

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Monday 13 October 2003

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

BALI BOMBINGS

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

That on the first anniversary of the Bali bombings the Legislative Council expresses its sympathy to the families of those who lost loved ones and to those others still bravely confronting their injuries and memories; and, further, that the council calls on the leaders of nations in our region and throughout the world to work together to fight hatred and intolerance and work for a lasting peace.

This motion of condolence marks the first anniversary of the Bali bombings. This tragic event had an impact on the lives of all Australians. We have mourned the loss of so many lives, prayed for those who fought horrific injuries and rejoiced as survivors began the long road to recovery. Over the past 12 months we have witnessed the stories of immense suffering and astonishing courage.

On 12 October last year 202 people from 22 countries perished in Bali, and 88 Australians were among their number. This event, which caused the single greatest loss of Australian life in peace time, has become entrenched in the Australian psyche. It is an event that brought home to us all that we are not immune to such loss. With this terrible loss came stories of great heroism, of strangers reaching out to help the injured reach safety, of local people staying with the injured and dying in makeshift hospitals, and of medical staff fighting to save lives. These stories have stayed with us and have become a symbol of the best of humanity. As Paul Kelly wrote in *The Australian* of 8 October:

Bali has touched our soul and revealed our character. A year on many have gathered in Bali to remember. At the memorial service held in Bali yesterday, military chaplain Richard Thompson told those gathered: 'If we live as victims the terrorists have beaten us and we are in danger then of spending our future living in anger and frustration. Such a life lived in anger and frustration does not honour the memory of our loved ones.'

In remembering those who lost their lives, and the countless others who continue to suffer the horrific effects of this deadly attack, we are reminded of acts of courage and compassion and the deep instinct within us to reach out to others.

In the days immediately after the bombing last year, South Australian doctors, nurses, police, counsellors and other support workers gave their all. The Royal Adelaide Hospital sent three medical teams to Darwin on two chartered Lear jets. Dr Bill Griggs, Dr Peter Sharley, Dr John Greenwood and their teams immediately began treating the injured who were retrieved by the Royal Australian Air Force from Bali. The Queen Elizabeth Hospital set up a dedicated trauma counselling service under the supervision of Professor Sandy McFarlane, who is a world-renowned expert in post-traumatic stress disorder.

Members of the South Australia Police missing persons section were involved in making initial contact with families of missing persons, and 14 SAPOL members from various specialist areas were deployed to Bali to assist with the disaster victim identification process. These specialists often worked under difficult conditions and contributed significantly to the successful identification of 199 of the 202 victims.

These are just a few examples of the compassion and commitment shown by countless Australians in the days and months after the bombing.

Yesterday, more than a thousand people attended a memorial service in Victoria Square. This service, led by the Governor, gave South Australians the chance to remember the victims and survivors of the bombings in Bali. Our deepest condolences are extended to those who suffered personal loss. To the other 21 nations who lost citizens, we stand with them in their sorrow.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Leader of the Opposition): I rise on behalf of Liberal members to support the motion and the comments that have been made by the Leader of the Government in his contribution to the debate. I am sure that I speak on behalf of many in terms of their own personal reaction to the events in Bali on that Sunday when each of us became aware of the tragic circumstances of the evening before.

The added significance for Australians in relation to Bali was that all of us, particularly those who are parents or grandparents, probably either had a son, a daughter, a grandson or a grand-daughter, or a friend with a son, daughter, grandson or grand-daughter who has travelled to Bali in recent times and has enjoyed their vacation there. It is that significance that brought home to many of us the personal circumstances of those families, particularly in those early hours as they worried about their own relatives, or those of friends who were in Bali at that time.

Many of us might have been told by friends that they were travelling at about that time but we did not know exactly whether they were there at that particular time, or whether they had been fortunate enough to have just caught a plane out of Bali, or fortunate enough not to be going there that week. For many, obviously those early hours were very worrying but, ultimately, their personal worries were satisfactorily concluded, that is, the person whom they knew was not there. Of course, many others, as we have heard over the last 12 months, were not quite so lucky.

For that reason, Bali and the tragic events there have had great significance not only for South Australians but for all Australians. As we look back as a community on the events of recent years in America and in Bali, we have seen that the evils of terrorism can impact on us in what we may have previously seen as a safe haven in Australia, or on Australians travelling just beyond our shores.

We have seen how such events, about which others have spoken on other occasions, are, sadly, perhaps accepted as a more regular part of daily life in other parts of the world. From our viewpoint, the reality is that we do not always give them the significance that perhaps we should because they do not impact on young South Australians, or young Australians, as immediately as, for example, the Bali tragedy. However, it did bring home for many of us the fact that the evils of terrorism can and will cause trauma and tragedy worldwide as well as for those of us here in South Australia.

Much as we might wish it to be otherwise, it will mean major changes in the way in which we go about our lives. Now is not the time to talk about those changes, but I think that anyone whose family members have travelled in recent times will know that we are heading into a period—perhaps for ever—of much less freedom than we might otherwise previously have had and much tighter security arrangements in terms of travel than we would have previously accepted. Of course, there will be major changes in our way of life in

many other areas as a result of the recent events in Bali and America.

On behalf of Liberal members, much has been said to the family members of Josh Deegan, Angela Golotta and Bob Marshall in terms of our sympathy and condolences. Certainly words cannot do justice to what many of us feel in terms of our sorrow at their loss, and I do not intend to speak at length other than to record, on behalf of Liberal members, our support for those public expressions of sympathy and condolence that many others in the community have expressed collectively on behalf of the community.

The Hon. SANDRA KANCK: On 12 October last year, 88 Australians were killed in targeted terrorist bombings at nightclubs at Kuta in Bali. Deaths on that scale had not occurred to Australians since our involvement in the United States war against Vietnam, and it was something for which we as a nation were psychologically unprepared. It caused, and continues to cause, enormous pain and grief for the relatives and friends of those who were killed and for those who survived the blast.

We should recognise, too, that that pain and grief has not been confined just to Australians; many other nations were represented in Bali on that night. We should also recognise the Balinese people living in and around Kuta who lost not only family members but also their livelihood in the resultant tourism downturn.

As well as extending sympathy for those who have suffered and are still suffering, this motion invokes peace. Peace will not happen just by wishing for it. Whenever atrocities occur, we must look to see not only what occurred but also what could have been done to prevent it. Adelaide magistrate Brian Deegan, whose son Josh was killed in the blast, is quoted in the September *Adelaide Review* as follows:

These kids died and were maimed because they were Australians. John Howard created the climate that made them targets. ASIO was worried about terrorism, yet my son was never told of the dangers of travelling to Indonesia. The government should have alerted people, irrespective of whether the threat was specific or generalised.

Those who were killed or injured in the Bali bombings a year ago were victims who were unaware of international politics and their impending personal impact. For the xenophobes in our society, it has been easy to marginalise those who are different and blame Islam for the terrorism, but we must look for solutions and not scapegoats. There is nothing in Islam that would cause one to go to war any more than there is in Christianity. Indeed, Islam comes from the same root stock as Christianity.

For those of us with Christian heritage, we have more in common with Islam than we do with those practising Hinduism (the religion of the Balinese) or Buddhism. We must ask ourselves what we as a society or a nation have done—or failed to do—that has allowed the growth of the frustration, anger and misguided judgment that has, in turn, led to such terrorism—what injustices, what inequalities and what prejudices have we perpetrated or ignored? We must ask these questions, and we must honestly answer them if we are, as this motion calls on our national leaders to do, to curb hatred and intolerance and work for a lasting peace.

The Democrats wish fervently for spiritual and emotional peace and closure for those who are still suffering—Australians, Balinese and those from other countries. We acknowledge their suffering and their ongoing courage. This was a terrible tragedy. To honour those who have suffered, we must all actively work for that wider peace that the Kuta

bombings have shown is vitally necessary in world affairs to ensure that tragedies such as this are not created again.

The Hon. NICK XENOPHON: I join my parliamentary colleagues in supporting this motion to express again my sympathy for the families who have lost loved ones as a result of this senseless act of terrorism; to commend the courage of the survivors and all those who have assisted them; and to reflect on the very best that this terrible act has brought out in our community and, indeed, in Indonesia. Both the Prime Minister and opposition leader, who attended yesterday's commemoration in Bali, did us proud in reflecting community opinion, but I would like to read into *Hansard* the words of the Indonesian Security Minister, Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono, who spoke on behalf of the Indonesian government, because in his words he gave a rousing call for reconciliation for all 22 nations that lost citizens on 12 October last year, and his plea for both tolerance and determination deserves to be repeated. The minister said:

They were our sons and daughters, our fathers and mothers, our brothers and sisters, our cousins, our best friends and our soulmates. And they were all innocents. They all had happy plans to spend tomorrow under the sun and had families to write and come home to. To this day, we still do not understand why these loved ones had to meet such a tragic undeserved fate. But there is a time to let go and move on. We let go knowing that our loved ones are in special places by God's side. We let go knowing that we will miss them forever. We will honour their memory by becoming a better person, by cherishing life even more, by always promoting goodness over evil, and we shall ensure that the noble values the terrorists aim to destroy remain with us forever—peace, tolerance, diversity, companionship, fraternity and humanity.

I support the motion.

The Hon. A.L. EVANS: I support the motion. It is very difficult to put into words how I feel at the loss of life in Bali as a result of men driven by religious extremism to commit evil. All religious extremism must be condemned as it is based on fanatical acts, mostly based on a lie. I have wondered what I can do to help, because of feeling inadequate but, as a Christian, I do believe in the power of prayer and, if I can do something perhaps unusual today, I offer a prayer for the relatives of the living, the victims, the western world (that they might have wisdom in dealing with it) and, lastly, the terrorists. So, here is my prayer.

