister indicate the nature and extent of progress of the audit of government funded prevention and intervention strategies promised during last year's Drugs Summit, and will the audit include an independent assessment of the effectiveness of such programs?

4. How much has been allocated in the past financial year and for the current financial year for government funded drug prevention and intervention programs, and will the minister provide a breakdown of the programs referred to?

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation): I will endeavour to relay those very important questions to the Minister for Health and bring back a reply.

The Hon. A.J. REDFORD: Before I ask my supplementary question, I just disclose that I am a member of the board of DrugBeat. Will the minister outline all other abstinence based programs which are currently supported by the South Australian government or any agency of the South Australian government in relation to the drug issue in this state?

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: I will refer that very important supplementary question to the Minister for Health in another place and bring back a reply.

RETIREMENT VILLAGES

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: I seek leave to make an explanation before asking the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation, representing the Minister for Social Justice, a question about the review of the Retirement Villages Act.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: As part of its commitment to the need to ensure that legislation remains relevant, the previous government reviewed the regulations of the Retirement Villages Act 1987. A substantially sized paper entitled 'Issues associated with the regulations under the Retirement Villages Act 1987' was released for public discussion in January 2000. Following extensive consultation, the Retirement Villages (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill was introduced in this chamber on 23 October 2001, debated and passed the following month and assented to on 15 January 2002. Arising from this process it has been determined to review the act itself.

A seven-page document is available on the DHS web site dated June 2003 and entitled, 'Progress report on review of the Retirement Villages Act 1987'. This document refers to the preparation of a paper which it anticipates will be finalised for the consideration of the minister during August 2003. The document states that this will then allow for further input from interested parties prior to any draft legislation being prepared for introduction to parliament. My questions are:

1. Has the minister received such a discussion paper as anticipated in the aforementioned document and, if so, on what date did the minister receive it and when will she release it for public comment?

2. If the minister has not received it, when does she expect to do so and when will it be released for public comment?

3. Has the Department of Human Services been given ministerial approval to approach parliamentary counsel for the drafting of amendments to the act?

4. If so, why has a comprehensive process of consultation not been adhered to prior to its drafting and in accordance with the process as outlined in the government's own document to which I referred earlier, 'Progress report on the review of the Retirement Villages Act 1987'?

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

CRAIGMORE HIGH SCHOOL

The Hon. KATE REYNOLDS: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, representing the Minister for Education and Children's Services, a question about Craigmore High School.

Leave granted.

The Hon. KATE REYNOLDS: Concerns have been raised regarding the transfer of five teachers from Craigmore High School, which transfer has resulted in the Australian Education Union issuing proceedings in the Supreme Court to settle the matter. The five teachers were transferred last month, resulting in strike action by students, causing disruption to years 11 and 12 students preparing for exams and causing disruption to students at other schools whose teachers were transferred to Craigmore at very short notice. In fact, my office has been told that in at least one other school year 12 students were not even given a chance to say goodbye to their teacher.

The education department has been criticised for its inappropriate use of section 15(c) of the Education Act relating to the conditions for the transfer of teachers, in that it has disregarded the agreed processes established to ensure procedural fairness, with the five teachers yet to receive an explanation regarding their transfer. Teachers from Craigmore and other schools have contacted my office to express their concern that the department might do the same thing to them at any time without explanation or justification. My questions are:

1. When will the minister release the department's review of Craigmore High School and to whom?

2. When will the minister and her department provide an explanation for the forced transfer of these teachers?

3. Will the minister explain why the proper processes associated with either performance management or grievance were not followed?

4. Will the minister give the more than 14 000 public sector teachers in South Australia her guarantee that their basic entitlements, being the right to be given a timely and complete explanation of a grievance, to have a right of reply and to have decisions made by an impartial person, will be protected under a Rann government without the need to resort to court action?

5. Given that this school has had absenteeism and retention problems for more than 10 years, does the minister condone the department's action of forcibly transferring coordinators and teachers of year 12 students in the third quarter of the school year?

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY (Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries): I will take that question on notice and bring back a reply.

CRICKET ACADEMY

The Hon. T.J. STEPHENS: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Correctional Services, representing the minister for sport, a question about the Australian Cricket Academy.

Leave granted.

The Hon. T.J. STEPHENS: As members would be aware, sadly, South Australia has lost the right to host the very successful Australian Cricket Academy. I quote various media reports, in part, as follows:

The new centre of excellence, to open in April, will be located at Allan Border Field, the home ground of the Queensland cricket team. The Queenslanders beat seven rivals, including Adelaide, for the right to host the new centre, their success ending the academy's [extremely] successful 16-year term in South Australia. SA Cricket Association corporate communications manager Jane Elliott said the SACA 'was extremely disappointed' with the decision.

'We put in what we believe to be a very strong bid,' Ms Elliott said. 'We were thrilled to get down to the final two.'

... Queensland Cricket clinched the deal with a submission detailing support from several Brisbane learning centres and the Queensland government. ... The academy, which has produced 31 Australian players including Shane Warne, Glenn McGrath and Brett Lee, has been lauded as one of the reasons Australia has come to dominate world cricket. Many rival nations send players on guest stints to the academy in preference to their own coaching programs.

SACA boss Michael Deare was quoted on the ABC as saying:

The administration will be wound up here by Christmas, and it'll be located in Queensland from the beginning of the New Year.

The minister, Michael Wright, was quoted on the ABC as follows:

This has come as somewhat of a surprise to me for this now to be thrown up. South Australia has done very, very well for the past 15 years, and I'm in no doubt that they could have done it just as well in the future if given the opportunity.

I am sure that what he actually meant was that he was in no doubt that they could have done it just as well in the future, if given the opportunity. My questions to the minister are:

1. Given that Adelaide's Cricket Academy has played a major role in ensuring that Australia has come to dominate world cricket, why did the minister not ensure that this facility remained in Adelaide?

2. Will the minister table in the house the actual detail of the assistance package that this anti-sport government was prepared to provide?

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS (Minister for Correctional Services): I will refer those questions to the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing in another place and bring back a reply. I am not quite sure where we get the anti-sport tag from.

MOUNT GAMBIER HEALTH SERVICES

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, as a member of the government and the cabinet, about the Mount Gambier health service.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: On Friday 30 May, an article appeared in *The Border Watch* under the heading

'Here lies our health system'. I will not read it all, but in essence it states:

General Surgeon Mark Landy—leaving; General Surgeon Richard Strickland—retiring; General Surgeon Brian Kirkby—no contract; Anaesthetist Kevin Johnston—no theatre contract; Anaesthetist Roger Gulin—no contract; Anaesthetist Paul Goodman—no contract; Anaesthetist Steve Simmons—heads of agreement, but no contract; Obstetrician, gynaecologist Richard Henshaw—left; Obstetrician, gynaecologist Chris Barry—resigned, leaving in June; Director of Medical Services John Elcock—resigned and left; Physician Chris Allen—resigned and left; Eye specialist Trevor Hodson—future uncertain; Orthopaedic surgeon Barney McCusker—no contract; Orthopaedic surgeon Henry Forbes—no contract.

On Tuesday 2 September 2003, *The Border Watch* stated:

Thousands of South East residents have demanded Premier Mike Rann fix Mount Gambier's spiralling medical crisis.

On that day, federal member for Barker, Patrick Secker and Senator Jeannie Ferris delivered, to the Premier, 2500 letters expressing concern over the state of Mount Gambier's hospital. They said:

We will be hand delivering over 2 500 letters from South East residents to the Premier Mike Rann's Parliament House office begging him to fix the Mount Gambier Hospital health crisis before it is too late.

Last week I was in Mount Gambier with my colleague the Hon. Mr Redford and the headlines were, and I will hold it up and repeat it:

I'll fix it, or I'll quit.

The article states:

Member for Mount Gambier Rory McEwen has vowed to resign from the Rann Government's Cabinet ministry if more money is not poured into the embattled Mount Gambier Hospital. "I will resign (if this is not resolved). I am not asking him (Treasurer Kevin Foley) for this money, I am demanding this money," said Mr McEwen, who held a crisis meeting with Mr Foley on Wednesday night.

I have told Treasurer Foley this. I have laid it on the line here and now that we are not taking that cut, end of story.

The cut is a \$1.5 million shortfall in the South-East health budget. Mr McEwen, who was recruited to the cause of the Labor ministry last November, 'conceded he had probably been standing back from the issue and had possibly failed his community'. He also went on to say that he had made 'enormous personal sacrifices' to be a minister. My questions are:

1. Has the cabinet discussed the member for Mount Gambier's demands?

2. Does the minister concede that the member for Mount Gambier is trying to blackmail the government in an attempt to save face in his local community?

3. Why has the government allowed the experience of so many important medical practitioners to be lost to the community?

4. Will the minister be using the same approach when representing his portfolios at the cabinet table?

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY (Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries): In relation to the first question, the honourable member has been here long enough to know that cabinet discussions are confidential and will not be repeated in this place. In relation to Mount Gambier Hospital, I know the honourable member, in his reference to the press cutting, was referring to the situation in May. As I understand it, my colleague the Minister for Health has taken a stance in relation to the Mount Gambier Hospital, which the previous minister was not able to do for many years and which has led to many of the problems down there.

My colleague the Minister for Health, with the generational health review, does have a plan. She has developed a much needed plan for the future of the health system within this state. I am sure that, as that system is implemented, the health system in this state will be improved. As for the details, I will refer those to the Minister for Health and bring back a reply.

The Hon. A.J. REDFORD: For the benefit and edification of the electorate and electors of Mount Gambier, and as a supplementary question, will the minister table all correspondence since 30 May this year from the local member to the minister regarding the Mount Gambier Hospital and the South-East medical situation?

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: That is a question for the Minister for Health, but I am sure that she will say that it is not the usual practice to table correspondence from other members, and I am sure she would have no intention of doing so.

The Hon. A.J. REDFORD: As a further supplementary question, can the minister confirm whether the local member has written any letters since 30 May this year to the Minister for Health regarding the South-East health situation?

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: That is not a matter for which the minister is responsible. If the honourable member wants an answer to that question, he should ask the Hon. Rory McEwen himself.

The Hon. A.J. Redford: I should ask who?

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: The Hon. Rory McEwen, the Minister for Small Business.

PORT LINCOLN CENTENARY OVAL

The Hon. IAN GILFILLAN: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation, representing the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing, a question relating to the Port Lincoln Centenary Oval.

Leave granted.

The Hon. IAN GILFILLAN: Honourable members may know that, in fact, Colonel Light ordained that the area which embraces the Port Lincoln Centenary Oval should be parklands. It then became a recreation area in the City of Port Lincoln. Through some oversight, it has apparently been zoned a residential area by the local council, all of which would be of little or no consequence except that there is a move by a commercial enterprise to purchase the oval from the council and convert it into a major commercial shopping centre. This would mean the total obliteration of the Centenary Oval.

I have been approached by the Port Lincoln Football League to do whatever I can to hold for the city and community of Port Lincoln their much cherished Centenary Oval. My questions, through the minister, are to the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing, because I believe that he should be the one who should care most about this icon for Eyre Peninsula football—the Mortlock Shield is contested at this oval. It has a long history, and it is now at risk. My questions are:

1. Is the minister aware of the imminent risk of the loss of the Centenary Oval to the people of Port Lincoln and to the community of Eyre Peninsula?

2. Will the minister investigate the possibility of the state government assessing the legal position of the council selling

what has previously been regarded as public recreation space to a commercial enterprise for commercial development?

3. Will the minister and colleagues he may feel are able to assist use their best endeavours to prevent the sale of this icon for sport in Port Lincoln to a commercial enterprise with its subsequent loss to the sporting community of Port Lincoln?

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation): I can understand why the Port Lincoln football fraternity would seek out the honourable member for sponsoring such a 'save the oval' campaign. I suspect that the honourable member is an old centre half back for Mallee Park or the Wanderers—

The Hon. Ian Gilfillan: Centre half forward for Penneshaw.

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: I see. I am sure the honourable member has very good credentials for doing this. This issue was raised during my recent trip to Port Lincoln. It is certainly a very controversial issue. Pardon the pun, but it has divided the town. It is one of those issues where I think some outside assistance may need to be supplied to get a solution that is acceptable to everyone in the town. I have been made aware of a number of organisations wanting to do land swaps because of the tight nature of the planning (or lack of it) in the Port Lincoln region, particularly with the education centres within Port Lincoln and the recreation and sport areas.

I will refer the question to the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing to see whether some assistance can be supplied to bring finality to the issue. That is what needs to be done. I think there needs to be a final position on the planning proposals in relation to the oval because of the uncertainty within the township about the future of the oval and the future needs and requirements for retail industry within Port Lincoln. I think there needs to be some finalisation to that issue to bring some certainty. I will certainly refer those important questions to the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing in another place and bring back a reply, and I hope the honourable member keeps his eye on the ball.

The Hon. IAN GILFILLAN: Since the minister has been so generous as to actually contribute to the answer, although the question was not directed to him, as a supplementary question I ask the minister whether he has an opinion whether, in fact, the Centenary Oval should be retained, bearing in mind that it was originally determined as open space, and as parkland specifically? I believe there has been no authentic legal process to change that. Does the minister agree with me that it is a precious part of the identity of Port Lincoln to have the Centenary Oval situated where it is in the centre of the city?

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: I do have an opinion in relation to its current siting: I think it is as good a siting as you would ever get for a sporting facility. However, I think the destiny of the facility lies with the community, looking at its broader—

The Hon. Ian Gilfillan interjecting:

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: I understand what the member is saying. I am not a resident of the Port Lincoln township, but I do know that, if democracy was to take place, the planning laws would have to be used in a way so they lined up with what the majority of Port Lincoln residents required.

SOCIAL POLICY COUNCIL

The Hon. KATE REYNOLDS: 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 regarding the establishment of a social policy council.

Leave granted.

The Hon. KATE REYNOLDS: The report of the Social Development Committee's poverty inquiry was tabled in parliament in May 2003. Despite problems with poverty continuing to plague this state, we are still waiting for the government to release its response to the poverty inquiry. For some time, the Democrats have been calling on the government to establish a properly developed whole of government anti-poverty strategy to address the causes, and not just the symptoms, of the rising number of people living in poverty.

The government's Social Development Committee's poverty inquiry had the scope to recommend the establishment of a social policy council to address these very issues, but it did not do so. This is despite the fact that, for some years now, social welfare organisations have been calling for the establishment of such a council to provide advice to cabinet and to develop a new social strategy for the state.

A social policy council given the same clout as the Economic Development Board could take a wide and deeper view of poverty across the state than the Social Inclusion Unit is able to and could provide advice about social policy directions, highlighting and detailing what the Rann government intends to achieve during and beyond the current term of office. My questions to the minister are:

1. When will the government release its response to the parliament's Social Development Committee's poverty inquiry?
2. Will the government commit to establishing a social policy council?
3. What plans does the state government have to address widespread and increasing poverty in our community?

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

DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC PROSECUTIONS

The Hon. A.J. REDFORD: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation, representing the Attorney-General, a question about the Office of the Director of Public Prosecutions.

Leave granted.

The Hon. A.J. REDFORD: In February this year, well before the Nemer case, I asked a series of questions of the then attorney-general. As part of my questions, I asked the attorney-general whether or not he had undertaken an independent assessment of the performance of the DPP's office to ensure that its performance had been unaffected by various conduct attributed to the Director. I was told in an answer in this place that no such inquiry had taken place. The answer was given on 28 April.

I also asked whether or not it was the intention of the government to have such an inquiry, or independent assessment, so that public confidence could be restored in the Office of the Director of Public Prosecutions, and I was told that that would not occur. I further asked how many people

had left the DPP's office over the past 18 months, their positions and why they left. I was given this answer on 28 April:

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.

Further, I asked whether or not any concerns had been expressed about the performance of the Office of the DPP to the attorney prior to Monday, 17 February 2003, and what those concerns were. The answer that the attorney gave to me on 28 April was as follows:

Yes, the members for Mount Gambier and Chaffey have raised concerns with me about the DPP and the DPP's office.

I might say that the member for Mount Gambier's brother works, or did work at the time, within the Office of the DPP. The answer given to me by the attorney continues:

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—

and the questioner I assume is 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.

I might add that I did say that; it was not meant to be a commendation of the efficiency of the office: it was meant to be a criticism of the attorney and the fact that the Director's office was not properly funded. I was also told a number of other matters concerning directions, which I will not go into for the purposes of this question. In the light of those questions and those answers, I ask:

1. In relation to the 15 people who left—that is, eight legal, six admin and one professional services officer—the reason why they left in relation to each of those positions. In other words, in respect of each category of staff, how many left in respect of each category given in that answer for resigning?

2. Does the Attorney-General regret not having an independent inquiry or assessment into the Office of the Director of Public Prosecutions following the public disclosure of what happened in the Nemer case? Is there any prospect of something of that nature occurring sometime in the future?

3. Will the Attorney outline the concerns the member for Mount Gambier and the member for Chaffey raised with the attorney in relation to the Office of the Director of Public Prosecutions?

4. Will the Attorney confirm that prosecutors in the Office of the South Australian Director of Public Prosecutions, even with the recent budget initiatives, are still required to run approximately 40 per cent more files and engage in about 40 per cent more work load at less wages and salary than their interstate counterparts?

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY (Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries): Under the changed representative arrangements, I will be representing the Attorney-General in the council in the future. I will take the question on notice to the Attorney-General and bring back a response.

I will make one comment in relation to the resources of the DPP's office. I am well aware that in the 2002-03 budget

and also in the 2003-04 budget, more than \$1 million over four years was provided in each of those budgets—the first two of the Rann government—in relation to giving greater resources to the Director of Public Prosecutions' office. I am sure my colleague the Attorney-General will provide more details about the additional resources that he has been able to provide to that office, but I will refer the question to the honourable member and bring back a reply.

The Hon. A.J. REDFORD: As a supplementary question: will the minister give this place and, indeed, the people of South Australia an assurance that resources will be given to the Director of Public Prosecutions to bring the office into line with the national average in terms of case loads expected to be undertaken by legal practitioners within the Office of the Director of Public Prosecutions?

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: The honourable member asked a question about the case load. He should await the response from the Attorney. Having had some information on it myself, I will not answer because it is not my responsibility. However, I think the honourable member should await the answer of the Attorney in relation to those relative resources.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON GENETICALLY MODIFIED ORGANISMS

The Hon. IAN GILFILLAN: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries a question about the government response to the Select Committee on Genetically Modified Organisms.

Leave granted.

The Hon. IAN GILFILLAN: After an 11-month inquiry, the Select Committee on Genetically Modified Organisms tabled its report. I believe that today, to be more accurate, we ought to be referring more to 'genetically engineered organisms'; however, that is an aside. Shortly after tabling this report, the Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries announced that cabinet had adopted its recommendations. In his press release dated 25 July this year, he stated:

The state government is committed to protecting the state's clean and green reputation by preventing the introduction of GM crops until it is absolutely clear that there will be no impact on the integrity of our traditional or organic production systems. Coexistence is the key, and this must not be threatened. That is what everyone wants. The farmers do not want the integrity of their agricultural products compromised, neither do their customers and neither do the consumers.

When I was in the UK on my study tour, I could not but be impressed by a delivery truck from Marks and Spencer, which conducts a series of supermarkets in the UK and is one of the major chains.

Across the full length of that semitrailer was the message, 'Our food? All non-GM.' That was the only message that that truck carried. On a hotel menu were the words, 'As far as possible we guarantee our food is GM free. We advise our customers to avoid all junk food'. These messages are stark to anybody who is assessing what the reputation of our product will be in international markets if we grow GM products in South Australia. The report of the select committee recommended that the Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries be given power over the growing of genetically modified crops in South Australia. We know from frequently repeated assertions that the only criterion upon which South Australia can actually determine not to grow genetically engineered crops is the question of marketing.

It is so starkly obvious that the markets available to us as a non-GM producing state are absolutely overpowering. It is recommended in the report that the communities of Eyre Peninsula and Kangaroo Island be allowed to choose to remain GM free, but there is considerable concern among the farming community, certainly those I speak to, about co-existence if genetically engineered crops are grown within any sort of range of non-GE crops. My questions to the minister are:

1. Will there be a period of community and industry consultation before the introduction of the legislation that the Lieutenant-Governor announced in his address today?

2. Does the minister agree that in other countries, Canada in particular, co-existence has proved to be not feasible?

3. Does he also agree that, if we are growing GE crops in South Australia, it puts at risk our clean green image, particularly internationally?

4. If the government is offering to Eyre Peninsula and Kangaroo Island this privilege of remaining GE free, why is the minister or the government denying the communities of Yorke Peninsula, the Adelaide Hills, the South-East, the Riverland and the north-east of the state the right to decide that their areas should also remain GE free?

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY (Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries): In relation to the latter question, the answer really is that that was the recommendation of the select committee.

The Hon. Ian Gilfillan interjecting:

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: That was the recommendation of the bipartisan select committee. However, as I understand the overall package of recommendations of that select committee, obviously before there could be any introduction of GM crops within this state a fairly strong test would have to be passed. In particular the select committee report advised setting up a GM advisory committee, which would have to be satisfied that a series of technical supply chain and market matters had been addressed before there could be any introduction of GM crops in this state.

In relation to Kangaroo Island and Eyre Peninsula, that was another condition over and above the broader condition, so one needs to look at the conditions for those areas in that broader context. In relation to the other part of the question, as announced today in the Governor's speech, a bill will be introduced. That progress has been slowed somewhat by the need to resolve some of the legal issues referred to by the honourable member. National competition policy issues are becoming increasingly difficult for the states—

The Hon. Ian Gilfillan interjecting:

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: That is another issue that is directly outside the state government's response, but certainly the NCP process is not. We are hoping that a draft consultation bill will be released for public consultation and will be out there for public consultation next month, in October 2003. That is the sort of timetable we are looking at. We will certainly welcome further discussion in that regard.

ROSEWORTHY CAMPUS

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

The Hon. CAROLINE SCHAEFER: In reply to my earlier question today, the minister indicated, unless I

misunderstood him, that he had no knowledge of any suggested change to the operation of Roseworthy and that he was unaware of any review. I have a letter, sent to me on 7 August, introducing a major review of Roseworthy Farm and inviting me to make a submission. Was the minister misleading me if he knew that that review was in place, because clearly that is the source of the rumour of the sale of Roseworthy Farm, or did he have no knowledge of the review? If he had no knowledge, why did he have no knowledge: was he not briefed or was he misleading me?

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY (Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries): The honourable member was asking questions before about the sale of Roseworthy. She did not ask about a review in relation to it, but about whether I was aware that there were plans to sell it off. If a major review is under way, it would be done presumably by the University of Adelaide. I would expect that, if a review of Roseworthy is under way, my department would be aware of it and would take appropriate action. I can only repeat that the Department of Primary Industries and Resources, which has an interest in what happens at Roseworthy, is not responsible for the majority of assets out there. That is the responsibility of the University of Adelaide. I will endeavour to get some more information for the honourable member in that regard.

The Hon. CAROLINE SCHAEFER: By way of supplementary question, has the minister been briefed on a major review of Roseworthy Farm? If he has not, why has he not been briefed, since I have correspondence as shadow minister dated 7 August? If he has been briefed, why did he not say so?

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: I have not had a specific briefing in relation to Roseworthy. Obviously, if the University of Adelaide is conducting a review and has written to the shadow minister, I am sure it would have written to me and it has gone to the department. When the department has prepared a response to it, I will receive a briefing, but I have not received one yet. The honourable member asked a question previously in relation to the sale of assets out there.

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

The Hon. A.J. REDFORD: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, as Leader of the Government in this place, a question about questions on notice.

Leave granted.

The Hon. A.J. REDFORD: We all know on this side of the chamber that the asking of questions on notice is something that we hold dear to our heart as part of the important feature of the Westminster system of government. We on this side of the parliament have listened for a long time to the government's often stated high standards of accountability and the fact that it will adhere to Westminster and parliamentary principles. Mr President, you and some other members, may be well aware that in the last session of parliament, over a period of about 12 months, some 281 questions were asked of this government in this place.

Indeed, 131 of those questions remain unanswered. In other words, this government has chosen to answer 54 per cent of the questions that have been put on notice to it in this place. Given the pot luck nature of whether one gets an answer—indeed, an answer that might actually be directed to the question—one is now forced to use the lengthy and sometimes expensive process of freedom of information, because

there are legislative time limits on various processes under the Freedom of Information Act. I, myself, have 20 questions from the last session of parliament that remain unanswered. The former member, the Hon. Diana Laidlaw, who retired some considerable time ago, has four unanswered questions still on the books in this weekly supplement to the *Notice Paper*.

The Hon. Caroline Schaefer interjecting:

The Hon. A.J. REDFORD: The Hon. Caroline Schaefer—

The Hon. J.S.L. Dawkins interjecting:

The Hon. A.J. REDFORD:—and I suspect I will get interjections from left, right and centre—says that she has some going back to August last year. Some of the answers given to questions without notice earlier during question time dated back to March and April of 2002. It may well be that we on this side of the chamber and others who ask questions on notice are labouring under some misapprehension about what happens when a question is put on notice and remains unanswered. So, my first question to the Hon. Paul Holloway is what happens after a question is put on the *Notice Paper*, so that we can track its progress?

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY (Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries): When questions are asked of the two ministers in this council (the Hon. Terry Roberts and I), they are taken on notice by officers of our departments and referred to the respective ministers for response. I understand there is some tracking of those questions so that if answers are not provided by a certain time reminders are sent. It is interesting to note that we recently had a report on the Legislative Council for the first session of this parliament. It was a very short first session—

The Hon. A.J. Redford interjecting:

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: Yes, it was actually the second session of this parliament. I compared the number of sitting days that we had over that period from when the parliament first sat (just after 6 March)—I think it was some time in May through to the end of this session—with the report of the previous government for a roughly comparable period. It is interesting that the parliament sat for about 90 days in this period compared with about 68 under the previous government. So, there has been far more scrutiny available to members of this house over a period of roughly 15 months than there was in the last comparable period of the previous government. So, members of parliament have had far more opportunity to ask questions of this government than was the case previously. I think it is worth putting that on the record.

Regarding answers to questions, a lot of answers were provided today. I think it is worth pointing out that in this house there are numerous supplementary and other questions asked by members of parliament, some of which require an immense amount of detail.

The Hon. A.J. Redford interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. A.J. REDFORD: I ask a further supplementary question because I do not understand that answer. Will the minister explain—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Mr Redford has the call, and I ask him to use the Queen's English without embellishment.

The Hon. A.J. REDFORD: What has been the difficulty in answering a question that I asked earlier this year, as

follows: will the Minister for Education and Children's Services reveal the total number of teachers employed in South Australia as at 10 March 2003? Will the minister give us some explanation of the difficulty in providing information such as how many teachers we have?

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: I guess that some accounting takes place on particular dates. Whether that is the difficulty, I do not know, but the honourable member has asked a question and I am sure that he will get a response if he is patient.

The Hon. A.J. REDFORD: I ask a further supplementary question: is there any specific difficulty about answering that question, which might assist us to better design our questions and improve the government's performance over and above a 54 per cent answer rate?

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: I cannot comment on the complexity of a question in another portfolio. All I can say is that I endeavour to answer questions on my portfolio as quickly as possible. Occasionally, there are reasons why it is difficult to provide an answer.

The Hon. J.S.L. Dawkins: You got me an answer to a question, but there are still two outstanding questions going back to October last year on the same subject.

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: In relation to my portfolio, all I can say is that I endeavour to get questions answered as quickly as I possibly can. If there are difficulties with other portfolios, if the honourable member would like to ask a specific question I will endeavour to get an answer for him.

The Hon. A.J. REDFORD: I understand that the minister may need to take this question on notice, but will the minister compare the performance of answering questions put on notice in the lower house compared with answers given to members in the upper house and—I do not believe this to be the case—does he agree that this government is treating the Legislative Council with contempt by failing to answer such a large number of questions on notice?

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: I do not believe this government is treating this parliament with contempt. The same procedure is used. Having been a member of the other place, I know there are different standing orders in place, for a start. There are no supplementary questions or multiple questions permitted in that house; there are only single questions. The number of questions and the complexity involved in answering them is far greater in this house than in the House of Assembly—much greater. If one looks at questions that are asked there one will see why. Far more questions are taken on notice in this place than in the House of Assembly.