Heavenly father, we come to you at this sober time in our history and we bring before you the victims and the relatives who have lost family and children and loved ones, and we ask you for divine strength and help for them. We pray for those who are wounded and suffering, that you will give them the grace to carry on. We pray for the governments of the western nations, that they might find other ways to resolve this crisis in the world than force. Last of all, we pray for the terrorists themselves, for the Bible says we should pray for our enemies. And we ask, father, that you speak to their hearts and change them, that they might see the evil of their ways. In Jesus' name, amen.

The Hon. KATE REYNOLDS: I support the motion. I wish also to acknowledge on behalf of the Australian Democrats the loss of Endang Samaki, the wife of Ibrihim Samaki, an Iranian asylum seeker detained at Baxter Immigration Detention Centre with their two children, Sabda (aged seven) and Sara (aged four). We express our appreciation that Mr Samaki was able to attend the private memorial service held yesterday but regret that Mr Samaki and his children still have no idea if, when or how they will be

reunited so that they can together grieve for their mother and wife. I also pay tribute on behalf of the Democrats to the special efforts made by South Australian magistrate Brian Deegan to open the eyes and hearts of the Australian people to the plight of all children who lost a parent or were orphaned as a direct consequence of the Bali tragedy.

Motion carried by members standing in their places in silence.

CASEY, Hon. T.M., DEATH

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

That the Legislative Council expresses its deep regret at the recent death of the Hon. Thomas Mannix Casey, former member of the House of Assembly and the Legislative Council and former minister of the crown, and places on record its appreciation of his distinguished public service.

The Hon. Thomas Casey was born in Quorn in 1921 and lived in what was then the seat of Frome for most of his life. He joined the Labor Party when he joined the Australian Workers Union in 1939 as a shearing shed hand. Tom Casey served nearly 20 years in this parliament: 10 years in the House of Assembly and then 9½ years in the Legislative Council. He was first elected as the member for Frome in a by-election in November 1960 after the death of Mick O'Halloran, the long-serving Labor opposition leader. He went on to win the seat three times before moving to the Legislative Council in 1970 where he represented Central District No. 1.

He played football for North Adelaide and before that was a prominent country cricketer, track and field athlete, and swimmer. He enlisted in Peterborough and was a lieutenant in the 2nd/41st Australian Infantry Battalion during World War II. He was discharged in April 1946 and was a grazier in Peterborough before entering parliament. In his maiden speech, Tom told the house that his constant attention would be given to his duties both in the interest of the people of Frome and the Labor movement. He described himself as a 'man of the land' and was always concerned with causes important to his regional community. In fact, he showed significant foresight in speaking of the need for valuing and promoting unique aspects of his region, noting that the Flinders Ranges could become South Australia's major scenic tourist attraction.

Tom was very much country Labor. Like his father, he was a grazier and his political base was the Peterborough hotel, which was owned by the family. He was first elected to the ministry in 1968 by then premier Don Dunstan. During his parliamentary career, he held the portfolios of agriculture, forests, lands, irrigation, repatriation, tourism and recreation and sport. He was a hardworking minister who counted among his close friends the Hon. Don Banfield, former minister for health and former leader of the government in the Legislative Council. Don remembers Tom as a conscientious minister and a loyal friend. After his retirement, Tom regularly attended monthly luncheons with other retired members, keeping in close contact.

As minister for agriculture, Tom forged important links overseas and he brought an important rural and regional perspective to the Dunstan cabinet. Tom initiated South Australia's hay export business to Japan. After visiting Japan to look at beef production, he came back to Australia convinced that there was a major market for South Australian oaten hay. Tom also fostered the export of South Australia's

dryland farming techniques to the Middle East. He was the first minister for agriculture to visit the Middle East and, being an excellent ambassador, laid the foundations for this trade. The 1970s were an important time for agriculture in South Australia, and under Tom's leadership the then department for agriculture became known both nationally and internationally for its research. Tom was instrumental in reforming both the margarine and orange industries and was also responsible for reforming the Gepps Cross abattoirs.

Senior officers of the department of agriculture remember Tom Casey as a very approachable man who was committed to promoting markets for our agricultural products. Tom Casey retired from parliament in 1979. On behalf of the government, I extend my deepest sympathies to his wife Margaret, his children and grandchildren.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Leader of the Opposition): On behalf of the Liberal members I rise to support the condolence motion. As the leader has indicated, Tom Casey had a very interesting history in representing both the lower house in the electorate of Frome and the upper house in the district of Central. It is interesting to go back to see how times have changed in South Australia since the original *Advertiser* summaries of the candidates when they first stood for election in 1960 and Tom Casey was the Labor candidate. In recent times the electorate of Eyre took on much of the area of the old electorate of Frome, which was then the largest electorate in South Australia. In *The Advertiser* Frome was described as extending to the borders of the Northern Territory, Queensland and New South Wales in the far north-west of the state, and including such key country industrial centres as Radium Hill, Leigh Creek and Peterborough. It has certainly been some time since Radium Hill was a key industrial centre. That gives a fair indication of how South Australia has changed since Tom Casey's first election in 1960 and during his time in parliament.

I think—and perhaps the Clerk would know—that Tom Casey's time in the Legislative Council probably coincided with a period when there was a significant minority of Labor members in the Legislative Council. I know that at one stage it was 15 to 4, which was a very comfortable margin, and there was a suspicion that the LCL as it was then might have run dead in one province to make sure it was not too embarrassing a margin. Whether or not that is true I do not know, but certainly Labor members were in a very significant minority. In those early Labor days, with four members of the government comprising three ministers and one backbencher, who I presume was the Whip and the whole back bench, the back bench duty rosters were probably a little more difficult to organise. The whips may well smile; organising some ministers to be there might have been difficult for the whips, I suspect. Perhaps their sitting times were not quite as onerous as they are these days.

I knew Tom Casey a little during his period in parliament, but I had the pleasure of getting to know him a little better upon his retirement in recent years, because his grandsons were at school with my boys at Rostrevor. So, at the inevitable fundraising functions, fairs and barbecues that schools involve themselves in these days, I got to know Tom Casey's family much better than I had during his period in the parliament. As the Hon. Paul Holloway has indicated, he was certainly very good company outside the parliament. He enjoyed a quiet drink and certainly was very good company at those fundraisers and functions that we attended jointly. He was certainly very proud not only of his children but also of

the next generation of boys as they came through with their talents in sport.

As the Hon. Paul Holloway indicated, he was a minister for sport and a sportsman in his own right prior to entering parliament, and he continued to follow sporting pursuits with great interest. Before concluding and offering my condolences to the family, I must say that, knowing Tom's daughter Marie Casey—or Marie Saturno as she is now, having married into the Saturno family—very well, I will certainly be treating her with newfound respect when next I see her.

One of *The Advertiser* articles has a photo of Tom Casey being presented with an honorary black belt in tae kwon do as a result of his two daughters, Marie and Bernadette, having also taken up instruction in the sport. I put on the record that I always knew Marie was a formidable woman, but I had not realised her hidden talents in the area of tae kwon do. On behalf of Liberal members I join with the leader in acknowledging the contribution that Tom Casey made to the South Australian community, to the Labor Party and to the parliament and offer our condolences to his family and friends.

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

The PRESIDENT: I direct that written answers to the following questions be distributed and printed in *Hansard*: Nos 235 to 248 of the last session and No. 1 of this session.

CHIEF EXECUTIVES, ADMINISTRATIVE UNITS

235-248 (second session). **The Hon. A.J. REDFORD** asked all ministers:

1. (a) What are the names of the chief executives of all administrative units (within the meaning of section 3 of the Public Sector Management Act 1995) for which the Ministers are responsible; and
 - (b) In respect of each such chief executive:
 - (i) What is the date of commencement of the appointment and the term thereof?
 - (ii) What are the performance standards set by the minister?
 - (iii) What is the remuneration and other benefits?
 - (iv) What are the sums representing the values of the benefits (other than remuneration) and details of the benefits?
 - (v) What is the total remuneration package value for the position?
2. What are the names and positions of any person appointed as an executive of any administrative unit referred to in Part 1 above (within the meaning of section 33 of the said Act) and in respect of each such executive:
 - (a) What is the date of commencement of the appointment and the term thereof?
 - (b) What are the performance standards set by the minister?
 - (c) What is the remuneration and other benefits?
 - (d) What are the sums representing the values of the benefits (other than remuneration) and details of the benefits?
 - (e) What is the total remuneration package value for the position?
3. (a) What are the names and positions of any person appointed to a position, other than an executive position, (within the meaning of section 39 of the said act)?
 - (b) What is the date of their commencement?
 - (c) What is the term of such an appointment?

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: The Premier has provided the following information on behalf of the government as per the attached tables.

Part 1

Chief Executives appointed pursuant to Public Sector Management Act, 1995, as at 30 April 2003

Agency	Name	TRPV*	Contract start	Contract end
Premier and Cabinet	Warren McCann	\$292,172	16/10/2000	15/10/2005
Administrative and Information Services	Graham Foreman	\$250,207	23/10/2002	22/10/2007
Education and Children's Services	Steven Marshall	\$261,620	14/10/2002	13/10/2007
Further Education, Employment, Science and Technology	Greg Black	\$252,350	16/09/2002	15/09/2007
Environment & Heritage	Allan Holmes	\$222,931	31/07/2000	30/07/2005
Human Services	Jim Birch	\$261,620	18/03/2002	17/03/2007
Business, Manufacturing and Trade	Kevin O'Callaghan (acting)	\$225,000	5/05/2003	5/08/2005
Justice	Kate Lennon	\$261,581	1/04/1999	31/03/2004
Primary Industries & Resources	Jim Hallion	\$250,207	22/03/2002	21/03/2007
Treasury & Finance	Jim Wright	\$284,326	27/09/1999	26/09/2004
Water, Land and Biodiversity Conservation	Robert Freeman	\$240,000	30/09/2002	29/08/2007
Transport, Urban Planning	Tim O'Loughlin	\$248,887	3/10/2000	2/10/2005

*Total remuneration package value

Should further information be required in relation to the employment arrangements of the listed personnel, then a viewing of the individual contracts may be requested in accordance with the Government's Contract Disclosure policy.

Part 2

Executives appointed pursuant to Public Sector Management Act, 1995, as at 30 April 2003

Auditor General's Department

Salutation	Surname	First Name	Class	T/U	Title
Mr	Bianco	Salvatore	ExB	T	Director of Audits (Field Operations)
Mr	Marsh	Simon	ExB	T	Director of Audits (Field Operations)

Part 2
Executives appointed pursuant to Public Sector Management Act, 1995, as at 30 April 2003
Auditor General's Department

Salutation	Surname	First Name	Class	T/U	Title
Mr	McGlen	Ian	ExB	T	Director of Audits (Policy Planning and Research)
Mr	O'Neill	Simon	ExB	T	Deputy Auditor General (Field Operations)
Mr	Richardson	Andrew	ExB	T	Director of Audits (Field Operations)
Mr	Tate	William	ExB	T	Director of Audits (Field Operations)

NB—'T/U' represents Tenured/Untenured status

Courts Administration Authority

Salutation	Surname	First Name	Class	T/U	Title
Mr	Lindsay	Robert	ExA	T	Director of Magistrates Court

Department for Administrative and Information Services

Salutation	Surname	First Name	Class	T/U	Title
Mr	Allen	Michael	ExA	T	Project Director, SAMIS
Ms	Allison	Angela	ExA	T	General Manager, Strategic and Financial Services
Mr	Battams	Wes	ExA	U	Director, SA Sports Institute
Ms	Brooks	Beverly	ExB	T	Director, Land Services
Mr	Buckskin	Peter	ExC	U	Chief Executive, Department of State Aboriginal Affairs
Ms	Carr	Judith	ExA	T	Project Director
Ms	Casey	Gail	ExA	T	Director, Fleet SA
Mr	Cauchi	Anthony	ExA	T	Director, Building Maintenance Services
Ms	Chee	Chai	ExA	T	Director, Policy and Business Planning
Mr	Cunningham	Alan	ExB	U	Project Director
Mr	Di Lernia	Lino	ExB	U	Project Director
Ms	Ferguson	Jan	ExB	T	Director, Policy Development
Mr	Fowler	Peter	ExC	U	Director, Government Radio Network Contracts
Mr	Gehling	Andrew	ExA	T	Director, Building Asset Services
Mr	Griffin	Barry	ExB	T	Director, Real Estate Management
Mr	Grillo	Mike	ExC	T	Executive Director, Government ICS
Dr	Hamdorf	Phil	ExC	T	Executive Director, Office for Recreation and Sport
Mr	Hanson	Phillip	ExA	T	Director, E-Government Infrastructure
Mr	Harvey	Denis	ExA	T	Director, Office for Racing
Mr	Hook	Rodney	ExB	U	Director, Major Projects Group
Ms	Hughes	Jennifer	ExA	U	Director, Policy and Special Projects
Dr	Kobus	Hilton	ExB	T	Director, Forensic Science
Ms	Marsland	Mary	ExC	T	Director, Building Management
Mr	McGuire	James	ExB	U	Director, Contract Services
Mr	McRostie	Trevor	ExB	T	Director, Workplace Relations Policy
Mr	Miller	Barry	ExD	T	Executive Director, State Procurement and Business Development
Mr	Mills	Andrew	ExB	U	Project Director
Mr	Morris	Bret	ExA	T	General Manager, Information Services
Mr	Parker	Gregory	ExA	T	Director, Service South Australia
Mr	Patterson	Ken	ExA	U	Project Director
Ms	Patterson	Michele	ExC	U	Director, Workplace Services
Mr	Ryan	Terry	ExA	T	Director, State Records
Mr	Steele	Wayne	ExA	T	Director, Industrial and Commercial Property Development
Ms	Vincenzi	Lee-ann	ExA	T	Director Policy and Business Reform

Department of Attorney General's					
Salutation	Surname	First Name	Class	T/U	Title
Ms	Abraham	Wendy	MLS3	T	Associate Director, Office of the Director of Public Prosecutions
Ms	Barnett	Pauline	MLS2	T	Manager, Legal Services (Solicitor), Office of the Director of Public Prosecutions
Mr	Bermingham	Paul	MLS2	T	Assistant Crown Solicitor, Commercial & Finance Section, Crown Solicitor's Office
Ms	Bernardi	Maria	MLS1	T	Director, Prudential Management
Mr	Bodycoat	Mark	ExC	U	Commissioner for Consumer Affairs and Commissioner for Corporate Affairs
Mr	Brebner	Peter	MLS1	T	Senior Managing Solicitor (Senior Prosecutor) Office of the Director of Public Prosecutions
Mr	Briggs	Spencer	ExB	T	Director, Justice Technology Services
Mr	Brook	Rodney	ExA	T	General Manager, Client Service Delivery, Public Trustee Office
Ms	Burgess	Anne	ExA	T	Deputy Commissioner, Equal Opportunity
Ms	Chartres	Dianne	ExB	T	Director, Strategic Development and Communications
Ms	Contala	Debra	ExA	T	General Manager, Strategic Contracts, Strategic Contracts and Business Management Unit
Mr	Cox	Gregory	MLS1	T	Senior Managing Solicitor (Competition), Crown Solicitor's Office
Ms	Davison	Geraldine	MLS2	T	Managing Prosecutor
Ms	de Leo	Joy	ExA	T	Executive Director, Division of Multicultural Affairs
Ms	Denley	Louise	ExA	T	Director, Justice Strategy Unit
Mr	Dennis	Richard	MLS2	T	Senior Assistant Parliamentary Counsel, Parliamentary Counsel's Office
Ms	Eldridge	Penelope	MLS1	U	Managing Solicitor, Outposted Legal Unit - DETE, Crown Solicitor's Office
Mr	Evans	Terence	SPEC	U	Chief Commercial Counsel
Mr	Eyre	John	MLS3	T	Deputy Parliamentary Counsel
Mr	Fahey	John	MLS1	U	Managing Solicitor, Commercial and Property Section, Crown Solicitor's Office
Mr	Forrest	Simon	ExC	T	Director, Justice Business Reform
Ms	Foster	Anne	MLS1	U	Managing Solicitor, Business and Competition, Crown Solicitor's Office
Mr	Fuller	Robert	MLS1	T	Managing Solicitor, Chief Counsel's Office
Mr	Fuss	Robert	ExA	T	Deputy Ombudsman
Mr	Goode	Matthew	MLS1	T	Senior Managing Solicitor, Policy & Legislation
Ms	Grant	Lena	MLS1	T	Managing Solicitor (Business), Crown Solicitor's Office
Ms	Gray	Dianne	MLS1	T	Managing Solicitor, Policy and Legislation
Mr	Hackett-Jones	Geoffrey	MLS4	U	Parliamentary Counsel
Mr	Hall	Peter	MLS1	U	Managing Solicitor, Native Title Section, CSO
Mr	Hanson	Mark	ExA	U	CAD Project Manager, Strategic Business & Contract Management, Justice Portfolio Services
Ms	Hart	Jennifer	MLS2	U	Assistant Crown Solicitor, Native Title Section, Crown Solicitor's Office
Mr	Hassam	Darryl	ExA	T	Deputy Commissioner, Gaming
Mr	Hocking	John	MLS2	U	Assistant Crown Solicitor
Ms	Hughes	Judith	MLS1	T	Deputy Commissioner, Policy & Legal, Office of Consumer and Business Affairs
Mr	Illingworth	Brenton	MLS1	T	Managing Solicitor, Crown Solicitor's Office
Mr	Jackson	Philip	MLS2	T	Assistant Crown Solicitor, Business and Competition
Mr	Johns	Mark	MLS2	T	Assistant Crown Solicitor
Mr	Kelly	Kym	MLS4	T	Chief Counsel
Mr	Layton	Ronald	EL1	T	Executive Liaison Officer

Department of Attorney General's

Salutation	Surname	First Name	Class	T/U	Title
Mr	Lewis	Warren	ExA	T	Deputy Liquor and Gaming Commissioner
Mr	Lines	Wayne	MLS1	T	Managing Solicitor, Civil Litigation
Mr	Maguire	Jerome	ExB	T	Director, Business and Contract Management, Justice Portfolio Services
Mr	Manetta	Nicholas	MLS1	T	Managing Solicitor, Environment, Crown Solicitor's Office
Ms	Martindale	Virginia	MLS2	T	Managing Counsel, SAICORP Legal Unit, Crown Solicitor's Office
Mr	Matcham	Raymond	MLS3	U	Deputy Crown Solicitor
Ms	Miller	Susan	ExB	T	Director, Human Resources
Mr	Mills	Michael	MLS2	U	Assistant Crown Solicitor, Civil Litigation Section, Crown Solicitor's Office
Mr	Millstead	Steven	MLS3	'	Crown Counsel, DPP Office
Mr	Muscat	Paul	MLS1	U	Senior Solicitor, Office of the Director of Public Prosecutions
Ms	Norman	Ingrid	MLS1	T	Managing Solicitor, Outposted
Ms	O'Loughlin	Catherine	ExC	U	Public Trustee
Ms	Olsson	Jennifer	MLS1	T	Managing Solicitor, Crown Solicitor's Office
Mr	O'Neill	Desmond	ExA	T	General Manager Corporate Services, Public Trustee Office
Mr	Owen	Lyndon	MLS1-P	'	Manager, Legal Services
Ms	Panagiotidis	Maria	MLS1	T	Managing Solicitor, Outposted Lawyer Program
Mr	Parker	Greg	MLS1	T	Managing Solicitor, Advising Section
Mr	Pearce	James	MLS1	U	Senior Prosecutor, Office of the Director of Public Prosecutions
Mr	Penniford	Christopher	ExB	T	Director, Strategic & Financial Services, Justice Portfolio Services
Mr	Pryor	William	ExC	T	Liquor and Gambling Commissioner
Mr	Secker	Andrew	ExC	T	Principal Negotiator, Indigenous Land Use Agreement
Ms	Selth	Julie	MLS2	T	Director, Policy and Legislation
Mr	Snopek	Peter	MLS1	T	Senior Managing Solicitor (Senior Prosecutor) Office of the Director of Public Prosecutions
Mr	Squires	Rodney	ExA	T	Executive Liaison Officer, Justice Strategy Unit
Ms	Stein	Laura	MLS1	U	Managing Solicitor, Civil Litigation, Crown Solicitor's Office
Mr	Stevens	Mark	MLS2	T	Assistant Crown Solicitor
Ms	Swift	Christine	MLS2	T	Senior Assistant Parliamentary Counsel, Parliamentary Counsel's Office
Mr	Tonkin	Peter	MLS1	U	Managing Solicitor, Native Title Section, Crown Solicitor's Office
Mr	Walter	Michael	MLS4	T	Crown Solicitor
Mr	Wang	Kenneth	ExA	T	Chief Investment Officer, Public Trustee Office
Mr	Watts	David	MLS1	T	Managing Solicitor, Crown Solicitor's Office
Mr	Williams	Brendan	ExB	U	Chief Information Officer, Information and Knowledge Management, Justice Portfolio Services