TAFE, SOUTH-EAST

The Hon. KATE REYNOLDS: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the minister representing the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education a question about the South-East Institute of TAFE.

Leave granted.

The Hon. KATE REYNOLDS: Concerns have been raised in the South-East of this state about the lack of representation of the region's TAFE institute. During a recent visit to the area I met with TAFE representatives who informed me that they had not been included on the TAFE SA Executive nor on the task forces related to the Kirby report implementation steering committee to make recom-

mendations to the Chief Executive and the TAFE SA board at a time when the TAFE sector is both reconfiguring and rebuilding.

The concerns are so widespread that even the South-East Local Government Association has decided to become involved. At its meeting on 1 August the association expressed concern that the task force charged with planning TAFE's future had no direct representation from the South-East Institute. My questions are:

1. Will the minister create an additional position for the Director of the South-East Institute on the TAFE SA Executive to ensure that the South-East region of South Australia is fully and adequately represented?

2. Will this issue be addressed as a matter of urgency, and will the minister ensure that all TAFE institutes are included on relevant committees to ensure that all regions are adequately represented?

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

GLENSIDE HOSPITAL

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation): I table a ministerial statement made by the Hon. Lea Stevens on recent events at Glenside Hospital.

TRAVEL CONTRACT, GOVERNMENT

The Hon. A.J. REDFORD: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation a question about unanswered questions and travel.

Leave granted.

The Hon. A.J. REDFORD: Last year, I noticed on the government web site that the government was in the process of negotiating a new travel contract. Indeed, I made an application under the FOI legislation and discovered that there were quite a number of clauses relating to the provision of travel services to VIPs within government. I made some initial inquiries, albeit within the parliament, and I discovered very quickly that I do not fall within this category of VIP—and I have to say that was probably an astute judgment on the part of those who determine who is or who is not a VIP within government circles.

The Hon. T.G. Roberts interjecting:

The Hon. A.J. REDFORD: The minister interjects and I have a sneaking suspicion that, despite factional allegiances, he might just fall within this category of VIP. Mr President, I think it is always important, as you would agree, to know who is important and who is not important in this government. Indeed, I think it is also important to know who might or might not be important within the public sector. Mr President, I know you would agree with me that it can only help one's political career if one knows who is important and who is not important in government circles. With that in mind, rather than take up the valuable time of this chamber, I put a question on notice. On 18 February this year I asked a question as follows:

Can the minister reveal which selected senior government officials are to receive specialised and prompt travel service from the VIP cell as detailed on page 5 of the specification for the provision of managed travel services?

It does beg the question: who are those people who fall within this category of VIP? I notice that some members, particularly the Hon. Terry Cameron, are looking a touch jealous at present—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A.J. REDFORD: But we on this side, particularly those on the backbench, would be delighted to know what sort of specialised services and prompt travel services VIPs are likely to get as opposed to us mere mortals. In the light of that explanation, my questions are:

1. Who are the VIPs in this government?
2. What sort of specialised and prompt travel services do they get that we mere mortals do not get?

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation): It is clear that I will have to refer that question to a VIP to find out. It is clear that I am not one of them.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: I am not sure. I will have to refer that question to the minister in another place and bring back a reply.

The Hon. A.J. REDFORD: I have a supplementary question. Does the minister agree that it would have been far simpler to answer my question on notice rather than go through that process?

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: If I had the information at hand, I would have answered it.

FAMILY AND YOUTH SERVICES

The Hon. KATE REYNOLDS: 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 recruitment of staff for Family and Youth Services.

Leave granted.

The Hon. KATE REYNOLDS: There has been much publicity surrounding the shortage of staff at FAYS offices throughout the state, with staff previously resorting to implementing work bans in a bid to have the government acknowledge the extent of the problem. This situation has been going on for more than three months now. The latest development had the government announcing a \$1.5 million campaign to recruit up to 38 supposedly new social and youth workers, with 21 of the positions now filled. However, the Public Service Association, which represents FAYS workers, is continuing to call for 200 additional staff to ease the escalating workload and to protect the most vulnerable children. FAYS workers are not able to adequately investigate some reports made to the organisation or provide essential services because there are simply not enough staff to go around. Last week the PSA branded the latest appointments as an interim measure and declared that children and adolescents still remain at serious risk because of inadequate staffing levels. My questions are:

1. When will all the recently announced 38 positions be filled?
2. Does the government acknowledge that an additional 200 appropriately qualified and experienced staff are urgently required by the department?
3. Given that we heard this morning that this government 'cares about the future of our children and is committed to the urgent improvement of protection for children and young

people', will the government allocate funding for a further 162 positions as a matter of urgency; if not, why not?

4. On ABC Radio last week the acting social justice minister (Jay Weatherill) said that the recent appointments to FAYS were 'the first serious attempt to grapple with the question of child abuse in this state for 17 years'. If that is the case, how would the minister describe the 600-plus page Layton report?

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

WORKCOVER

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation, representing the Minister for Industrial Relations, a question about WorkCover.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: I had representations from a constituent who has business interests in both Victoria and South Australia. He has an issue with WorkCover, and he gave me a copy of a letter. I will not identify the people in it, but I am prepared to identify them and make names available to the minister. The letter states:

We have been notified that our Workcare levy has been increased from 4.956 per cent to 9.106 per cent. This is because we had a claim of \$15 186. The only claim we have ever had and this claim was caused by the actions of an unauthorised driver of a forklift not employed by our company. Prior to this financial year, we first started operating in South Australia in July 1996. We have paid \$54 817 without a claim. This increase represents an extra \$17 449 on last year's premium, \$2 263 more than the total claim. In effect our company has had to pay a WorkCover premium (\$20 839), the total cost of the workers injury (\$15 186) plus (\$2 263).

Clearly this is totally unacceptable and defies all logical explanation. Our company cannot be expected to pay insurance plus carry an excess of 115 per cent. Should you wish to discuss any aspects of this letter, please ring [the person who has written the letter]. We look forward to your response and a mutually acceptable solution.

The response from WorkCover is, I expect, a standard letter, and it details a number of the features of the WorkCover scheme. It then goes on to state:

Should you consider this decision to be unreasonable, you may apply for a review. A written application for a review should be made within two months of this advice by contacting the Levy Review Registry, WorkCover Corporation GPO Box 2668, Adelaide 5001. Please note, an application for review does not suspend your liability to make levy payments at the levy rate advised.

It is signed 'Yours sincerely, Matthew.' My questions to the minister are:

1. Will the minister, as a matter of urgency, investigate this outrageous levy?
2. Can the minister explain how this levy policy is an incentive to attracting business to South Australia?
3. Can the minister ensure that all staff identify themselves fully when signing correspondence on behalf of WorkCover Corporation?

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

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

The Hon. A.J. REDFORD: I seek leave to make an explanation before asking the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation a question about unanswered questions.

Leave granted.

The Hon. A.J. REDFORD: I draw the minister's attention to the questions on notice that were around in the last parliament. Indeed, I asked a question of the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation (question 240). I asked him for the names of the chief executives of all administrative units for which he was responsible and, indeed, I have not received an answer. I know that there are some cynics out in the community who might believe that the minister does not know who his chief executives are and, indeed, is still struggling to determine the nature and extent of all the administrative units. But I have every confidence that he does know the name of each chief executive and which administrative units he is responsible for—or, indeed, in the case of his position as Minister Assisting the Minister for Environment and Conservation, what administrative units which he is not responsible for.

In any event, I have asked a series of questions—and I must say, I did receive some inspiration from the current Treasurer in relation to questions that were asked by him in the previous parliament regarding chief executives of administrative units and what they are paid and what were their dates of commencement and various contractual conditions, so that we could monitor them (we being Her Majesty's loyal opposition) to ensure that the South Australian taxpayer was receiving the benefit. I also asked a series of questions relating to a number of other portfolios for which this minister is charged with the responsibility of taking questions. In that respect, I refer the minister to questions 241, 242, 243, 244, 245, 246, 247 and 248. My questions to the minister are—

The Hon. R.K. Sneath: You don't know much, do you? You've got to ask a lot of questions.

The Hon. A.J. REDFORD: The honourable member interjects—and I know, and I have to accept, that I do not know much. But I do not walk around the corridors of this place with people whispering behind my back that I am a know-all, as they do about the Hon. Bob Sneath. My questions are:

1. Does the minister intend to ensure that those questions that I put on notice will be answered, and can he indicate when they are likely to be answered?

2. In relation to the minister's portfolio, what stage have his officers reached in answering those questions that I put on notice back in April, some four months ago?

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation): I thought I indicated earlier during question time that I had a whole series of answers to questions that I would be proffering to the parliament tomorrow.

The Hon. A.J. Redford: Are these amongst them?

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: I am not sure. I have not gone through the numbers in the list. I will endeavour to find out, and give an assurance that, with respect to the questions that the honourable member has asked, and those questions with respect to which I have given an undertaking to bring back replies to this council, I will endeavour to do so as soon as possible.

EQUAL OPPORTUNITY

The Hon. KATE REYNOLDS: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, representing the Attorney-General, a

question about the review of the current equal opportunity legislation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. KATE REYNOLDS: In February of this year, the Attorney-General announced that the public would be consulted about the legislative changes needed to remove discrimination against same sex couples in South Australia. A discussion paper examining unjustified discrimination (which some people took as implying that some discrimination was justified) was released at the same time seeking feedback about who should be recognised by the law as a couple. Opportunities for public comment closed on 7 April and the discussion paper has since been removed from the government's web site, yet five months later we have heard nothing further. Two weeks ago, the Tasmanian government passed world-first legislation to recognise the equal rights of same sex couples. South Australia, which was once a leader, is now well and truly lagging behind the rest of the nation when it comes to affording same sex couples equal rights. My questions are:

1. When will the Attorney-General report to parliament and the community about the legislative changes needed to remove discrimination against same sex couples?

2. When will he take action in accordance with the recommendations of the report?

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY (Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries): I will endeavour to get an answer from the Attorney-General and bring back a response as soon as possible.

PARLIAMENTARY PRIVILEGE

The Hon. A.J. REDFORD: My questions are to the Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, as follows:

1. Has the minister or any other minister within this government given any direction to any freedom of information officer on the meaning of parliamentary privilege or when it ought to be or should be claimed when answering FOI applications?

2. Will the minister table any documents prepared either from the minister's office or indeed from any other office within the public sector concerning what is or is not meant by the term 'parliamentary privilege' when freedom of information applications are being dealt with?

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY (Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries): I have not given any instructions in relation to parliamentary privilege. I think that during the last session the Leader of the Opposition asked a question in relation to some meeting that was supposedly held in relation to this matter. I will see whether there is any information. I am certainly not aware of any, but if there is any information regarding the use of parliamentary privilege in relation to FOI requests, I will find out. I think it is a matter for the Minister for Administrative Services. I will see whether there is any information and bring back a response.

The Hon. A.J. REDFORD: I have a supplementary question. Will the minister outline what he is talking about when he refers to some meeting with the Leader of the Opposition?

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: No, I said I thought that the Leader of the Opposition asked a question that referred to a meeting supposedly held during the last session. I thought he had asked a question about that when he raised this issue of parliamentary privilege. It was a long time ago. I will refresh

my memory in relation to that matter and see whether there is any information to give to the member.

The Hon. A.J. REDFORD: I have a further supplementary question. What are the limits to this claim of parliamentary privilege and who outside of members of parliament can claim it?

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: I will take that question on notice.

BAXTER DETENTION CENTRE

The Hon. KATE REYNOLDS: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, representing the Minister for Police, a question about South Australian police involvement in involuntary deportations from the Baxter Immigration Detention Centre.

Leave granted.

The Hon. KATE REYNOLDS: South Australian police officers were involved in the involuntary removal of asylum seekers from the Baxter centre in recent weeks. My office has been informed that police were involved in a secret operation to deport to Iran at least three detainees from Baxter. More forced removals are expected from Baxter in the coming months. My questions are:

1. How many officers were involved in the removal of asylum seekers from the Baxter Immigration Detention Centre?

2. Why were South Australian police, instead of the appropriate federal authorities, involved in the removal of asylum seekers?

3. Were any other South Australian government employees involved in forced deportations last month?

4. Will the federal government be reimbursing SAPOL for its staffing resources used during the event?

5. Will South Australian police officers or any other South Australian government employees be expected to assist with forced removals of men, women or children detained at Baxter Immigration Detention Centre?

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY (Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries): I will refer those questions to the Minister for Police and bring back a reply.

The PRESIDENT: It is the normal practice on the opening day of parliament that there is unlimited question time. My observation today is that some members thought it was unlimited explanation time. My other observation today was that a number of questions sought opinions. The Hon. Mr Gilfillan specifically asked for an opinion and the Hon. Mr Redford posed the question, 'Does the minister regret'. I point out to members that questions seeking opinions are out of order. I hope that when we begin formal question time all members are aware of their obligations regarding the procedures of question time.

REPLIES TO QUESTIONS

MURRAY RIVER LEVY

In reply to **Hon. J.F. STEFANI** (3 June).

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

1. The Save the River Murray Levy will be charged at a flat rate of \$30 per residential property.

2. The Government cannot confirm whether landlords will be in a position to absorb the Save the River Murray Levy. The eventual

impact of the levy on tenants, if any, depends on the prevailing supply and demand conditions in the rental property market.

GAS SUPPLY

In reply to **Hon. SANDRA KANCK** (3 June).

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

1. Adelaide Hills residents and businesses currently purchase LPG bottled gas in the absence of reticulated natural gas being available. Some Hills consumers prefer LPG bottled gas to electricity. In metropolitan Adelaide, the price of bottled LPG gas is markedly higher than that of natural gas for the average household consumer. The lower price of natural gas compared to both bottled LPG gas and peak electricity has resulted in many consumers taking advantage of the reticulated gas system for such purposes as cooking and space heating. If this situation were to be replicated in the Adelaide Hills, then some heating loads are likely to be converted over to natural gas and energy competition would be enhanced.

While the Government is actively encouraging competition throughout the South Australian energy market, it is also mindful not to impose excessive cost burdens on South Australian consumers when proposals to extend energy networks are considered.

2. When burned to generate energy, all fossil fuels, including coal and natural gas, release the greenhouse gas carbon dioxide (CO₂).