Department of Business Manufacturing and Trade

Salutation	Surname	First Name	Class	T/U	Title
Mr	Arthur-Worsop	Murray	ExA	U	Principal Policy Manager
Ms	Bensted	Elaine	ExB	U	Director, Corporate Services
Ms	Bierbaum	Christine	ExC	T	Executive Director, Infrastructure
Mr	Byass	Leon	ExB	T	Investment Director
Mr	Frogley	John	ExC	T	Executive Director, Commercial & Prudential Services
Mr	Hartley	Roger	ExC	T	Executive Director, International SA & Director, Partners in Rail (and A/Chief Executive)
Mr	Krasowski	Michael	ExA	T	Manager Business and Financial Services
Mr	Litchfield	David	ExA	T	Project Director, Resources

Department of Business Manufacturing and Trade

Salutation	Surname	First Name	Class	T/U	Title
Ms	Lowe	Jan	EL1	'	Deputy Director, Office of Regional Development
Mr	Mastrangelo	Guiseppe	ExA	T	General Manager, Industrial Supplies Office
Mr	Mitchell	David	ExB	T	Deputy Chief Executive, Invest SA
Mr	O'Callaghan	Kevin	ExB	T	Deputy Executive Director, Centre for Innovation Business and Manufacturing
Mr	Piro	Len	ExA	T	General Manager, Regional Business Services
Mr	Price	William	ExB	U	Commercial Director
Mr	Scott	Andrew	ExC	T	Executive Director, Strategy Policy and Communication
Mr	Stock	John	ExB	T	Executive Consultant, Asian Gateway
Mr	Tyler	Phil	ExB	T	Executive Director, Office of Regional Affairs
Ms	Walford	Donny	ExC	U	Executive Director, Office of Economic Development
Mr	Ward	Steven	ExA	T	Principal Project Manager, Infrastructure SA
Mr	Whittenbury	David	ExA	U	General Manager, Business Services

Department of Correctional Services

Salutation	Surname	First Name	Class	T/U	Title
Mr	Barton	Ian	ExA	U	Director, Human Resources
Ms	Bordoni	Maria	ExA	T	General Manager, Yatala Labour Prison
Ms	Les	Eva	ExB	T	Director, Custodial Services
Mr	Martin	Alan	ExA	T	Manager, Financial and Physical Resources
Mr	Powell	Lange	ExA	T	Director, Community Corrections
Mr	Weir	Gregory	ExB	T	Director, Strategic Services

Department of Education and Children's Services

Salutation	Surname	First Name	Class	T/U	Title
Mr	Bos	Rene	ExB	T	Director, Finance
Ms	Bruce	Wendy	ExB	T	Director, Metropolitan Schools
Ms	Byrnes	Kathryn	ExA	T	Assistant Director, Strategy and Innovation
Ms	Daley	Miriam	ExA	T	Assistant Director Training and Development
Ms	Day	Judith	ExB	T	Director, Country Schools and Children's Services
Mr	DeGennaro	Luigi	ExD	T	Executive Director, Business Improvement and Strategic Financial Management
Dr	Dolman	Barry	ExA	U	Assistant Director, Planning and Information
Ms	Evans	Margery	ExC	U	Executive Director, Strategic Human Resource Management and Organisational Development
Mr	Fletcher	Trevor	ExD	U	Executive Director Schools and Children's Services
Mr	Kilvert	Paul	ExB	T	Director, Learning Assets and Services
Ms	Kolbe	Helga	ExD	U	Executive Director, Strategy
Mr	Lake	Ronald	ExB	U	Director, Australian Science and Mathematics School
Ms	Lamont	Karen	ExA	T	Assistant Director, Information, Licensing and Standards
Mr	Lewkowicz	George	EL2	T	Director, Capital Works Management
Mr	Lugg	Julian	ExA	T	Director, Health and Safety Services
Mr	Malcolm	Peter	ExB	T	Director, Technology and Knowledge Management Services
Mr	McClure	Sandy	ExB	T	Director, International Education
Ms	Monks	Susan	ExA	T	Assistant Director, Special Services
Ms	Page	Stephanie	ExB	T	Executive Director, Student and Professional Services
Mr	Rathman	David	ExC	T	Executive Director, Aboriginal Education and Employment Strategies
Ms	Riedstra	Julieann	ExB	T	Director, Infrastructure

Department of Education and Children's Services

Salutation	Surname	First Name	Class	T/U	Title
Dr	Salagaras	Stanley	ExA	T	Manager, Educational Development Projects
Mr	Shakes	Christopher	ExA	U	Assistant Director, Children's Services
Ms	Sleath	Marilyn	EL2	T	Member Functional Review Team
Ms	Stehn	Jennifer	ExC	T	Executive Director, Curriculum
Mr	Travers	David	ExA	U	Chief Administrative Manager Director Executive Support
Mr	Treadwell	Ross	ExA	T	Assistant Director, School/Preschool Technologies
Ms	Wildash	Helen	ExA	T	Assistant Director, Curriculum
Ms	Winter	Patricia	ExA	T	Assistant Director, Disability and Professional Services
Dr	Witham	Mark	ExB	T	Director, Resource Allocation

Department of Environment and Heritage

Salutation	Surname	First Name	Class	T/U	Title
Mr	Alexander	Peter	ExA	T	Assistant Director, Operations, National Parks and Wildlife SA
Ms	Ball	Susan	ExA	T	Project Director, Accelerated Freeholding Project
Mr	Barrett	John	ExB	T	Director, Business Development
Mr	Barrington	David	ExA	T	Regional Manager, Adelaide, National Parks and Wildlife SA
Mr	Best	Lindsay	ExB	T	Deputy Director, National Parks and Wildlife SA
Ms	Burch	Leanne	ExB	T	Director, Environment Policy
Mr	Croft	Peter	ExB	T	Director, Corporate Information and Director, Crown Lands
Mr	Fletcher	Robert	ExA	T	Executive Adviser
Mr	Forbes	Stephen	ExB	U	Director, Botanic Gardens
Mr	Gardner	Peter	ExB	U	Director, Environmental and Geographic Information
Mr	Haegi	Laurence	ExA	T	Assistant Director Biodiversity, National Parks and Wildlife SA
Ms	Harvey	Anne	ExC	T	Executive Director, Office of Sustainability and Deputy Chief Executive
Mr	Janssan	Rick	ExA	T	Director, Corporate Finance
Mr	Leaman	Edward	ExC	U	Director National Parks and Wildlife South Australia
Ms	Martin	Merridie	ExA	T	Director, Office of the Chief Executive

Department of Further Education, Employment, Science and Technology

Salutation	Surname	First Name	Class	T/U	Title
Mr	Allan	Garry	ExB	T	Director, Policy
Ms	Anderson	Carolyn	ExA	T	Senior Policy Advisor
Mr	Butler	Paul	ExA	U	Executive Officer, Employment Council
Ms	Doolette	Ann	ExA	T	Assistant Director, VET Quality Branch
Mr	Dymock	Darryl	ExB	U	Deputy Director, Centre for Lifelong Learning and Development
Ms	Gilding	Nicole	ExA	T	Principal Project Officer
Ms	Harrison	Christine	ExB	T	Director, VET Strategy and Coordination
Mr	Hutchinson	Louis	ExA	T	Assistant Director, VET Contract Management
Mr	Jaksa	Gabriele	ExA	T	Senior Policy Advisor, IEPO
Ms	Jeremic	Sally	ExA	T	Executive Officer, Skills for the Future Ministerial Inquiry
Mr	Kinnear	Lachlan	ExA	T	Principal Advisor
Mr	Markwick-Smith	Patrick	ExB	U	Chief Executive, Education Adelaide
Mr	Nagel	John	EL1	'	Director, Analysis & Planning
Mr	Nayda	Leslie	ExA	T	Director, Aboriginal State Wide Initiatives
Ms	Nicoll	Valmai	ExA	T	General Manager, TAFEBIZ SA
Mr	Procter	Ian	ExD	T	Deputy Chief Executive

Department of Further Education, Employment, Science and Technology

Salutation	Surname	First Name	Class	T/U	Title
Mr	Ralph	Denis	ExF	T	Director, SA Centre for Lifelong Learning and Development
Ms	Raupach	Elizabeth	ExA	T	Chief Executive, Helpmann Academy
Ms	Schaefer	Katherine	ExB	U	Director, Operations, Office of Employment and Youth
Ms	Taylor	Jennifer	ExC	T	Executive Director, Office of Employment
Mr	Tizard	James	ExA	T	Senior Policy Advisor
Dr	Wood	Geoffrey	ExC	T	Executive Director, Vocational Education & Training
Ms	Melrose	Anne	ExA	T	Consultant, Urban Regeneration Project
Ms	Swieckicka	Ewa	ExA	T	Assistant Director, Business Review