Energy obtained from coal is derived entirely by converting carbon to CO₂. Part of the energy produced in using natural gas is derived from converting hydrogen to water, which is not a greenhouse gas. The same amount of electricity can be generated from natural gas with lower levels of greenhouse gas emissions.

Only about one third of the energy content of a fuel such as natural gas is recovered as electricity in power stations. The balance is lost, for example, as heat contained in the flue gas. Further electrical energy is lost in the transmission and distribution systems.

When natural gas is used directly to heat water or houses, the efficiency losses in generating and distributing electricity are avoided. A current Energy SA brochure "The Cost of Heating Water" shows that providing hot water for an average household using electricity releases about 4 times as much CO₂ as using natural gas.

The use of natural gas as a direct fuel source is environmentally preferable to coal or gas-fired electricity, specifically in terms of the lower amount of greenhouse gases released to generate the same amount of heat.

3. The national gas pipelines access regime makes provisions for the supply of gas to new areas such as the Adelaide Hills. It permits a tender being called by a party independent of the industry to select a pipeline service provider for a greenfields area like the Adelaide Hills. Mildura, for example, used this approach to provide reticulated natural gas. The Mildura Rural City Council under the auspice of Victoria's independent regulator conducted the tender. This approach would permit the Hills community to be closely involved in ensuring the most competitive pipeline system is chosen.

The access regime permits a surcharge where the prevailing regulated haulage tariff for a regulated gas distributor is insufficient to meet the costs of an extension. The Essential Services Commission of South Australia, which became the economic regulator for the Envestra System on 1 July 2003, is able to approve a surcharge applied to all Hills gas consumers should such an extension satisfy certain criteria.

At this stage the Government believes that the competitive processes of the current provisions of the national gas pipelines access regime should be utilised to establish a gas extension to Mount Barker.

MOUNT BARKER POLICE STATION

In reply to **Hon. IAN GILFILLAN** (4 June).

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

1. The question relates only to the Mount Barker Police Station. The Government, however, intends to replace the police stations at Port Lincoln, Gawler and Victor Harbour and the courthouses at Port Lincoln and Victor Harbour, as well as Mount Barker, under a single development contract. Provision has been made for a half-year payment of \$1.15 million in 2004-05, or \$2.3 million over a full year, for all of the facilities. It should be noted that this payment includes

both the rental payment for the buildings and a range of ancillary services relating to the maintenance and operation of the facilities.

The Government will undertake the development of the police stations and court facilities as a public private partnership (PPP), only if it can be demonstrated that there is value for money for the Government in doing so.

2. It is expected that the development of the police stations will be put to competitive tender. It would seriously undermine the Government's competitive position if it were to disclose the detail of its financial analysis of the police stations project prior to tender, as this would have to include information such as capital and interest costs, which bidders may exploit to the Government's disadvantage. It is simply not in the public interest to disclose commercially sensitive information relating to the financing of the project at this stage.

3. PPP contracts are subject to the Government's contract disclosure policy, as detailed in Treasurer's Instruction No 27. These contracts will also undoubtedly be scrutinised by the Auditor General for conformity with the Government's Partnerships SA policy. This will provide sufficient information to Parliament and the public as to whether the Government has received value for money from a PPP arrangement, if such an arrangement is entered into, for the development of the regional police stations.

COGEN DEVICE

In reply to **Hon. A.L. EVANS** (5 June).

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

1. I am advised that a check with Ministerial Offices has revealed that as at 16 June 2003 no office had advised that it had received correspondence from Dr Nitschke on this matter.

2. Ministerial Offices have advised that as at 16 June 2003 they had not received an invitation to attend that public meeting and no Minister attended.

3. No instruction has been sought, nor any advice received.

GREENHOUSE GASES

In reply to **Hon. SANDRA KANCK** (26 June).

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

The Government has not ignored this recommendation of the Electricity Demand Side Measures Task Force, nor has it ignored the other Task Force recommendations.

An Interdepartmental Review Group developed the Government's responses. On 1 May 2003 the Natural Resources, Environment and Energy (NREE) Cabinet Committee supported these recommendations. On 23 June 2003 Cabinet supported the public release of the Task Force's final report and the Government Response Report.

Regarding the Task Force's recommendation of providing greenhouse gas emission information on energy customers' bills, the Government referred this matter to ESCOSA on 4 August 2003.

SHEARING INDUSTRY

In reply to **Hon. T.J. STEPHENS** (5 June).

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: The Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education has provided the following information:

Remarks made in relation to the shearing industry referred to the structures in which training is provided in the industry, and not the shearing and wool industry itself.

The review of the shearer training program in South Australia was prompted by calls for funding in order avert skill shortages in the industry, despite the injection of around \$800 000 in State Government funding since 1996-97. The review also assessed how effective the current program has been in attracting and retaining new entrants to the occupation.

This review has now been completed and the future of funding for shearer training in South Australia has been secured for the first time.

A single, effective system to train people in this industry will be set up and a number of wide ranging training and advisory measures in partnership with the industry will be introduced which will include:

- TAFE becoming the sole provider of quality training for shearers and shedhands from January 2004, through its Primary Industries Program

- The adoption of ongoing training programs in recognition of the high turnover of shearers, shedhands, wool pressers and wool classers in the industry

- The establishment of the Woolharvesting Training Advisory Committee (WoolTAC) to provide ongoing industry input and contribution to the program and to ensure that long-term training needs of the industry are met in an efficient and effective manner.

While these measures are being developed and implemented, interim funding has been provided to ensure the continuation of the current training program to the end of 2003.

The consolidation of the program within TAFE from January 2004 will provide a more cohesive and efficient use of resources with respect to:

- In-service training needs of instructors
- Effective recruiting and targeting of participants
- Regional and state-wide coordination through the TAFE Institute network
- Recurrent funding provision and prioritising through the TAFE Primary Industries Program

This outcome will not only guarantee the financial stability of these training programs, but will also ensure the availability of high quality trainers and the provision of ongoing in-service training for instructors in the woolharvesting industry.

COOBER PEDY, POLICE

In reply to **Hon. T.J. STEPHENS** (15 July).

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

Coober Pedy Police Station currently has a staffing level of 16 members, comprising of:

- 1 Senior Sergeant
- 1 Sergeant
- 3 Senior Constables
- 6 Constables
- 2 Community Constables
- 2 Senior Constables (Criminal Investigation Branch)
- 1 Administration Services Officer

The uniformed police officers work Day and Afternoon Shifts, providing seven days a week coverage from 8.30 a.m. to 1.30 a.m. Exceptions to this are Friday and Saturday nights when the police coverage is extended through to 2.30 a.m., or when a prisoner is in custody in which case a police officer remains on duty until the Day Shift commences at 7.00 a.m. The Shifts and working hours of the police officers may be adjusted to satisfy planned operations, and during 'after hours' police officers may be called out to deal with specific incidents as they arise.

The provision of a 24-hour uniformed police coverage would have a number of implications, including:

- A review of the roster to determine the additional staff members required to provide a 24-hour coverage.
- Housing for the additional police officers (to be provided by Real Estate Management [REM]).
- A Minor Works Building Program to provide additional Station/Office accommodation to cater for the increase in staff (eg locker room, shower and toilet facilities).
- Additional equipment items that may be necessary dependant upon the number of additional police required to provide the determined level of service.

The total impact of these factors cannot be provided without a Needs Analysis being completed.

The current level of police service is monitored on an ongoing basis. At this stage, workload assessment indicates that the after hours call out arrangement is able to provide a satisfactory response to the community needs and does not warrant the introduction of a 24-hour patrol service.

EXTRACTIVE AREAS REHABILITATION FUND

In reply to **Hon. CAROLINE SCHAEFER** (15 July 2003).

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: As indicated in my response to the Hon Caroline Schaefer of 15 July regarding the Extractive Areas Rehabilitation Fund, I have verified the date for the closure of submissions to the Review of Funding of Rehabilitation in the Extractive Industries of South Australia. While submissions formally closed on 1 August 2003, it was agreed that some respondents could add additional material to their submissions until 15 August.

DEEP SEA PORTS

In reply to **Hon. IAN GILFILLAN** (17 July).

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

1. The Ardrossan proposal is not one that is supported by Government.

It is a proposal that has been developed by a private party, AusBulk, and we do not know the extent to which the proposal has been costed and worked through.

I can imagine a whole range of difficult issues that AusBulk would need to address with respect to its proposal, not only the transport issues identified by the Hon Ian Gilfillan but also the environmental impact of dredging and the challenge of obtaining the necessary development approvals.

2. The Government intends to continue with the work at Port Giles and follow through on other Committee recommendations to which Government has made a commitment.

In this regard, I am pleased to report that all three of the Flinders Ports' managed and Government funded deep-sea grain port developments are progressing well and are on track to deliver significant benefits to the grain farmers of this State.

The Government has for some time been working closely with the private port operator, Flinders Ports, and the grain industry participants to facilitate the developments.

At Outer Harbor, Flinders Ports and AusBulk have each recently obtained development approvals for their respective developments.

This will pave the way for preliminary work to commence later this year and construction to gain momentum in early 2004, with a fully operational deep-sea grain port, comprising a deepened channel and berth pocket, a new wharf and a new grain terminal, envisaged for late 2005.

The new port at Outer Harbor will enable the larger Panamax vessels to fully load.

The new grain dedicated wharf and AusBulk's new just-in-time terminal, complete with a rail loop and fast grain unloading capacities, will provide the world-class facilities that a grain exporting State like ours needs.

The Government's decision to proceed with the Port River Expressway rail and road bridges, along with other improvements planned for the rail corridor along the Le Fevre Peninsula, will facilitate an efficient transport corridor to the port.

It should be noted that an efficient rail corridor servicing Outer Harbor is not only important for the grain industry but for all importers and exporters using the port at Outer Harbor. An efficient rail corridor is also important from a community perspective as more rail freight means fewer trucks on our roads.

The upgrade of the port of Wallaroo, to make it capable of part loading Panamax class vessels, involves significant improvement work on the wharf. I am advised that construction work commenced in March this year with completion scheduled for later this year, around October/November.

The upgrade of Port Giles to full Panamax capability involves the deepening of the channel and a berth pocket as well as significant work on the wharf. Flinders Ports has obtained the necessary development approvals and I am told that site works on the wharf will commence in September with completion expected later this year. I am also advised that dredging of the channel at Port Giles is expected to commence during the winter of 2004 with completion scheduled in late 2004.

The Government and Flinders Ports remain committed to each of these developments and there is very real progress in bringing the developments to fruition.

Some \$60 million was foregone from the sale proceeds of Ports Corp to fund these developments. To that figure we can add the Government's planned and significant investment on the rail and road bridges and other transport corridor and head-works infrastructure along the Le Fevre Peninsula and Outer Harbor.

The Government is delivering the deep-sea grain ports that the grain industry has been seeking for many years.

3. In relation to the Ports Corp sale agreement, as this agreement refers to the developments at Outer Harbor, Port Giles and Wallaroo, all of which remain committed to by both Government and Flinders Ports, the AusBulk proposal will not affect the sale agreement.

In response to the Hon Ian Gilfillan's supplementary question:

The need for three deep-sea ports on the Yorke Peninsula was outlined by the DSPIC. The DSPIC was established in 1992 by the

grains industry and included key grain industry participants such as AusBulk Ltd, AWB Ltd and ABB Ltd.

Its task was to determine and recommend the best option for the development of deep-sea grain ports in the State.

The DSPIC considered a number of different options, including the port of Ardrossan and its final recommendations (1999) were that the ports of Adelaide and Giles should be developed to full Panamax capability and the port of Wallaroo should be upgraded to part Panamax capability.

The Government has accepted the findings of the DSPIC and is working toward bringing those recommendations to fruition.

In light of the DSPIC findings and Flinders Port's and the Government's commitment to Wallaroo and Giles, it would seem that the Yorke Peninsula will be well served by its grain ports without the need for further port development.

I also note that the developments at Outer Harbor, Giles and Wallaroo remain fully supported by the State's key grain body, the Grains Council of the South Australian Farmers Federation.

I trust this information will allay the concerns Mr Way and the Port Giles Strategic Site Committee have.

ENTERPRISE ZONE, UPPER SPENCER GULF

In reply to **Hon. T.J. STEPHENS** (13 November).

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

This government's regional development policy is about making sure that all parts of South Australia have the opportunity to benefit from jobs and economic growth, as well as the highest quality public services.

The people of the Upper Spencer Gulf region have experienced declining economic and social circumstances over the last decade when compared to other regions in the State.

The solutions being worked on by the Government are based on a partnership approach. We are working with key stakeholders in the Upper Spencer Gulf, such as the Common Purpose Group, Local Government, employers, unions, regional development boards and community organisations to develop policy solutions that work for the community.

The Government has committed itself to a range of projects to encourage investment and improve services to the region. These include: supporting exploration and mining, promoting increased usage of local labour, establishing a single office of regional affairs and a requirement for a regional impact assessment statement for significant government decisions affecting regions.

Further, the Government has also opened a regional ministerial office in Port Augusta, known as the Office of the Upper Spencer Gulf, Flinders Ranges and Outback. This office will work with local leaders, community organisations, State Government agencies and the public to further enhance the delivery of services and the development of policy for the region.

During the visit by Cabinet to Port Augusta last year, I asked the Upper Spencer Gulf Common Purpose Group to work with the Government to implement an enterprise zone for the Upper Spencer Gulf.

Since that time a working party has been considering a number of initiatives and ideas, which will assist the Common Purpose Group to implement its own strategic plan and create new opportunities for investment in the region.

On 21 May 2003, I announced the establishment of an Enterprise Zone for the Upper Spencer Gulf. As part of this announcement I outlined an initial commitment of \$250 000 towards assisting the Common Purpose Group, as well as specific strategic projects for the region.

The Enterprise Zone will continue to develop in partnership with the Upper Spencer Gulf Common Purpose Group and will complement the activities of regional development boards.

New opportunities for investment will be explored in such areas as defence and aerospace, resource processing, transport and tourism.

On top of this there is already a strong commitment by the Government to existing industries and long term proposals such as the potential SAMAG plant in Port Pirie and the expansion of WMCs operations in Roxby Downs.

The Enterprise Zone status enjoyed by the Upper Spencer Gulf will also allow for a focus on education and training, as well as a number of other important policy areas.