Department of Human Services

Salutation	Surname	First Name	Class	T/U	Title
Mr	Atkinson	Andrew	ExA	U	Director, Real Estate Services, SA Housing Trust
Mr	Beltchev	George	ExB	T	Director, Community Development & Primary Care , Metropolitan Division
Mr	Bishop	Rodney	ExC	T	Director, Corporate Services, Corporate Resources Division
Mr	Buckett	Kevin	ExC	U	Director, Environmental Health, Strategic Planning & Population Health Division
Mr	Bull	Peter	ExA	U	Director Finance, South Australian Housing Trust
Mr	Caudrey	David	ExA	U	Director Disability Services, Social Justice and Country Division
Dr	Chapman	Peter	ExB	U	Director, Epidemiology, Strategic Planning & Population Health Division
Ms	Crearie	Mary	ExB	T	Director, Regional Services, Metropolitan, SA Housing Trust
Mr	Dixon	Brian	ExC	T	Executive Director, Aboriginal Services Division
Mr	Downie	Malcolm	ExD	U	General Manager, SA Housing Trust
Ms	Durrington	Leanne	ExB	U	Director, Service Planning, Social Justice and Country Division
Mr	Evans	Keith	ExB	U	Director, Drug Programs, Metropolitan
Mr	Exton	Derek	ExA	T	Manager, Projects, Asset Services, Corporate Resources Division
Mr	Fagan-Schmidt	Philip	ExB	T	Director, Policy, Strategic Planning and Population Health Division
Mr	Filby	David	ExD	U	Executive Director, Strategic Planning and Population Health Division
Ms	Fulcher	Helen	ExB	T	Director, Maintenance, SA Housing Trust
Ms	Gale	Annette	ExB	T	Director, Regional Services Country, SA Housing Trust
Mr	Gerrie	Doug	ExA	U	Manager, Risk Management, Corporate Services, Corporate Services Division
Mr	Halkett	Ian	ExA	T	Director, Information Systems, IMS Corporate Resources Division
Ms	Hlipala	Elizabeth	ExA	T	Manager, Workforce Strategy
Mr	Jackson	Peter	ExC	U	Director, Asset Services, Corporate Resources
Mr	Larkin	Christopher	ExB	U	General Manager, Aboriginal Housing Authority
Mr	Leggett	Mark	ExB	T	Director, Strategic Procurement, Corporate Resources Division
Ms	Martin	Kae	ExB	T	Director, Acute Care and Clinical Services, Metropolitan Division
Mr	McGowan	Chris	ExB	U	Director, Service Development, Metropolitan Division
Mr	Melino	Michele	ExA	T	Manager, Metropolitan Division
Mr	Michael	Robin	ExD	U	Executive Director, Corporate Resources Division
Ms	Miller	Sandra	ExA	T	Director, Strategic Planning & Policy, Aboriginal Services Division
Mr	Mleczko	John	ExA	T	Director, Hospital Systems, IMS, Corporate Resources Division
Mr	Moran	Brendon	ExA	T	General Manager, South Australian Community Housing Authority
Ms	Nowak	Zofia	ExA	T	Director, Intergovernmental Relations, Strategic Planning and Population Health Division
Mr	Ogden	Paul	ExB	T	Director, Capital Projects, SA Housing Trust

Department of Human Services

Salutation	Surname	First Name	Class	T/U	Title
Ms	O'Loughlin	Carmel	ExA	U	Director, Office for the Status of Women
Mr	Overland	Christopher	ExB	T	Director, Ageing and Community Care, Metropolitan Division
Ms	Paull	Jillian	ExA	T	Regional Director, Northern Metropolitan Region, Family and Youth Services
Ms	Penna	Nancy	ExA	U	Regional Director, Southern Metropolitan Region, Family and Youth Services
Ms	Poole	Lyn	ExB	T	Director, Strategic Operations, Social Justice and Country Division
Ms	Principe	Iolanda	ExB	T	Director, Strategic Planning and Corporate, Metropolitan Division
Mr	Ramsey	Steve	ExA	T	Director, Strategic Planning and Coordination, Strategic Planning and Population Health Division
Ms	Ramsey	Roxanne	ExD	U	Executive Director, Social Justice and Country Division
Ms	Richter	Jennifer	ExB	U	Director, Resource Management & Monitoring, Metropolitan Division
Ms	Saunders	Nerida	ExC	U	Director, Family and Youth Services
Mr	Stanley	Andrew	ExA	T	Director, Research and Evaluation, Strategic Planning and Population Health Division
Dr	Stubbs	Thomas	ExD	T	Executive Director, Metropolitan Division
Ms	Ward	Fiona	ExA	T	Regional Director, Country Region, Family and Youth Services

Department of Premier and Cabinet

Salutation	Surname	First Name	Class	T/U	Title
Mr	Andary	Jeffery	ExA	T	Director, Lead Agencies & Planning
Ms	Andrews	Janice	ExC	T	Deputy Commissioner for Public Employment
Mr	Angove	Richard	ExB	U	Major Projects Coordinator
Ms	Barnett	Margaret	ExA	T	Director, Human Resource Development
Mr	Bettcher	Jeffrey	ExA	T	General Manager, Bureau Services
Mr	Blackstock	David	ExB	T	Director, Economic and Strategic Advice
Mr	Bodzioch	Adam	ExC	T	Executive Director, Corporate and Organisational Development
Mr	Boxhall	Graham	ExA	T	Director, Special Projects
Mr	Brine	Martin	ExA	T	Director, Inter Government Relations
Mr	Brooks	Elbert	ExC	T	Director, Workforce Relations
Ms	Butow	Heather	ExC	U	Executive Director, Policy Coordination
Dr	Cahalan	Peter	ExA	T	Director, Arts SA
Ms	Carman	Suzanne	ExB	T	Director, Government and Legal Services Cabinet Office
Ms	Caust	Margaret	ExA	T	Director, Capital City Project Team
Mr	Cook	Ian	ExA	T	Director, Artlab Australia
Mr	Flannery	Tim	ExB	U	Director, South Australian Museum
Ms	Halliday	Bronwyn	ExB	U	Director State Library South Australia
Ms	Ince	Rosemary	ExB	T	Director, Economic Reform Branch
Mr	Lambert	Raymond	ExB	T	Project Adviser, Commercial Advice
Ms	Lewis	Susan	ExA	T	Project Director, State Library Redevelopment
Ms	Martin	Pamela	ExC	U	Director, Commercial Advice
Ms	Massey	Kathleen	ExC	U	Executive Director, Arts SA
Ms	Mazel	Joslene	ExA	T	Director, Special Projects
Ms	McDonald	Trudi	ExA	T	Director, Urban & Resources Policy Branch
Mr	Nelson	Anthony	ExA	T	Director, Business and Information Services
Ms	Parkes	Heather	ExC	U	Director, Social Inclusion Unit
Ms	Paull	Tania	ExA	U	Associate Director, PLAIN Central Services
Mr	Radford	Ronald	ExB	U	Director, Art Gallery of South Australia

Department of Premier and Cabinet

Salutation	Surname	First Name	Class	T/U	Title
Mr	Riley	Steven	ExA	U	General Manager, South Australian Museum
Mr	Salter	Gary	ExB	T	Assistant Director, Workforce Relations
Mr	Temple-Heald	Simon	ExA	T	Director, Economic Policy, State Strategic Policy
Ms	Treloar	Caroline	ExB	T	Director, Arts Industry Development
Mr	Tysoe	Terry	ExC	T	Executive Director, Major Projects
Mr	Walsh	Jeffrey	ExC	T	Executive Director of Cabinet Office
Mr	Williams	Rod	ExA	U	Director Policy, Strategic Policy Division
Ms	Wilson	Elizabeth	ExB	T	Director, Cabinet Office
Ms	Woolley	Madeleine	ExC	T	Executive Director, Social Inclusion Unit
Ms	Worth	Janet	ExA	T	Director, Projects

Department Primary Industry and Resources of South Australia

Salutation	Surname	First Name	Class	T/U	Title
Mr	Alley	Neville	ExA	T	Director, Minerals
Mr	Archer	Steven	ExA	T	Director, Finance and Business Services,
Mr	Blair	David	ExB	T	Director, Information Management
Mr	Blight	David	ExC	U	Executive Director, Minerals and Energy Resources
Mr	Brown	Anthony	EL2	'	Manager, Farm Chemicals
Mr	Carr	Peter	ExA	T	Director, Strategic Policy
Mr	Cheshire	Anthony	ExA	U	Chief Scientist, Aquatic Sciences, SARDI
Mr	Faunt	Robert	ExA	T	General Manager, Energy Regulation
Dr	Fong	Clifford	ExC	U	Executive Director, Office of Energy Policy
Mr	Gibson	Peter	ExA	T	Chief Scientist, Crops Strategic Research Area Executive Director
Mr	Goldstein	Barry	ExA	U	Director, Petroleum
Mr	Jervois	Kym	ExA	T	General Manager, Energy Reform Policy
Mr	Johnson	Johnathon	EL1	'	Manager, Administration and Scientific Services
Mr	Knight	Geoff	ExC	T	Executive Director, Corporate
Mr	Lewis	Robert	ExC	T	Executive Director, SARDI
Prof	Maddocks	Simon	ExA	U	Chief Scientist, Livestock Systems
Mr	McLaren	Lachlan	ExA	T	Executive Director, Rural Solutions SA
Ms	Nelle	Susan	ExB	U	Director, Food for the Future Director, Food SA
Mr	Nightingale	Ian	ExA	U	Director, Aquaculture
Mr	O'Loughlin	Philip	ExA	T	General Manager, Human Resources
Mr	Plowman	Donald	ExB	T	Director, Finance and Strategic Planning Director, Research and Development
Mr	Stone	Michael	ExA	T	Program Manager, Environmental Services
Mr	Thomas	Robert	ExC	T	Chief Scientist, Sustainable Production Systems
Mr	Vandergraaff	Robin	ExA	T	Manager, Animal Health
Mr	Weir	Glen	ExA	'	Principal Project Officer, Legislation and Review
Mr	Windle	Barry	ExC	T	Executive Director, Food and Fibre Executive Director, Agriculture, Food and Fisheries
Mr	Zacharin	Will	ExA	U	Director, Fisheries Policy