This policy is not about giving handouts to individual companies, but rather creating a strategic and coordinated approach to the future growth of the Upper Spencer Gulf region.

CORA BARCLAY CENTRE

In reply to **Hon. KATE REYNOLDS** (19 March).

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: The Minister for Education and Children's Services has provided the following information:

The Minister for Education and Children's Services and the Minister for Disability have worked closely to provide significant funding to the Cora Barclay Centre for the delivery of education and support services to children with a hearing impairment and their families.

The Minister for Education and Children's Services acknowledges that the Cora Barclay Centre has received world recognition from the Alexander Graham Bell Association for the Deaf as 'Program of the Year' in 2000 for the auditory Verbal program conducted at the Centre. This program is also one of the methods utilised within the Department of Education and Children's Services which supports over 1200 children and students with a hearing impairment, many of whom have severe sensory impairment and also multiple disabilities.

Recently the State Government has offered the Cora Barclay Centre a package of measures to help it address issues of financial viability into the future.

For the first time ongoing Disability funding of \$40 000 per annum for newly diagnosed children in the Early Intervention program has been offered together with one off funding of \$40 000 to assist with the current financial predicament.

The Department of Education and Children's Services plans to open a public kindergarten on the current Norwood Primary School site and the offer has been made to the Cora Barclay Centre for its children to enrol there. The Government has offered accommodation at a peppercorn rent for Cora Barclay Centre administration, auditory verbal therapy and related activities at Norwood Primary School.

It is expected that the government will contribute up to \$200 000 for the refurbishment of existing buildings for Cora Barclay Centre use. A commitment has also been made to pay the salary of a Cora Barclay Centre teacher at a cost of \$70 000 per annum.

The Government is currently negotiating with the Board of the Cora Barclay Centre in relation to this offer.

SCHOOLS, RACIAL HARMONY

In reply to **Hon. KATE REYNOLDS** (27 March).

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: The Minister for Education and Children's Services has provided the following information:

1. The use of security officers to manage violent behaviour in schools should always be a last resort but if the safety of students or staff is threatened it is appropriate that schools exercise their responsibilities within strict guidelines to ensure everyone is safe and secure at school. The Department has policies to guide schools in the management of a range of behaviours that, if not addressed, may lead to incidents of violence or the threat of violence. Racial vilification and harassment is not only unacceptable behaviour but also illegal behaviour. Staff in our schools and preschools work constructively with all members of their communities to prevent and address racism and to foster racial harmony. However, if tensions in the school community reach the point of violence or threatened violence the safety and security of students and teachers is paramount and the use of security officers may be appropriate.

2. The Department has advised that the cost of additional security, required as a result of one off incidents, such as patrolling schools, where there are unsecured buildings, due to construction work, or to provide security to staff and students, was \$104 495 over the period January to March 2003. It must be noted that over the January school holidays considerable construction and maintenance work is undertaken on school buildings during which the buildings are not secure and require static security.

3. The Department of Education and Children's Services places a high priority on countering racism and fostering racial harmony in our schools and preschools. The Department has initiated and developed a wide range of programs, resources and personnel to support leaders and staff in providing safe and supportive learning and care environments and culturally inclusive education. The Anti Racism and Multiculturalism in schooling and children's services policies ensure that all staff, learners and their families are aware of their rights and responsibilities with regards to racial vilification and harassment and that grievance procedures are in place for addressing racism if it occurs. Children and students are also supported to develop the knowledge, skills and understandings they need to effectively participate in our multicultural society and to become active and responsible local and global citizens.

4. The Chief Executive of the Department issued a circular 'Support Strategies in the light of World Events' to all schools and pre-schools on 19 March 2003. Included in the circular was information about strategies and resources available from within DECS and in the broader community to assist staff in working with learners and their families to help them cope with potentially disturbing media images and stories and possible incidences of racism in response to the War in Iraq.

5. In February 2003 the Chief Executive also issued a circular to all schools and preschools to encourage and promote their involvement in the Department of Immigration and Multicultural and Indigenous Affairs (DIMIA) and the Council for Multicultural Australia's national Harmony Day initiative on March 24th. This resulted in large numbers of schools and centres organising, and participating in, celebrations to promote cultural and linguistic diversity and to take a stand against racism.

6. The Minister is committed through the government's social inclusion agenda to the elimination of racism and to ensuring that all cultural, religious and language groups are valued, respected and represented at all levels within its care and education services.

COOPER PEDY POWER SUPPLY

In reply to **Hon. T.J. STEPHENS** (1 and 29 May).

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

1. The Mayor and Chief Executive Officer of the District Council of Coober Pedy (the Council) informed the Minister for Energy and the Minister for Local Government of the extent of Cooper Pedy's electricity supply problems in late November 2002.

The Minister for Energy established an inter-agency taskforce in response to these problems. Energy SA provides technical support to the taskforce while the Department of Treasury and Finance and the Office of Local Government have been tasked with reviewing the Council's financial position and developing options for the way forward.

With the technical assistance of Energy SA, the Council has engaged ETSA Utilities to go to public tender to cost options for the replacement of generating plant and equipment. Tenders are due to close 13 June 2003.

In the interim period, the electricity supply will continue to be sourced from generators leased by the Council.

2. The Government continues to assist the Council to manage the electricity supply situation in Cooper Pedy. The Local Government Finance Authority of South Australia has established \$1.8 million in loans to the Council to enable it to carry on the provision of electricity supply. Energy SA will continue to provide technical advice through the tender process and the Minister for Energy will continue to provide the RAES scheme subsidy.

3. To partly finance the high costs incurred by the Council in leasing temporary generating plant and equipment, the Council implemented an increase in commercial electricity tariffs by 5 per cent effective from 1 April 2003. A further 5 per cent increase will be effective from 19 July 2003. The Minister for Energy has approved these increases on the basis that the tariffs will be reviewed when the long-term arrangements for electricity generation and distribution are finalised.

4. On 29 January 2003, the Acting Minister for Energy approved bringing forward the quarterly RAES subsidy payment from April 2003. This payment provided the Council with sufficient funds to continue operating the electrical infrastructure and electricity generation. The July 2003 quarterly subsidy payment was also brought forward for this purpose.

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

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

The Office for Local Government and the Department of Treasury and Finance are in discussions with the Council on the subject of financial security.

SPEED LIMITS

In reply to **Hon. T.G. CAMERON** (13 May).

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

1. All SAPOL members were advised to exercise discretion during the three month public education period for the new 50 km/h speed zone. During this period, police were advised that drivers

detected travelling at speeds up to 69 km/h on a 50 km/h default speed limit road should be issued with a caution expiation notice.

Drivers detected travelling in excess of 69 km/h on a 50 km/h default speed limit road or committing other breaches of road rules may still have incurred an expiation notice during the three month period.

2. Due to the increase in fatalities on rural roads, speed cameras have been used to provide an increased focus on policing rural roads.

3. There are a total of 18 speed cameras operating on South Australian roads. One speed camera per dayshift was deployed on 50 km/h default speed zones, with the remainder deployed in metropolitan and rural areas.

4. Speed cameras are deployed as part the Road Safety Strategy adopted by the Government to reduce excessive speed and to establish a firm base for long-term change in driver attitude to speeding. Achieving these aims will lead to a reduction in the general level of speed, with a corresponding reduction in the number and severity of road crashes.

Speed cameras are deployed to locations which constitute a road safety risk. The determining factors include roads which have either a high crash history or the potential to contribute to collisions, speed camera statistics, other speed statistics, in response to speeding complaints or for safety reasons at locations where the use of other speed detection methods or equipment is not the preferred option.

5. Further to the response to Question (1), it was determined that in 50kph default areas, expiation notices would only be issued for speed camera offences where the speed detected was 70kph or higher. Drivers detected up to 69kph and not committed any other breaches were issued with a caution letter and printed material on the 50kph changes. On this basis, no expiation notices were issued for speeding up to 69kph.

6. SAPOL is not at this time planning to purchase any further speed cameras as a result of the introduction of the 50 km/h default speed zones.

In reply to **Hon. J.F. STEFANI** and further to the information supplied in response to Questions 1 and 5.

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: between 1 March 2003 and 31 May 2003, speed cameras detected 4 498 drivers exceeding the 50kph default limit.

This number comprises 4 303 cautions, 191 infringement notices issued for detections at speeds of 70kph or over and 4 incidents being investigated in relation to driving at a speed dangerous.

CHRISTIES BEACH HIGH SCHOOL

In reply to **Hon. T.J. STEPHENS** (12 May).

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: The Minister for Education and Children's Services has provided the following information:

On 31 January 2000 the former Minister for Education and Children's Services declared the Christies Beach High School West Campus oval surplus to the Department's requirements.

On 15 February 2000 instructions were forwarded to the Land Management Corporation to dispose of the oval in accordance with Premier and Cabinet Circular 114.

Subsequently numerous parties have held discussions with the Land Management Corporation in relation to the purchase of the oval, however during 2002 the disposal process was put on hold pending consideration of a range of options for the whole site including relocation of certain services to the disused Christies Beach High School West Buildings.

Since then there have been ongoing discussions between interested parties, including the City of Onkaparinga, on the future of the oval.

Since coming to office, I have sought advice in relation to the future use of the buildings on the site of the Christies Beach High School West Campus. Until the various options have been properly investigated I am not in a position to make an announcement on the future use of the buildings.

DROUGHT RELIEF

In reply to **Hon. CAROLINE SCHAEFER** (15 May).

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: 141 farmers have been advised that they will receive reseeded or restocking grants of up to \$10 000. A total of \$1 394 729.60 has been targeted to these farmers through these grants to assist them in recovering from the drought.

Farmers may apply for the grants following expenditure on reseeded, restocking or water cartage. For crop farmers this may mean fertiliser, seed or fuel expenditure and may occur well before

seeding actually takes place. Stock farmers may need to wait a little longer. All do however have a promissory note from the Government that the money is available to them when they meet the obligations of the application they submitted.

6 farmers have received a total of \$4 823.25 for the carting of water for domestic use.

A further \$25 000 was provided to Lions International to enable them to meet transport costs for their fodder drive project in late 2002.

The \$60 000 to support landholders in the Murray Mallee to rehabilitate land degraded by wind erosion has been provided to the Murray Mallee Soil Conservation Board who have an agreement with the Murray Mallee Local Action Planning Association. The Association administer the Mallee Futures Program, which will use the funds to supplement its existing program supporting farmers undertake earthworks and seeding to stabilise drifting areas.

In addition \$120 000 has been provided to the Murray and Mallee Local Government Association to assist member councils of the Association meet the costs of removal of sand drift from roads.

I can confirm that funds were not made available for the carting of water to stock. The Premier's Task Force in recommending that the grants be targeted at reseeded and restocking, believed that those who held their livestock retained an income source, while those who quit livestock had no ongoing income flow as they needed their livestock sale funds to repurchase stock at a likely higher price. There was some concern that by subsidising stock water carting, some farmers may retain livestock to the detriment of the environment. The grant was therefore targeted to help in restocking or reseeded which would enable farmers to more rapidly re-establish their income source. Graziers who did cart water were eligible to apply for the restocking grants and could substitute the assistance for other expenses which might include water carting.

In reply to **Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY** (15 May).

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

1. The \$120 000 in funding assistance provided by the State Government to the region will be released on advice from the region's Local Government Association which in consultation with the member councils, will determine the relative distribution of funds to the councils within the area.

2. In addition to the \$120 000 announced by the Premier as part of the State's drought assistance funds, there is an opportunity for councils to receive funding support through the Local Government Disaster Fund.

When the State Government established the Local Government Disaster Fund in 1980 it defined the purposes to which the Fund could be directed. The Fund can be used for purposes related to the effects on local governing authorities of natural disasters or other adverse events or circumstances that are non-insurable, where the expenses incurred exceed the financial capacity of the affected council.

Under the Fund guidelines, councils are not eligible for assistance from the Fund unless damage expenses are estimated to be greater than ten percent of the works budget of the council. The Local Government Disaster Fund Management Committee considers each eligible claim, including the council's level of contribution, and makes recommendations to the Treasurer.

The Executive Officer of the Management Committee has had discussions with three Councils who have experienced problems in relation to sand drift. Two Councils, the District Council of Karoonda East Murray and the District Council of Loxton Waikerie, have made applications for consideration by the Management Committee.

The Management Committee decided, in consultation with Councils, to defer making a decision regarding assistance until the cost of the sand drift removal and rehabilitation of the road network was quantified.

However, on 4 July 2003, the Minister for Local Government, the Hon Rory McEwen, announced that the District Council of Karoonda East Murray would receive \$100 000 from the Local Government Disaster Fund as an interim payment toward rehabilitation works in that Council area.

The Management Committee was satisfied that the extent of the damage in Karoonda East Murray, when finally quantified, would be in excess of ten percent of the works budget of that Council.

The interim payment was made to allow works to commence pending assessment of the final claim. These funds have been made available through the Local Government Disaster Fund.

3. In relation to the District Council of Loxton Waikerie, it is not yet clear whether the level of damage will make that Council eligible for assistance under the Disaster Fund guidelines. Once the District Council of Loxton Waikerie is able to quantify the cost of the sand drift removal and rehabilitation of their road network they will contact the Management of the Local Government Disaster Fund who will reconsider their claim.

ELECTRICITY SUBSIDY

In reply to **Hon. CAROLINE SCHAEFER** (26 May).

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

Under the regulatory structure designed and implemented by the former Government, AGL included a service charge on all meters for customers on a combination of domestic and business or farm tariffs from 1 January 2003.

The Minister for Energy became aware of the magnitude of the problem of multiple supply charges on 9 January 2003 and called an urgent meeting with AGL, ETSA Utilities and the Chairperson of the Essential Services Commission of South Australia (ESCOSA), Mr Lew Owens, to see if the new charge could be reduced or removed. This meeting was held on Friday 10 January 2003.

The Minister for Energy was able to convince AGL and ETSA Utilities to put a six-month cap on this new charge to give farmers and other industries the chance to review their power needs. While they will be charged a reduced fee for their first two additional meters, they will not have to pay for subsequent meters.

The ESCOSA has since undertaken a review into this situation that included calling for public submissions. It released its Draft decision on 22 May 2003 and released its Final Decision on 4 July 2003.