Department of Transport and Urban Planning

Salutation	Surname	First Name	Class	T/U	Title
Mr	Alexander	Nathan	ExA	U	Director, Urban Programs
Mr	Allan	Philip	ExA	T	Director, Executive Support
Ms	Bellette	Kathryn	ExA	U	Director, Strategic Planning

Department of Transport and Urban Planning

Salutation	Surname	First Name	Class	T/U	Title
Mr	Burman	Brenton	ExA	U	Director, Planning Policy
Ms	Churchman	Susan	ExA	T	Policy Director
Mr	Coughlin	Steven	ExA	T	Director, Business and Information Services
Mr	Delaney	Timothy	ExA	T	Manager, Corporate Finance
Mr	Elford	Mark	ExB	T	Director, Investment and Planning, Transport Planning
Mr	Frisby	Rodney	ExA	T	Manager, Registration and Licensing
Mr	George	Kingsley	ExA	T	Manager, Projects
Ms	Haselgrove	Jean	ExB	T	Director, Contracts
Mr	Hemming	Brian	ExB	T	Director, Regulatory Services
Mr	Hollister	Peter	ExA	T	Director, Strategic Planning, Passenger Transport Board
Ms	Holmes	Julie-Anne	ExA	T	Manager, Budget and Investment Strategy
Mr	Ide	Robin	ExA	T	Coordinator, Vehicle Policy
Mr	Lovell	Ian	ExA	U	Freight Transport Coordinator
Mr	Maunder	John	ExA	T	Manager, Information Strategy
Mr	Milazzo	Andrew	ExB	T	General Manager, Transport Policy
Ms	Miller	Fij	ExA	U	Director, Office for Southern Suburbs
Mr	Milln	Anthony	ExA	T	Project Director, Corporate Projects
Mr	Milln	Michael	ExA	T	Senior Adviser, Aviation
Mr	Petrovski	Mick	ExA	U	Director, Local Government Relations
Mr	Poumako	Robin	ExA	U	Senior Industry Consultant, Passenger Transport Board
Ms	Procter	Carolyn	ExB	T	Executive Director, Office of Local Government
Mr	Richards	Robert	ExB	T	Director, Operations Management
Mr	Roberts	Lloyd	ExA	T	Regional Manager, Metropolitan
Mr	Roberts	Ian	ExA	T	Special Project Coordinator
Mr	Sandeman	Peter	ExA	U	Director, Office of the North
Mr	Savery	Neil	ExC	U	Executive Director, Planning SA
Mr	Smith	Phil	ExA	T	Director, Development Assessment
Mr	Spencer	John	ExA	T	Manager, Safety Strategy
Mr	Steele	Thomas	ExB	T	Director, Investment and Planning
Mr	Steele	Jonathon	ExB	T	Director, Strategic Projects
Mr	Teague	Robert	ExA	T	Development Adviser

Department of Treasury and Finance

Salutation	Surname	First Name	Class	T/U	Title
Mr	Beveridge	Mark	ExA	T	Director, Resource Allocation
Mr	Blaskett	Andrew	ExA	T	Director, Account Management - Commercial
Ms	Bonato	Kelly	ExA	T	Director, Member Services
Mr	Cantley	Kevin	ExC	T	General Manager, SAFA
Mr	Chappell	Robert	ExA	U	Director, Office of the Independent Gambling Authority
Mr	Damin	John	ExA	T	Director, Account Management
Mr	Daniels	Brian	ExA	T	General Manager, SAICORP
Mr	Emery	Roger	ExA	T	Director, Financial Services
Mr	Fantasia	Emilio	ExA	T	Director, Emergency Services Levy
Mr	Goddard	Garry	ExA	U	Deputy Director, Public and Private Partnerships Unit
Mr	Grimes	Paul	ExD	U	Deputy Under Treasurer
Ms	Hart	Linda	ExB	T	Executive Director, Policy Analysis
Mr	Henderson	John	ExA	T	Director, Commonwealth-State Relations
Mr	Hocking	Stuart	ExA	T	Director, Economics

Department of Treasury and Finance

Salutation	Surname	First Name	Class	T/U	Title
Mr	Imber	David	ExC	U	General Manager, Finance
Mr	Jones	Leslie	ExA	T	Director, Information Management
Mr	Klar	Peter	ExA	T	Deputy Director, Public Private Partnership Unit
Dr	Lindner	Bernard	EL2	'	Assistant Under Treasurer (Infrastructure and Asset)
Mr	MacDonald	Gerard	ExA	U	Director, Policy Analysis
Ms	Matas	Susan	ExA	T	Director, Fiscal Strategy
Ms	Moore	Kathryn	ExA	T	Director, Revenue
Mr	Morris	Ian	ExA	T	Assistant Commissioner, Legislative Policy and Review
Mr	Muirden	Kent	ExA	U	Project Leader, Government Accounting and Reporting
Mr	Muncey	Richard	ExB	T	Director, Government Business Enterprises
Mr	Mylius-Clark	Peter	ExA	T	Director, Policy Analysis
Mr	Negus	Andrew	ExB	T	Deputy Commissioner State Taxation
Mr	O'Flaherty	John	ExB	T	General Manager, SuperSA
Mr	Page	Steven	ExB	U	Director, Private Financing Initiatives
Mr	Persse	Richard	ExA	T	Director Corporate Information
Mr	Posaner	David	ExB	T	Director, Client Services
Mr	Priadko	Mark	ExC	U	General Manager, Government Accounting and Reporting
Ms	Pring	Vivienne	ExA	T	Director, Infrastructure
Mr	Prior	Deane	ExA	T	Director, Superannuation - Policy
Ms	Rantanen	Nicolle	ExA	T	Director, Operations
Mr	Rowse	Brett	ExD	U	Deputy Under Treasurer
Mr	Ruse	Robert	ExC	U	Director, Government Business Group
Mr	Schwarz	Robert	ExC	T	Assistant Under Treasurer (Economics)
Mr	Thompson	Andrew	ExB	T	Director, Financial Markets & Advisory Services
Mr	Ullianich	Joseph	ExA	T	Director, Financing and Investment
Mr	Walker	Michael	ExC	T	Commissioner of State Taxation
Mr	Wright	John	ExA	T	Director of Projects

Department of Water Land and Biodiversity Conservation

Salutation	Surname	First Name	Class	T/U	Title
Mr	Gargett	Adrian	ExB	T	Consulting Director
Mr	Hanna	Haydn	ExA	T	General Manager, Natural Resource Management
Mr	Johnson	Andrew	ExA	T	Group Manager, Strategic Services
Mr	Milln	Anthony	ExA	T	Director, Corporate Projects
Mr	Wickes	Roger	ExC	T	Executive Director, Sustainable Resources
Mr	Harris	Colin	EL2	T	Assistant Director, Land and Biodiversity Services
Mr	Harris	Bryan	ExB	T	Director, Resource Assessment
Mr	Harvey	Paul	ExA	T	Deputy Director, Murray-Darling Division
Mr	Hoey	Peter	ExC	T	Executive Director, Murray Darling
Mr	McClennan	Robert	ExB	T	Director, Resource Management
Mr	O'Neill	Peter	ExC	T	Executive Director, Corporate Strategy and Business Services
Mr	Parkinson	John	ExA	T	Executive Director, Portfolio Corporate Services
Mr	Schonfeldt	Claus	ExB	T	A/Director Corporate Strategy & Business Services
Mr	Smith	Michael	ExA	T	Deputy Director, Strategic Water Projects

Emergency Services Administrative Unit

Salutation	Surname	First Name	Class	T/U	Title
Mr	Apsey	Barry	ExC	U	Chief Executive
Mr	Lancaster	Brian	ExA	T	Director State Emergency Services

Emergency Services Administrative Unit

Salutation	Surname	First Name	Class	T/U	Title
Mr	Royle	David	ExB	T	Director, Business Services and Performance Management

Environmental Protection Authority

Salutation	Surname	First Name	Class	T/U	Title
Mr	Harvey	Maxwell	ExA	T	Deputy Director, Environment Protection Authority
Mr	Newland	Nicholas	ExC	T	Executive Director, Environment Protection Authority

South Australian Police

Salutation	Surname	First Name	Class	T/U	Title
Mr	Dickie	Garry	ExB	T	Director, Information Services and Technology
Mr	Menzies	Peter	ExB	T	Director, Human Resources
Mr	Patriarca	Denis	ExB	T	Director Corporate Services

Unattached Unit

Salutation	Surname	First Name	Class	T/U	Title
Ms	Bossley	Claire	EL2	'	Executive Director, Unattached
Mr	Crichton	Tony	ExB	T	Executive Consultant
Mr	Duigan	Michael	EL1		Executive Consultant
Mr	Guerin	Bruce	ELG	'	Executive Consultant
Mr	Miller	Euan	ExA	T	General Manager, Business Enterprise Centres SA Inc.
Ms	Stimson	Dorothy	ExA	T	Executive Consultant

Executive remuneration structure
Remuneration for a tenured contract appointment
Total remuneration package value (TRPV)

	ExA	ExB	ExC	ExD	ExE	ExF
Minimum	\$101,235	\$121,468	\$147,146	\$179,473	\$202,835	Negotiable
Indicative	\$112,483	\$134,684	\$163,276	\$199,125	\$225,151	
Maximum	\$123,533	\$147,956	\$179,411	\$218,902	\$247,469	

Remuneration for an untenured contract appointment
Total remuneration package value (TRPV)

	ExA	ExB	ExC	ExD	ExE	ExF
Minimum	\$101,235	\$133,371	\$161,703	\$197,227	\$222,931	Negotiable
Indicative	\$123,545	\$147,969	\$179,449	\$218,923	\$247,481	
Maximum	\$141,778	\$169,869	\$206,068	\$251,464	\$284,306	

EL Executive Salaries
EL1 EL2 EL3
\$80,533 \$89,997 \$102,617

MLS remuneration
MLS1 TRPV
\$136,250

MLS2 AND MLS3 TRPV
MLS2 8% super \$161,445
9% super \$164,266
15% super \$176,123
21% super \$181,196
MLS3 8% super \$190,434
9% super \$193,582
15% super \$202,096
21% super \$218,982

Part 3

This question requires the disclosure of the details of every individual employed within the Public Service appointed pursuant to Section 39 of the PSM Act, totalling approximately 17,208* employees, and will not be provided.

*Information sourced from Table 31 of the Workforce Information Collection Report, June 2002.

REFUGEES

1. The Hon. A.J. REDFORD:

1. How many temporary protection visa refugees had been released to Adelaide by 30 August 2003?

2. How many temporary protection visa refugees had availed themselves of emergency accommodation, health assessments and settlement services?

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

1. 2,201 asylum seekers were released in South Australia on temporary protection visas (TPVs) between 1 July 1999 and 30 August 2003, 17 of whom were released between 1 January 2003 and 30 August 2003.

2. All TPV holders are provided with services coordinated by the Department of Human Services (DHS), in collaboration with agencies funded by DHS and with other non-government agencies.

These services include:

- emergency housing;
- support for families through Family and Youth Services;
- hospital services;
- assistance in securing private rental accommodation;
- coordination of foster care for asylum seeker children; and
- assistance with medical care, particularly for mental health problems.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the President—

City of Mitcham—Report on Outcome of Applications for Rebate of Rates

Report of the Auditor-General and Treasurer's Financial Statements, 2002-03, Parts A and B.

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

Reports, 2002-03—

Pastoral Board of South Australia

Upper South East Dryland Salinity and Flood Management Act.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN ECONOMIC PERFORMANCE AND INITIATIVES

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation) I table a ministerial statement on South Australia's economic performance and initiatives made by the Hon. Rory McEwen in another place.

QUESTION TIME

DON DUNSTAN FOUNDATION

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Leader of the Opposition): I seek leave to make an explanation before asking the minister representing the Premier a question on the subject of the Don Dunstan Foundation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. T.G. Roberts interjecting:

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Highly unlikely. The first edition for 2003 of the Don Dunstan Foundation Bulletin contained a report from the then chair of the foundation, Mr Greg Crafter, former member for Norwood. In that report he welcomed the new chair designate of the foundation, Mr Bill Cossey, the Chief Executive of the Courts Administration Authority. The bulletin also highlights various other sponsors and supporters and also the work of the Don Dunstan Foundation.

My attention was drawn to two particular aspects. One was the comment that the South Australian government has made a contribution to the work of the foundation by releasing a senior Public Service executive, George Lewkowicz, to be the executive director of the foundation for the next two years. Further on in the report there was a reference to the Don Dunstan Foundation's having received a grant from the state government to commission work on social inclusion and employment through John Spoehr, of the

Centre for Labour Research. He is a person well known to all of us on this side of the chamber. My questions to the minister representing the Premier are as follows:

1. What is the total cost, if any, to taxpayers of the two-year release of Mr Lewkowicz to the Don Dunstan Foundation, including, if his salary is to be covered by taxpayers, any on costs, including remuneration, long service leave and any other payments that might need to be paid by the public sector for his employment?

2. What are the details of the grant that has been provided from the state government to commission work on social inclusion and employment through Mr John Spoehr, Centre for Labour Research?

3. What other support, financial or in kind, has the government or any government department or agency provided to the Don Dunstan Foundation since 5 March 2002?

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY (Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries): I will pass on those questions and bring back a reply.

ABORIGINAL JUSTICE ADVOCACY COMMITTEE

The Hon. R.D. LAWSON: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation a question about the Aboriginal Justice Advocacy Committee.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.D. LAWSON: The opposition has been furnished with a copy of a letter dated 14 August 2002 to the minister from Mr Tauto Sansbury, Chairperson of the Aboriginal Justice Advocacy Committee. The letter expresses Mr Sansbury's deep regret and concern that a budget of some \$7 000, which he submitted to the minister, at the Wudinna joint regional council meeting of ATSIC earlier this year, was not paid by the minister's department but was forwarded on to the Attorney-General's Department. Mr Sansbury says:

That budget was submitted to you, as the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, because your ministerial appointment deals with Aboriginal issues, deaths in custody, and the issues of basic human rights that are being denied to Aboriginal people.

Mr Sansbury goes on to refer to the important work that the Aboriginal Justice Advocacy Committee has done in relation to matters arising out of the Royal Commission into Aboriginal Deaths in Custody. He refers to the fact that the committee has represented family members who have suffered and are still suffering because they believe that no justice has come in relation to deaths in custody from past and present governments. He goes on to say:

As an Aboriginal person who nominated to run in the state election [for the Legislative Council] and gave all my preferential votes to the Labor Party, I am bewildered and lost in relation to where we as Aboriginal people are going to find a true government that is going to represent and understand exactly what are the issues that affect, hurt, concern and, at the end of the day, kill Aboriginal people.

My questions to the minister are:

1. Does he recognise the fact that the Aboriginal Justice Advocacy Committee has performed valuable work in relation to the implementation of the recommendations of the Royal Commission into Aboriginal Deaths in Custody?

2. Will he confirm that the committee did submit to him a budget of some \$7 000, which he passed on without comment to the Attorney-General's Department?

3. Will the minister confirm that his department has no intention of paying anything to the Aboriginal Justice Advocacy Committee?

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation): In reply to the first question—whether I recognise that AJAC has done valuable work—at this stage I flag that, given that AJAC was underresourced generally to carry out what is regarded by Mr Sansbury as its role and responsibilities, it has done as good work as is possible with the backup and support that it has had. I recognise the work that Mr Sansbury has done for Aboriginal people under difficult circumstances. I suggest that, in dealing with the Aboriginal deaths in custody report, the recommendations will not be neglected by the changes to the budgeting of the AJAC officer.

I recognise that all Aboriginal organisations across this country struggle with administrative funding programs. The partnerships that we are trying to build up across agency now (and this includes Justice) are the direction in which this current government is going. We prefer that, where resources can be shared and can be worked in partnership, they are worked in partnership and are shared so that the load that some individuals carry within the Aboriginal community is supported adequately by government resources, not only in Justice but in welfare generally and across the board in a whole range of areas where Aboriginal organisations and individuals are carrying out good work at a community level through and with partnerships with government agencies.

We have made changes to the way in which the issues that were covered by Mr Sansbury's participation in AJAC are being carried out. As the honourable member pointed out, Justice is now the principal department looking after this issue. The funding of the AJAC secretariat through the state department, DAARE, was due to be phased out by the end of 2002-03. In opposition, I made an approach to the then government to keep the funding going until other alternatives were found. I must say that the previous government, which itself was looking at changes to the funding structure for AJAC, continued to fund until the end of its term. I suspect that we are now doing what the previous government was going to do, that is, to change the way in which AJAC was to operate in this state.

There had been consultation with those individuals and organisations that were to be affected, and a budget was put to me which I discussed with Justice. My understanding is that the Aboriginal Legal Rights Movement (ALRM) is currently in discussions with the justice department to examine how the work of AJAC may be supported. So, it is not as though we have cut AJAC's budget, or Mr Sansbury's budget, or that the good work that he was carrying out will not be done. We want to give a higher profile, if you like, to the work that was being done through the justice department in conjunction with DAARE but not financed by it. The \$7 000 budget that was being put forward was, from memory, for personal computers, etc.

We would hope that that backup secretarial support can be provided. We are starting to assist those community groups by getting DAARE, in the case of other organisations, to supply the secretarial backup and to open the department up so that communities have access to government resources. I am not sure whether the shadow minister, as the minister, went down to DAARE's office, but it was like a fortress; you could not access the office without punching a whole range of coded numbers into the office security. I can understand that in relation to some aspects, but, in relation to drawing the

community into departmental support, it was not a satisfactory circumstance. So, we have changed the security system so that it is more user friendly and so that DAARE now offers secretarial support and shop front advice to community groups and organisations; and, I think, that is starting to work and have an effect.

I can understand that Mr Sansbury, who, for some time, has been an advocate for Aboriginal people at a whole range of levels in this state and is now a respected commissioner with ATSIC, would be nervous about the supposed downgrading of AJAC's role. But, as I said, ALRM, which is a fine, upstanding organisation and advocate for Aboriginal people in this state, and the Justice Department, hopefully, will be, as we speak, putting together a package or program that will adequately service the needs and requirements of Aboriginal people in this state that were previously supplied by the AJAC.

BARLEY, SINGLE DESK MARKETING

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 single desk marketing of barley in South Australia.

Leave granted.

The Hon. CAROLINE SCHAEFER: We have all heard that this is a contentious issue. On 18 June this year, a report commissioned by the minister was brought down which identified the preferred option of introducing a scheme for the marketing of barley in South Australia similar to that operating in Western Australia.