The approach proposed in the ESCOSA's Draft Decision was followed in the Final Decision and was given effect to by the release of Electricity Guideline Number 11: Supply Charges for Multiple Connection Points. The guideline places obligations on ETSA Utilities to:

- In a case where there are several meters connected to a single connection point, the customer will pay for the residential supply charge and the hot water supply charge (if applicable). All other meters, however, will be combined and treated as a single metered consumption point on an appropriate tariff. Accordingly, the maximum number of supply charges billable is three—residential light and power, hot water and a combined business/farm tariff.
- Introduce a two-year phased rebate scheme ending on June 2005 to alleviate price shocks for situations where there are multiple distribution network connections and hence multiple supply charges; and
- Introduce a scheme whereby ETSA Utilities provides partial financial assistance for physical consolidation in situations where electricity customers at a single point or adjoining premises have multiple points of entry by ETSA Utilities' distribution lines.

I note that the ESCOSA's Final Decision provides for financial assistance for affected customers to rationalise their connection points. Customers will be able to access up to \$3 500 to reduce their number of connection points, thus providing a long-term solution to multiple supply charge issues.

In regard to where the most affected consumers are located, I am unaware of comments by the ESCOSA that have indicated that the most affected customers are Adelaide Hills and Riverland farmers. The ESCOSA Media Release on this issue notes that those most affected by this issue are consumers with farm/business supply charges in addition to residential supply charges. The Government remains acutely aware of the many issues facing South Australia's farmers.

MUSIC INDUSTRY

In reply to **Hon. SANDRA KANCK** (15 May).

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: The Minister Assisting the Premier in the Arts has provided the following information:

During the eighties and the nineties, commercial radio stations SAFM and Triple M both produced programs of between 30 minutes and one hour, which provided limited airplay for South Australian artists.

It is the view of Arts SA that those programs which were aired during the low-rating period of Sunday evening, and did not reach a mass audience and very few, if any, of the bands received airplay across other time periods.

Therefore Government sponsorship of a potentially expensive program on commercial radio to a relatively small audience during a Sunday evening may not be the best use of resources allocated to assist the development of the live contemporary music industry in South Australia.

Community radio stations including 3D and Radio Adelaide (5UV) have provided outstanding support for contemporary music artists by programming a significant quantity of new South Australian music across all time periods. This point was acknowledged by attendees at the Contemporary Music Forum, which was held on 17 March 2003. One of the suggestions made at the Forum was that the Government should consider investing money into local community media.

In response to this and other ideas, the Government has prepared a paper outlining new initiatives to develop Live Music and seeks industry feedback regarding a program of support for community radio. This paper will be distributed to the local music sector for comment in the near future.

The Government is not aware of any regulatory impediments restricting community radio's ability to program local content more readily and easily.

The community radio sector, under its voluntary code of practice, has increased the quota of Australian music by a further 5 per cent to a minimum of 25 per cent.

GOLDEN GROVE POLICE STATION

In reply to **Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS** (27 May).

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

A number of factors have to be balanced in decision-making with respect to location of police stations. There is a finite amount of government resources and they must be used in a way that will benefit South Australia most effectively.

The Government will consider Golden Grove along with other locations for police stations in the future.

ELECTRICITY SUPPLY

In reply to **Hon. A.L. EVANS** (29 May).

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

1. Pursuant to the Electricity Retail Code, all retailers are required to provide the Essential Services Commission of South Australia (ESCOSA) with quarterly data regarding their performance against its Retail Code obligations for customers experiencing payment difficulties.

Data is aggregated and then published by the ESCOSA on an annual basis in its Annual Report into the Performance of Regulated Electricity Businesses in South Australia. The most recent report was released in November 2002 for the 2001-02 year. Data relating to the period since the introduction of full retail competition on 1 January 2003 is not due to be released by the ESCOSA until later in the year.

While the ESCOSA report will not be published until later this year, AGL has advised that in the period from 1 January 2003 to 31 March 2003 it has issued 18 723 residential disconnection notices. Data relating to the April to June period is yet to be collated.

2. AGL has further advised that of those residential customers whose accounts have fallen into arrears during the same period, 1 485 customers have had their electricity supply disconnected.

3. The requirement to maintain and provide quarterly data to the ESCOSA came into effect on 1 January 2003. Accordingly, AGL advises there is no direct comparative data available. Similarly, AGL advises that in previous years it has not been required to provide specific data on the number of disconnection notices.

Annual data for the level of residential customer disconnection for the previous years is as follows:

1999-2000	2000-01	2001-02
7 310	7 141	7 470

No information is yet available from other retailers.

The government established the ESCOSA in 2002, its primary objective being to protect the long-term interests of South Australian consumers with respect to price, quality and reliability of essential services. The ESCOSA's Electricity Retail Code requires all retailers to provide customers who are having difficulty in paying their bills with the opportunity to access flexible payment options.

PARLIAMENT HOUSE, IT SERVICES

In reply to **Hon. NICK XENOPHON** (14 July).

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: The Minister for Administrative Services has advised:

1. Following investigation with the internet service provider it has been ascertained that internet services and external mail were unavailable to parliamentary offices from 8 p.m. Sunday 13 July 2003 until 8:15 p.m. Monday 14 July 2003.

The interruption to services was caused by equipment failure at the company providing internet services and was not a failure of any infrastructure under the direct control of the Parliamentary Network Support Group (PNSG).

2. The service outage was isolated to hardware failure of the internet service provider with no impact on the internet services provided to Government agencies through Statenet.

GAMBLERS' REHABILITATION

In reply to **Hon. NICK XENOPHON** (13 May).

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: The Minister for Social Justice has advised:

1. *How much did the previous prevalent study cost?*

The prevalence survey undertaken in 2001 to determine levels of problem gambling in South Australia cost \$134 000.

2. *Is the GRF considering essentially replicating the 2001 study and, if so, what is the likely cost?*

The research priorities of the Gamblers' Rehabilitation Fund (GRF) beyond 2003 have not been set yet. The GRF Advisory Committee and the Department of Human Services (DHS) will provide advice to me on the proposed priorities. The issue of whether such a survey should be funded by the GRF, the IGA or by both is the subject of ongoing discussions between the Minister for Gambling and myself.

It would not be necessary to conduct as extensive a survey as the original. The 2001 prevalence survey looked at an extensive range of other associated factors such as mental and physical health, patterns of gambling, and smoking and alcohol consumption. A survey designed simply to measure levels of problem gambling would not need to include those additional measures. I cannot provide a precise cost for such a study as the final design has not been worked out.

3. *In terms of the replication of such a study at significant cost, what are the factors that have changed since the last study that would materially affect the result? Will the minister point to any policy or legislative changes that would materially affect the results of such a study and, if so, will the minister point to any substantive changes in public policy in terms of affecting such prevalence levels?*

Regular surveys of the prevalence of things such as smoking, illicit drug taking, and alcohol consumption are a standard feature of research and policy in the health area. Large scale epidemiological surveys in those areas typically run three yearly, whilst some smaller scale ones of issues such as injecting drug use are run annually as the cost is lower and the public health implications of issues concerning the prevalence of diseases, for example HIV/AIDS and hepatitis, require more up-to-date information. How frequently these are run is an exercise in balancing the cost of the survey against the need for reasonably current information. Three years is an interval which experience has shown strikes a good balance. The making of informed decisions in areas such as these relies on the collection of reliable and reasonably timely information.

4. *What is the degree of interaction, including the frequency and level of communication between the GRF and the IGA? For instance, what is the research program of the GRF and how is this coordinated with the research program of the IGA? What public information and consultation is released in relation to the research priorities of the GRF in the context of its efficacy in tackling problem gambling?*

The GRF's research agenda was most recently set in 2000, to run until 2003. The program was developed after extensive public consultation. The research priorities are now being revisited, and will involve public consultation with key stakeholders from the health and welfare sectors, government, industry and gambling researchers. The IGA has been invited to take part in this consultation. Priorities will be publicly available once they have been determined.

The IGA is required by the Independent Gambling Authority Act of 1995 (as amended) to conduct research directed at issues, such as:

- gauging the social and economic costs and benefits of gambling;
- measuring the likely impact on the community of new gambling products; and
- strategies for reducing the incidence of problem gambling and preventing or minimising the harm caused by gambling.

DHS focuses on matters surrounding problem gambling itself and related service provision, in the testing and evaluation of new treatment measures, and in understanding the needs of problem gamblers and those affected by problem gambling. Another major function is in conducting evaluations of program such as community education about problem gambling and the efficacy of service delivery.

Research and evaluation are meant to inform policy and service development and the targeting of resources which are themselves the agent of change relating to problem gambling. Funding of counselling services is the main means by which DHS attempts to assist with those affected by problem gambling, but it is not the only means. GRF funds are also being used to conduct a major community information campaign directed at encouraging problem gamblers to seek assistance from the agencies, which provide services. The IGA and the Liquor and Gambling Commissioner also have responsibilities in ensuring that levels of problem gambling are not exacerbated.

5. *To what extent can the minister advise the council that the GRF's research projects are not going to be duplicated or replicated by the IGA or, indeed, they have not been already dealt with in substance by other research bodies in Australia?*

The IGA and DHS have different aims for their research agendas. The IGA will have the opportunity to provide input to the development of the new DHS research agenda and there is ongoing liaison between senior executives of DHS and the IGA to ensure proper coordination of research activities. DHS ensures that it is continually up-to-date with interstate research activities through national ministerial forums, liaison at officer level and through attendance at national conferences on gambling and gambling research. I also regularly liaise with the Minister for Gambling to ensure the proper coordination of activities between DHS and the agencies for which the Minister for Gambling is responsible.

DHS makes every effort to ensure that it does not duplicate work already carried out elsewhere, and makes use of interstate work as much as possible. One example of this cooperation is the use being made of a series of television and radio advertisements developed in Victoria. These advertisements were made at considerable expense in research and production costs and are being made available for use in South Australia at zero cost, apart from those costs involved in payments to the actors and in customising telephone numbers and organisation names.

GAMBLING RELATED CRIME

In reply to **Hon. NICK XENOPHON** (14 May).

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: The Minister for Gambling has advised:

1. The terms of reference for a study into the relationship between crime and problem gambling were approved by the Minister, after consultation with the Independent Gambling Authority (IGA). Following this, a detailed project brief was developed between the IGA and the Office of Crime Statistics and Research (OCSAR) and approved by the IGA's Board at the end of 2002. OCSAR has since been retained to undertake the research tasks required by the project brief, under the supervision of a steering committee of the IGA's board. Thus far, research staff have been assigned, the necessary literature review has been completed and scans of the available data have been commenced. Work is continuing in line with the project brief under the guidance of the steering committee.

2. The terms of reference were confirmed by the Minister, after consultation with the IGA, at the end of October 2002.

3. Some time was lost in the commencement of the study due to staffing issues within the Office of the Independent Gambling Authority, in particular, disruption to the work program of that office arising from the time needed to fill a vacancy which arose from a resignation at the end of 2002.

In the same period, the IGA has, with respect to advertising and responsible gambling codes of practice, conducted three inquiry hearings and produced a report, five sets of uniform codes of practice and a schedule of issues for further consideration; with respect to the inquiry into the management of gaming machine numbers, conducted two initial hearings, commissioned and reviewed South Australia specific research, produced a discussion paper and conducted a further two-day hearing; with respect to the approval of new gaming machine games, undertaken consultation and issued guidelines to the Liquor and Gambling Commissioner; with respect to a request from the Minister for advice on an early intervention scheme, undertaken

consultation and provided a report including a proposal for legislation.

These are all very important issues requiring the IGA to assign its resources as required. The level of resources of the IGA is subject to on-going review.

4. The IGA expects to have a draft report available for consideration by its board in October 2003. Once the IGA is satisfied that the report is complete, it will be forwarded to the Minister.

5. I referred this matter to the IGA for inquiry and reporting. I am currently considering the report which was provided by the IGA on 30 June 2003.

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

6. I am unaware of how many times this has been discussed publicly by Ministers, however it reflects the importance which the Government places on this issue.

GAMBLING, LOYALTY PROGRAMS

In reply to **Hon. NICK XENOPHON** (2 April).

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: The Minister for Gambling has advised:

1. The former Minister for Gambling outlined the undertaking in respect of the J-card scheme in a response to a question on this matter on 15 May last year. I refer the Hon Member to the *Hansard* for further details.

2. The Heads of Christian Churches gambling taskforce refers to advertisements promoting the availability of being able to accrue points at 5 Star Delicatessens, Pizza Haven, Movieland, Liquorsmart as well as at Jackpot Club gaming venues. The advertisement clearly qualifies that "points earned from retail outlets are not redeemable for cash in licensed gaming rooms". On that basis the promoters of the J-card loyalty scheme have not breached their undertaking with the former Minister.

3. Player loyalty schemes are currently being considered by the Independent Gambling Authority as part of the review into gambling codes of practice. The Independent Gambling Authority released draft uniform codes of practice on Friday 30 May 2003. With the release of these codes the Authority has also indicated a number of additional measures on which it wishes to undertake additional public consultation on 29 July 2003 before finalising. The measures for the second stage consultation include a possible ban on inducement and loyalty schemes based on activity. The Authority will consider this issue further following the public consultation process.

4. The Minister for Gambling has advised that he does share concerns expressed by the former Minister for Gambling in relation to the coverage of gambling loyalty schemes and their potential adverse effects with respect to problem gambling. It is a statutory function of the Independent Gambling Authority to formulate codes of practice on these issues after appropriate consultation with stakeholders. It is important that the Independent Gambling Authority ensures that all stakeholders (including the concern sector and operators) have an adequate opportunity to put their submissions and be properly heard. The Government looks forward to the determination of the Independent Gambling Authority on this matter.

GAMBLERS' REHABILITATION

In reply to **Hon. NICK XENOPHON** (29 April).

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: The Minister for Social Justice has advised:

1. *Does the Minister consider that the waiting times referred to are acceptable? If not, what does she consider to be a reasonable waiting time, particularly for urgent cases?*

Waiting time of one or two weeks for specific gambling counselling services is not unusual. Short waiting times for any human service that deals with specialised issues is a reality within the context of well managed resources. The 24 hour Gambling Helpline is funded to provide crisis counselling and can link callers to appropriate emergency assistance where an immediate response and assistance is required.

2. *Given that all three agencies referred to did not have the resources to replace staff on leave, will the Minister indicate whether there are plans to provide such resources and rectify this situation?*

Without detailed information regarding arrangements for backfilling Break Even counselling personnel when annual or long service leave is taken, it is difficult to determine whether the reported difficulty of backfilling by some agencies, is one of planning, resource management or a lack of resources. The Department of

Human Services will shortly be conducting a review ahead of allocating additional funds of \$280 000 to services. In conducting the review the Department will have regard for current and projected demand for services, current caseloads, and requirements for efficacy in agency management of resources. This process will determine how the staffing issues could be resolved, which may include the provision of additional resources.

3. *How much funding is actually provided through the GRF for face-to-face counselling services as a proportion of its total budget in the current financial year? In terms of the GRF's overall funding, how much of that is spent on other matters. Such as education, research and training?*

In 2002-03 the GRF budget was increased to \$3.3 million with an additional \$1 million p.a. provided by the Government. Break Even services will receive \$405 000 out of the additional \$1 million p.a. allocated by the Government in 2002-03 (\$230 000 is yet to be allocated). This increases funding earmarked for the service sector (including the Helpline) to \$2 342 580, which is over 60 per cent of the \$3.3 million total GRF. The metropolitan, regional and statewide services under the current priority of access arrangements could allocate all agency funding to face to face counselling, where the demand warrants and where this is an appropriate response for the cultural target group.

A recurrent budget to develop and maintain the major media campaign has also been provided out of the new \$1 million, with \$500 000 allocated in 2002-03 and \$410 000 p.a. until 2006. The GRF provides \$203 500 p.a. to service sector coordination and development including a training component. The remaining funds are spread across research and evaluation, and various administrative functions including data management and GRF Committee executive support.

4. *Does the Minister concede that Break Even services are ill equipped in terms of resources to deal with the additional requests for assistance that are inevitable once an advertising campaign commences? Are there plans to increase funding?*

The increase of funding to services provided out of the new \$1 million is allocated to provide additional resources to services in anticipation of increased demands through the planned media campaign. The Department will closely monitor services through the quarterly data reporting requirements of Break Even agencies to assess capacity of services (including the Gambling Help Line) to adequately respond to increased demands.

SMOKING BAN

In reply to **Hon. NICK XENOPHON** (24 March).

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

1. There has been no study conducted that specifically quantifies the savings to the health system that are likely to result from a total ban on smoking in gaming rooms.

2. The Government is committed to protecting South Australians from exposure to Environmental Tobacco Smoke. As part of this commitment, the Smoke-free Hospitality Taskforce was brought together by the Government in September 2002. This Taskforce has helped bring many of the health, financial and broader social implications of broader bans to light. On 15 April 2003 the Minister for Health was officially presented with the Recommendation Report of the Hospitality Smoke-free Taskforce and launched a six week public consultation period. The consultation period closed on 30 May 2003. The submissions are currently being analysed by officers from the Tobacco Control Unit before the Taskforce reconvenes to review the findings and reports these to the Minister for Health. Before reaching its decision on these recommendations, the Government will need to balance health and worker safety considerations with economic and other factors.

The Minister for Gambling has advised:

3. The gambling portfolio has not undertaken any study on the impact on problem gambling associated with a ban on smoking in gaming rooms. The Independent Gambling Authority released draft uniform codes of practice on Friday 30 May 2003. With the release of these codes the Authority also indicated a number of additional measures on which it wishes to undertake additional public consultation on 29 July 2003 before finalising, including the implications of a ban on smoking where gambling products are provided. All parties with relevant information will have the opportunity to put this information to the Authority for further consideration.

GP HOMELINK

In reply to **Hon J.S.L. DAWKINS** (15 July).

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

1. The GP Home Link programs that have operated in both the Eastern and Northern metropolitan regions are to be expanded to all metropolitan regions with the establishment of the Metropolitan Home Link Service.

The new Metropolitan Home Link Service will incorporate the successful learnings of the two GP Home Link initiatives, the hospital-based Emergency To Home Outreach Service (ETHOS) auspiced by Flinders Medical Centre and the Interface program auspiced by The Queen Elizabeth Hospital.

2. The two GP Home Link programs previously operated on a combined budget of \$400 000 per annum. The new Metropolitan Home Link Service has now been expanded to \$1.6 million in per annum funding.

GAMMON RANGES NATIONAL PARK

In reply to **Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS** (15 July).

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

1. The issue of co-naming National Parks with indigenous names was originally raised during the course of the annual 2002 Friends of Parks Forum held at Sandy Creek in the Barossa Valley between 6-8 September 2002. There were more than 250 Friends group members present at the 2002 Forum.

During the final part of the Forum an initiative was suggested to place Aboriginal names along side existing names of all parks in support of reconciliation efforts. I understand there was a general agreement and consensus within the Forum for this initiative.

I believe that an important role of the Friends of Parks is to assist the community in understanding a range of matters related to parks and conservation. In this context I feel that the Friends will indeed be able to provide valuable assistance to the general community in becoming accustomed to the co-naming of parks.

REGIONAL FACILITATION GROUPS

In reply to **Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS** (10 July).

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: The Premier has provided the following information:

I am advised that the members of the Regional Facilitation Groups are nominated as regional Portfolio representatives.

The Spencer Regional Facilitation Group representative for the Department for Administrative and Information Services (Portfolio) is the manager of the Port Augusta regional office of the Department for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation.

It is clearly desirable for DAARE to have representation on Regional Facilitation Groups where a locally based senior officer is available to serve.

The State Government is committed to consultation with local Indigenous communities and leaders in carrying out their responsibilities in the regions.

OFFICE OF THE NORTH

In reply to **Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS** (28 May).

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: The Minister for Urban Development and Planning has advised:

1. The Minister responsible for the Office of the North is the Minister for Urban Development and Planning, Hon Jay Weatherill MP. Minister Weatherill has the responsibility to ensure that the Office implements the Government's strategic directions for the North. The Office is located within the Department of Transport and Urban Planning. The Hon Lea Stevens is the Lead Minister of the Northern Ministers Group, which provides strategic direction to the whole-of-government approach to the north. These arrangements have been in place since the opening of the Office in November 2002.

The news release to which the Hon. John Dawkins's questions refer, was produced to announce the official appointment of Mr Peter Sandeman as Director for the Office of the North in May 2003. Prior to this, Mr Sandeman was the acting Director, pending the outcome of a nationwide selection process.

2. The Office of the North and the Northern Partnership were established in order to improve outcomes for communities experiencing disadvantage. The residents in Gawler, Salisbury and

Playford have been identified as suffering particular disadvantage and difficulty in accessing the opportunities available in the north.

3. The role of the Regional Facilitation Groups is to facilitate interagency communication, coordination and cooperation in non-metropolitan areas. These Groups have been established in 6 regions and involve local representatives from State Government departments which have a strong presence in the region. They aim to facilitate and improve administration of public services in the identified regions and provide the Senior Management Council with regionally focused operational groups. It is not proposed to establish a similar regional facilitation group in the north as the Office of the North facilitates whole-of-government coordination and cooperation as well as implementing strategies to improve the economic, environmental and social outcomes for the community in the area.

4. There are currently a range of industry support activities in the northern region such as the NADB, the Northern Adelaide Business Enterprise Centre, the Salisbury Export Centre and the Virginia Horticulture Centre. The Office of the North has been working with a number of these organisations, including the Northern Adelaide Development Board and the Northern Adelaide Business Enterprise Centre in relation to economic development and training opportunities in the North.

The recent Review Report on the Northern Adelaide Development Board (NADB) by Economic Research Consultants Pty Ltd for the Office of Regional Affairs examined the funding of the Northern Adelaide development Board and highlighted the lack of fit of the NADB within the regional development framework.

Subsequently the Minister for Industry, Trade and Regional Development decided not to continue the funding for the NADB beyond the expiry of the current five-year term, which ended on 20 June 2003.

The Chief Executives Group of the Northern Partnership has been asked to examine the situation in the region and make recommendations as to the future arrangements for economic development, employment and training programs.

The Office of the North provides executive support to the Northern Partnership and will be assisting the Northern Partnership Chief Executives Group in working with key stakeholders to develop an integrated approach to economic development in the region.

MURRAY RIVER FERRIES

In reply to **Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS** (14 May).

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

1. *Is the minister aware of the severe implications for emergency services and personal health that could be caused by the closure of the ferry or the reduction of ferry services hours?*

2. *Will the minister rule out the closure of any of the current ferry services?*

3. *Will the minister also rule out any reduction in the hours of operation of any Murray River ferry service?*

The Government has provided funds in the budget to maintain the current level of service provided by the River Murray ferry system in the 2003-04 financial year.

SPEEDOMETERS

In reply to **Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS** (29 April).

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

Does the minister, or Transport SA, have plans to introduce speedometer checking devices in South Australia, perhaps on the South-Eastern Freeway or the Southern Expressway, or even the Gawler bypass?

Vehicle activated speedometer checking devices are currently used in South Australia.

The SA Police currently have two mobile units capable of displaying the speed of a passing vehicle, or text messages to road users. The units are mainly deployed in country areas, but have recently been used to advise motorists of vehicle speeds on selected streets in the Adelaide metropolitan area to assist the introduction of the 50 km/h urban speed limit.

The Department of Transport and Urban Planning is currently assessing the effectiveness of fixed speedometer checking devices, including the devices utilised on the Melbourne to Ballarat Freeway.

MINISTERS REGIONAL RESPONSIBILITY

In reply to **Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS** (19 November 2002).

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: The Minister for Urban Development and Planning has advised:

It is not the Government's intention to create an office for the west or the east.

WATER SUPPLY, GOVERNMENT

In reply to **Hon. A.L. EVANS** (9 July).

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: The Minister for Administrative Services has advised:

1. South Australians who elect to purchase water-saving devices are entitled to a rebate from the Government which is available until 30 June 2004. Devices included in the Rebate Scheme are tap-timers, water efficient shower heads (AAA Conservation Rating) and flow restrictors.

A standard rebate of \$10 per item up to a maximum of \$50 is available. Eligible concession customers are entitled to claim \$20 per item up to a maximum of \$100.

To qualify for a rebate, customers need to provide proof of purchase of an approved water-saving device or product, and in the case of flow restrictors, proof of installation by a licensed plumber. Rebates will be paid to SA Water customers by crediting their SA Water account. Other customers will receive their rebate by cheque.

ABORIGINAL PRISONER AND SUPPORT SERVICES

In reply to **Hon. A.L. EVANS** (7 July).

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

1. *What is the proportion of Aboriginal prisoners compared with non-indigenous people entering the prison system with drug dependent addictions?*

Aboriginal prisoners make up about 17 per cent of the prisoner population and while there is no epidemiological database of prisoners in South Australia, the Department has, in order to inform its policy process, developed a profile, based on statistics available from other Australian jurisdictions, of the prisoner population and that profile reveals that:

- 80 per cent are smokers;
- 75 per cent have drug and alcohol related problems;
- 50 per cent of men consume alcohol at a dangerous level (WHO); and,
- 32 per cent were imprisoned for a drug-related offence.

The issues identified above are noted to be more prevalent in the Aboriginal prisoner population.

2. *Can the minister provide information on the type of support and counselling being proposed or offered to the Aboriginal prisoners as a result of the Drugs Summit?*

The Department and I have just signed a 12 month agreement with Aboriginal Drug Alcohol Council SA to provide a six to eight session, in-prison and post-release alcohol and drug education program for Aboriginal offenders.

POWER SUBSIDIES

In reply to **Hon. A.L. EVANS** (26 May).

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: The Minister for Social Justice has advised:

1. *Will the government increase the threshold eligibility for energy concessions for carers; if not, why not?*

Thresholds are set at levels equivalent to those set for Commonwealth Income Support payments. This allows the State Government to target assistance to those most in need without having to undertake its own income and asset testing. There is no intention to change the current thresholds at this time.

The Social Development Committee of the South Australian Parliament also considered the impact of electricity prices increases on low-income households and as part of their report recommended that the Minister for Energy examine the feasibility of a state domestic energy management strategy. It was recommended that the strategy include:

- education/information to help households reduce electricity consumption;
- low cost or free energy audits for low income households;
- free energy audits for all SAHT tenants in older housing stock; and
- low interest loans for items to assist in reduction of energy use.

It was also recommended that the Ministers for Energy and Urban Development and Planning develop strategies to promote energy efficiency in urban developments that include low cost housing.

In response to the Committee's recommendations, the Minister for Energy recently announced \$2.05 million over two years to fund an energy efficiency program for low-income households. The program will be run in partnership with local community based organisations.

The program include free energy audits for low-income households which identify how the householder can reduce the cost of heating and cooling without reducing their own comfort. Details of the program are now being finalised. I anticipate that all members will be advised of the way the scheme will operate in the near future.

2. *Will the minister recognise the carers' allowance as a basis for eligibility for concessions and subsidies for households; if not, why not?*

The Government does not recognise the Carer Allowance as a basis for eligibility for concessions and subsidies for households.

Core State concessions are currently accessible by recipients of the Commonwealth Carer Payment, who are entitled to a Commonwealth Pensioner Concession Card and may also be entitled to receive an additional Commonwealth Carer Allowance. However, carers receiving only the Carer Allowance are not currently eligible for core State concessions. The eligibility criteria of the Carer Payment are more stringent than those of the Carer Allowance, in particular:

- the Carer Payment requires the recipient to be providing 'constant care' to someone with a disability or medical condition (the level of severity required varies), whereas the Carer Allowance is for providing 'daily care';
- income and assets tests apply to the Carer Payment, whilst no income or assets tests apply to the Carer Allowance.

Furthermore, the benefits of the Carer Payment are greater than for the Carer Allowance. Carer Payment recipients receive a fortnightly payment, a pensioner concession card, rent assistance, a telephone allowance and a pharmaceutical allowance. Carer Allowance recipients may receive a fortnightly allowance and, if caring for a child, are entitled to a Commonwealth Health Care Card, although the Card is to be used only for the direct benefit of the child.

The survey undertaken by the Carers Association showed that extending current eligibility was an issue raised by less than 5 per cent of the surveyed population.

3. *Has the government discussed with the Carers Association of South Australia the development of a strategic framework of education on entitlements to concessions and subsidies; if not, why not?*

I have met with the Carers Association to discuss concession eligibility and related issues. The Carers Association is already funded to provide information and community education to carers. A strategic approach to information on concessions would be an appropriate service response by them.

MURRAY RIVER FERRIES

In reply to **Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW** (24 March).

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

1. Which of the 10 ferry services currently operating on the Murray River on a 24-hour basis has Transport SA identified for reduced hours of operation as part of the government's proposed budget cuts to the agency from July 2003?

The 2003 Budget does not contain cuts to ferry services.

2. *Do Transport SA's contracts for the funding and operation of the ferries provide for the government to cut the hours of operation at any stage during the term of the contract, with or without the agreement of the contractor and the operator? If so, what are the specific provisions of the contracts that provide for such amendments to be made?*

Transport SA contracts are for the operation of the ferries only, not funding. In these contracts there is no provision or allowance to reduce the ferry service with or without the agreement of the contractor and operator.

3. *Will the government require a regional impact statement to be considered by Cabinet before any cut is made to the operational hours of any ferry service and, if not, why not? Would such a regional impact statement be released prior to the decision being made?*

There has been no reduction in the current operating hours of ferry services

4. *What savings target is the government seeking to gain through Transport SA by a cut to the current operating hours of*

service, and how would this target impact on the more than 60 jobs, I think it is, related to ferry operations in this state and/or the income of ferry operators?

There has been no reduction in the current operating hours of ferry services.

REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT

In reply to **Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW** (7 May 2002).

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

What are the government's priorities in terms of transport in both a budget and infrastructure sense?

The Minister for Transport has informed me that, in accordance with our policy document 'A Commitment to Transport', the Government has released a Draft Transport Plan for South Australia, the first published plan since 1968. The plan is now open to a three-month public engagement process. The plan encompasses all modes in both regional and metropolitan South Australia and also covers regulation, policy and operational matters. It is important to recognise that the plan is not a wish list for the next 15 years but a framework for future decision making with clear principles and objectives to guide policy and investment.

When finalised, the Transport Plan will reflect the Government's vision to achieve a sustainable transport system for all South Australians.

INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS

In reply to **Hon. A.J. REDFORD** (18 November 2002).

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

1. *When will the Government respond to this review and advise which of the 35 recommendations it accepts and which it does not?*

It should be noted that the Stevens report is very comprehensive and contains some 233 recommendations and not 35 as suggested by the Honourable member. The Government is currently considering the recommendations contained in the report.

2. *What is the estimate of the cost that South Australian Taxpayers will incur if the recommendation regarding the increased scrutiny of contractors is accepted?*

No estimate is currently available on the specific costs associated with this recommendation. Implementation costs of such a recommendation would be affected by a variety of factors.

3. *What has been the increased cost to Queensland taxpayers as a result of the increased scrutiny?*

Advice from the Queensland Government indicates that their Section 276 Unfair Contracts jurisdiction has been actioned without any additional resources being provided to their Court or Commission. It has been pointed out that there has been limited use of the provision with 20 matters being listed under this section in 1999-2000 (out of a total of 1999 matters) and 45 matters in 2000-01 (total 2 491 matters).

4. *How is this process any different from the alleged ad hoc nature of business done by the former Government when it comes to industrial relations as promised by Minister Wright on 7 May this year?*

The process for the development of this legislation is different from that utilised by the previous Government in that it has begun through independent input and is highly consultative.

OFFICE FOR RACING

In reply to **Hon. A.J. REDFORD** (17 July 2002).

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

1. *Will the Minister outline how the \$451 000 will be spent, that is, the actual budget for the expenditure of \$451 000?*

Salaries inc. on costs	\$244 000
Accommodation, cleaning, security costs	29 000
Administration, travelling, conference costs etc	178 000
Total Budget	\$451 000

2. *Does the Minister recognise Racing SA as the peak body of the racing industry or will his Racing Industry Council now be the peak body?*

The Racing Industry Advisory Council is simply, as the name describes, an Advisory Council. Unlike the existing Controlling Authorities, the Council has no responsibility for the management of the Racing Industry. It cannot, and was never intended to be recognised as the "peak body".

3. *Will the Minister tolerate criticism of the government by his Racing Industry Council?*

I have given a commitment to listen to all of the advice arising from the Council's deliberations. I intend to implement, where possible and practical, any recommendation from the Council that assists the growth and viability of the State's Racing Industry

4. *Will the Minister, similar to his promise to meet the Racing Industry Council regularly, also meet representatives from the democratically elected Racing SA regularly?*

I have already met, and will continue to meet, with Racing SA representatives. For the record, each of the three Racing SA Chairmen are also represented on the Racing Industry Advisory Council.

5. *Why does he need to put something in place that will complement what is already in existence?*

The role, functions and responsibilities of the Council and those of Racing SA are not identical. They can therefore, and are expected to, function in a manner that is complementary to each other.

6. *Does he agree that the provision of advice to government with respect to racing by the Office for Racing will duplicate that same role that Racing SA currently performs?*

The Member appears to be confused about the roles performed by each of Racing SA, the Racing Industry Advisory Council, and the Office for Racing. In any event, Racing SA would not duplicate the provision of advice to the Minister and to Government by the Office for Racing.

CHRISTIES BEACH HIGH SCHOOL

In reply to **Hon. T.J. STEPHENS** (17 July).

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

1. The Member is referred to the response given by the Minister for Education and Children's Services, to a similar question he raised on 12 May 2003.

2. I am aware there are a range of options for the long-term use of land at Christies Beach High School West Campus oval. The redevelopment of the land as a public park is certainly an option that I have discussed with the City of Onkaparinga, and within the Government.

ELECTRICITY SUPPLY, ERNABELLA

In reply to **Hon. T.J. STEPHENS** (4 June).

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

Monitoring of the Pukatja power supply has shown it to be reliable. The Department for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation (DAARE) has inquired with the Distribution Maintenance Contractor (ETSA Utilities) and the Pukatja Community Powerhouse Operator as to the number of outages of power that have occurred recently. DAARE was advised that there have been no recent power outages reported to ETSA Utilities by the Pukatja Community.

The Honourable Member needs to be aware that power outages are defined as those of a duration that are reportable to the Essential Services Commission under the Electricity Act 1996 and associated Regulations.

The powerhouse operator did advise that there was a shutdown of the powerhouse when he was absent from the community on business at approximately 2.00 a.m. on 14 May 2003, as a result of a severe thunder and lightning storm. Cavpower, the generator maintenance contractor, had officers at the community at the time. Upon waking at approximately 6.30 a.m., Cavpower employees discovered the power supply had been disrupted. The supply was restored to the community before 7.00 a.m.

As part of this electrical problem, the powerline to Yunyarinyi was discovered to have a fault, which also affected Umuwa. The powerhouse operator returned to the community later on 14 May and was able to restore the power to Umuwa, as well as isolate the homeland Single Wire Earth Return (SWER) line. Power was restored to Yunyarinyi on 15 May. The only other significant power interruption of which I am aware since the 14 May disturbance, was the 30-minute down time, which was the result of programmed routine maintenance at the powerhouse switchboard on 17 May. Power was restored upon completion of the maintenance work.

I am pleased to advise that, after a short production delay, the installation of the Pukatja inductive reactors has been completed. The contractor, ETSA Utilities, received the reactors at 9.00 a.m. on June 16, mobilised to the AP Lands the same day and completed the installation on 18 June.

Further, DAARE has been establishing standards with regard to the electrical engineering issues experienced by this type of generation and distribution system. A contract has been let to install protection equipment on the distribution systems at the communities of Pukatja, Amata, Kaltjiti (Fregon) and the Pukatja High Voltage Grid, which is 90 kilometres long. This will establish further voltage control and protection for consumers connected to these distribution systems.

The voltage issues at Pukatja are being monitored by DAARE with respect to both consumer electricity supplies and the functionality of water supplies. Breakdowns associated with essential services infrastructure obviously impact on small remote communities such as Pukatja, however, remedial action, generally undertaken within 24 hours, ensures adequate supply is maintained. Additionally, at the completion of the installation of the protection equipment, voltages of the bores will be assessed to ensure their compliance with voltage standards.

With respect to the commissioning of stage 1 of the Umuwa power generation contract, Stage 1 of the project is a 200-kilowatt Solar Farm. This is the first commercialisation of this technology and the State Government is proud to be supporting this initiative. The solar concentrators are currently being commissioned and the contract manager, Pitjantjatjara Council, has advised that commissioning should be completed before the end of July 2003.

In response to the Honourable Member's supplementary question regarding backup power, I advise that the Pukatja Power Station has no backup power supply, nor do any power stations in the AP communities managed by DAARE. Should individual consumers require a continuous power supply when outages or other minor disruptions inadvertently occur, they should make their own arrangements. The use of backup generators is part of usual business practice in many companies and is a commercial decision that rests with the consumer.

MINISTER FOR THE SOUTHERN SUBURBS

In reply to **Hon. T.J. STEPHENS** (15 May).

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: The Minister for the Southern Suburbs has advised:

I refer the Member to the Minister's Grievance Debate contribution on 30 April 2003, a copy of which is attached.

PORT STANVAC OIL REFINERY

In reply to **Hon. T.J. STEPHENS** (28 April).

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: The Minister for the Southern Suburbs has advised:

I refer the Member to the Minister's Grievance debate contribution on 30 April 2003, a copy of which is attached.

MINISTER FOR THE SOUTHERN SUBURBS

In reply to **Hon. T.J. STEPHENS** (14 May).

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: The Minister for the Southern Suburbs has advised:

The Member is referred to the Minister's Grievance Debate contribution on

30 April 2003 and the Southern Suburbs opening speech during Estimates on 23 June 2003. The cost of the trip was \$2 301.95.

WATER SUPPLY

In reply to **Hon. T.J. STEPHENS** (27 March).

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: The Minister for the River Murray has advised:

I refer the Member to the Ministerial Statement that was made in the House of Assembly in relation to Water Restrictions on 15 May 2003, a copy of which is attached.

SEXUAL OFFENCES

In reply to **Hon. NICK XENOPHON** (13 May).

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

Queensland, New South Wales, Victoria and Western Australia all have developed treatment programs, both in prisons and in the community, aimed at the rehabilitation of male sex offenders. Besides South Australia, Tasmania is the only other state currently without a prison-based sex offender program.

These programs are based on a considerable body of international research and well-established programs in the United Kingdom, United States, Canada and New Zealand. Furthermore, research supports the most appropriate and effective methods of treatment for sex offenders use group programs based on a cognitive—behavioural approach with a strong relapse prevention component.

Like many of their overseas counterparts, the Australian programs also are based on a cognitive-behavioural approach and content will focus on such topics as relapse prevention, victim empathy, social skills, relationships and consequences of offending amongst others.

It is my understanding that prison-based programs vary in length and intensity from a 60-hour low intensity program in Queensland, a 40 week medium intensity residential program in Long Bay Goal to Western Australia's 450 hour high intensity residential program.

There has been very little research on recidivism rates of Australian programs. However, overseas studies suggest that recidivism rates for treated groups is about 12 per cent and approximately 16 per cent for untreated groups of offenders.

Despite the difficulties in obtaining reliable recidivism data around sex offending programs in Australia, there is little doubt that this type of crime, against both adults and children, is a major social problem.

As identified in this year's budget, I am very pleased that this government has recognised the importance of this issue and has provided funding for the implementation of the first prison-based sex offender program in South Australia. The department will be looking very closely at evaluation data following the establishment of the program.

In reply to **Hon. IAN GILFILLAN**.

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: Sex offenders in the metropolitan area presently wait about two to four weeks to access the SOTAP program. However, in some regional areas, and Port Augusta in particular, the waiting time has been and is presently up to six to eight weeks.

SOTAP clinical staff have made a number of changes to reduce the wait time. It was longer (up to two months) for part of 2002. Changes have been made to the assessment procedures, which are currently being evaluated. The hope is that by streamlining this procedure, offenders will move into treatment more quickly.

At present, apart from streamlining the assessment procedure, there are no proposed changes to the Port Augusta service.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON A CODE OF CONDUCT FOR MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT

The Hon. J. GAZZOLA: I move:

That members of this council appointed to the joint committee have power to act on the joint committee during the present session.

Motion carried.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTERNET AND INTERACTIVE HOME GAMBLING AND GAMBLING BY OTHER MEANS OF TELECOMMUNICATION IN SOUTH AUSTRALIA

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY (Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries): I move:

That the select committee have power to sit during the present session, and that the time for bringing up the report be extended until Wednesday 3 December 2003.

Motion carried.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON PITJANTJATJARA LAND RIGHTS

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation): I move:

That the select committee have power to sit during the present session, and that the time for bringing up the report be extended until Wednesday 3 December 2003.

Motion carried.

**SELECT COMMITTEE ON STAFFING,
RESOURCING AND EFFICIENCY OF THE SOUTH
AUSTRALIA POLICE**

The Hon. R.K. SNEATH: I move:

That the select committee have power to sit during the present session, and that the time for bringing up the report be extended until Wednesday 3 December 2003.

Motion carried.

SESSIONAL COMMITTEES

Sessional committees were appointed as follows:

Standing Orders: The President and the Hons P. Holloway, R.D. Lawson, R.I. Lucas and Carmel Zollo.

Library: For this session not appointed.

Printing: The Hons G.E. Gago, J.M. Gazzola, J.M.A. Lensink, R.K. Sneath and T.J. Stephens.

Motion carried.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

The President having laid on the table a copy of His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor's opening speech, the Hon. P. Holloway moved:

That a committee consisting of the Hons P. Holloway, J.M.A. Lensink, A.J. Redford, R.K. Sneath and Carmel Zollo be appointed to prepare a draft address in reply to the speech delivered this day by His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor and to report on the next day of sitting.

Motion carried.

WOMEN'S PRISON

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: During question time I was asked a question in relation to advice. I would like to seek clarification of the words and give a fuller explanation tomorrow after I have seen *Hansard*. In answer to a question that was put to me in relation to a preferred site for the women's prison, I think the words I used were that I had not seen preferred positions proffered in relation to that siting. I have to report to the council that I have seen advice that put forward suggestions for a preferred site. I will refer to the *Hansard* tomorrow.

The Hon. A.J. Redford: I bet you they're not in the seats of Adelaide or Norwood!

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: I will refer to *Hansard* and bring back a fuller explanation to the council tomorrow.

ADJOURNMENT

At 5.57 p.m. the council adjourned until Tuesday 16 September at 2.15 p.m.