The Western Australian model is a system of licensing applicants to export barley, providing they show any economic disadvantage to the first licence holder. In the case of South Australia, it is assumed that the first licence holder would be the Australian Barley Board. The Western Australian act has now been in operation for some six weeks, and it is my understanding that there have been a number of applicants for export licensing in Western Australia. I have a copy of the application for this contentious form of licensing: it is a whole three pages long. The last page is devoted to whether you want to use a credit card to pay for your application fee, and the first page contains such detailed information as the applicant's name and contact details, yet it was identified in the minister's own report that economic modelling of the export barley desk is very difficult and very expensive. Therefore, my questions are:

1. Does the minister still intend to use the Western Australian model as a template for any new legislation in South Australia?

2. If so, how does the minister propose to do this, given that his own report outlines that the methods used to apply for and the issuing of licences in Western Australia are economically unsound?

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY (Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries): Let me first make some comment on the initial remarks made by the shadow minister. She said that the report that we had produced this year was commissioned by me. That is true, but I point out that it was required under the terms of the Barley Marketing Act as part of a negotiated outcome made several years ago, before this government came to office, as part of the national competition policy review. Of course, national competition policy is still very much a driving policy in this area. We are still awaiting the official outcome from the National Competition Council of

what its findings will be in relation to the review of the Barley Marketing Act and a number of important other measures. I will have more to say on that when those reports are released by the commonwealth.

Prior to their release, I believe, the states have a certain period of time, I think 30 days, in which they can appeal to the federal Treasurer in relation to any determination that might be made by the National Competition Council. But those matters are still under consideration. In relation to what the government intends to do, the department is currently setting up negotiations with industry in relation to how we might proceed in relation to a review of the Barley Marketing Act. The Western Australian model is one that we have looked at with some interest. As the honourable member said, it has been in operation for only a very short time. It is also my understanding that under the Western Australian model there are to be no licences issued in the first 12 months of the scheme.

From the discussions that I had, admittedly some time ago, in relation to the Western Australian model, I believe that that model, while it may have its faults, need not necessarily pose a great threat to the operations of the grain pool in that state, and I think that a similar model here would not necessarily pose any significant threat to the ABB if it were operated in the way that I understand it is intended to operate in Western Australia. I understand, from the information that I was provided with, that this model would really only issue licences in relatively small numbers and that they would be to markets subject to a market classification system. The grain pool is the equivalent of our ABB in Western Australia.

Also, of course, it would apply only in years when—as may be the case in the current year, of course—there are excess amounts of grain available, so it would not interfere with any current contracts and therefore with the viability of the grain pool. Certainly, the Western Australian model is one that we will continue to look at in relation to how it performs over coming days, but I would not say that the government here is necessarily wedded to that model, given that it was the subject of some review and that it is, I guess, the only model that we have, in many respects, apart from the commonwealth's model for the AWB, the wheat export authority, which itself has been subject to review by the Senate and to some criticism.

But the federal government's policy in relation to the operation of the single desk appears to be driven from several directions. On the one hand, we have negotiations over a free trade agreement with the United States, where things such as the single desk obviously will be part of the negotiations. On the other hand, it appears that we also have a National Competition Council that has its own agenda in relation to these single marketing bodies. As a matter of fact, I have written to the federal Treasurer and recently received a response in relation to the interpretation of national competition policy on single desks.

I must say that the response from the Treasurer did not particularly enlighten me in relation to the commonwealth policy, although in his response the federal treasurer certainly did indicate that he believes that those provisions of national competition policy ought to be upheld. Our policy in relation to the single desk will continue to evolve. I am aware of the time lines involved. I think our original indication was that we would hope to have a position developed and that that would translate into legislation by the first quarter next year. I am due to have some negotiations with industry in the next

couple of weeks in relation to this matter. We will continue to progress policy in this area.

Certainly the Western Australian model is one that we will keep in mind, but I would not say that necessarily we will be wedded to the exact copy of that particular model. Indeed, the reason why we are watching it closely is to see whether there are problems with the operation and model upon which we could improve. The final position we take will be determined to a significant extent by what position the commonwealth government takes in relation to its interpretation of national competition policy.

GOLD INDUSTRY

The Hon. CARMEL ZOLLO: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Mineral Resources Development a question about gold industry investment.

Leave granted.

The Hon. CARMEL ZOLLO: The gold industry is a significant employer in regional South Australia. Over recent years, there has been a great deal of interest in the Gawler Craton on the west coast of South Australia. It is believed that this area has a high potential for the discovery of economic quantities of gold. Does the minister have any recent information about gold industry investment?

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY (Minister for Mineral Resources Development): The Australian Gold Council's gold industry investment survey for 2003, which was recently released, provides a snapshot of Australia's gold industry expenditure across a range of areas, including capital operational, exploration, environment and community development. As part of that survey, responses were received from all major Australian gold producers, explorers and contractors—some 149 in all. All reported on their investment levels for the 2001-02 actual year. There were estimates for 2002-03 and forecasts for the 2003-04 financial year. Gold is one of the nation's and this state's major contributors to economic development in terms of export volume, capital investment and employment, especially in regional areas. South Australia's most significant gold mines are the Roxby Downs mine, where gold is a fortuitous by-product of the copper mining, and also Australia's newest gold mine at Challenger.

The 2003 survey results indicate that, in 2002-03, the Australian gold industry spent an estimated \$6.7 billion plus in capital operational and exploration expenditure. In 2003-04, Australian gold producers, contractors and explorers will spend almost \$7 billion in capital operational and exploration, with more than \$6.6 billion of this forecast investment to occur in regional areas. The industry remains a major employer in regional areas. In 2003-04, the Australian gold industry is forecast to employ 19 800 people, directly and indirectly, or as contractors, and more than 17 000 in regional areas. In 2002-03, the level of expenditure committed to environmental projects was estimated at more than \$84 million, with a forecast increase to more than \$97 million in 2003-04. In 2002-03, the industry allocated more than \$11.1 million for community development contributions, with a further \$6 million to \$17 million in 2003-04.

A new section was added to the survey seeking investment details of Australian gold companies in the Asia-Pacific region: 18 companies responded, revealing that they expected

to invest \$1.26 billion in gold related capital exploration and contracting activities. This snapshot of the national situation shows why the government is keen to see the Gawler Craton opened to exploration and eventually production. Gold exploration and production injects large sums of money into the economy, especially regional economies, and is a rich source of regional employment. Recently, the Premier spoke about the benefits of mining in this state, so this council can rest assured that the government will be doing everything it can to ensure that those benefits continue by encouraging exploration and production wherever possible.

SCHOOL RETENTION RATES

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY (Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries): I lay on the table a copy of a ministerial statement in relation to school retention rates made earlier today in another place by my colleague the Premier.

CRIMINAL LAW (UNDERCOVER OPERATIONS) ACT

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY (Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries): I lay on the table a copy of a ministerial statement in relation to the Criminal Law (Undercover Operations) Act 1995 made earlier today in another place by my colleague the Attorney-General.

RURAL JUSTICE BUILDINGS

The Hon. IAN GILFILLAN: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, representing the Minister for Infrastructure, a question relating to the privatising of rural justice buildings.

Leave granted.

The Hon. IAN GILFILLAN: It is interesting to note that the ABC news bulletin on line this morning, headlined with the phrase 'SA privatises rural justice buildings', stated that South Australia will spend \$30 million to upgrade police stations and courts at six regional centres across South Australia. It goes on further to indicate that the minister has said that the private sector will build, own and maintain the buildings at Victor Harbor, Mount Barker, Gawler, Berri, Port Lincoln and Port Pirie while the government will run the policing and court processes. My colleague the Hon. Sandra Kanck raised the issue with the media with what I would regard as the most disconcerted minister for infrastructure I have ever heard in the media when challenged about whether or not this is genuine privatisation. It is inappropriate for me to expand on that in my brief explanation.

Honourable members will recall that on 4 June I asked a question regarding the Mount Barker police station and did not get an immediate reply. However, the reply is significant to this issue as to whether or not this is privatisation and whether the people of South Australia are getting a good deal. I will quote from the answer I received over the name of the Hon. P. Holloway in respect of the payment of \$2.3 million in regard to the Mount Barker police station over a full year for all the facilities as follows:

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.

As far as giving this demonstration that there is value for money, the answer goes on to state:

It is simply not in the public interest to disclose commercially sensitive information relating to the financing of the project at this stage.

It further states:

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.

In my brief explanation it is reasonable to indicate that, if the government has taken this step on the basis that it can be demonstrated that there is value for money for the government in doing so, it is a strange anomaly that it is keeping confidential and secret the very information which would allegedly prove it to be an advantage to the citizens of this state. In relation to this non-privatised privatisation, I ask the minister:

1. Can he justify that the arrangement to be entered into of spending \$30 million for the private sector to build, own and maintain is not indeed a form of privatisation?

2. If this parliament is to have confidence in the judgment that it is to the advantage of the community, when will the government reveal the actual economic data—the calculations—which will assure the parliament that indeed renting and maintaining (I repeat that maintenance is also at a cost to the government for 25 years when at the end of that time the government will own no asset) are in fact a good deal for the people of South Australia?

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY (Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries): Obviously those questions asked by the honourable member are matters for the minister for infrastructure, and I will see whether the minister wishes to add to my answer. The state government has not been in the business of building buildings for many years. My department, the Department of Primary Industries and Resources, along with several other departments, is housed in an AMP centre. That building has been there for many years—I think close to 20 years, if not more—and it has never been owned by the state government. The government has not been involved in the construction of infrastructure for buildings to house government departments. The government has not built the buildings; and nor has it had exclusive ownership. That has been the case for many years. The fact that this government is currently looking at public/private partnership in relation to building police stations—

The Hon. T.G. Cameron interjecting:

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: I will come to that. That is the second part of the question.

The Hon. A.J. Redford interjecting:

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: Well, we will see in relation to that afterwards. The point is that, with the exception of the Housing Trust, the state government has not been in the business of building buildings for many years. I do not think there is any substance to those comments made by the honourable member in relation to him calling this privatisation. What was the second part of the honourable member's question?

The Hon. Ian Gilfillan: Are you going to produce the calculations and the budgeting that shows that—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: In relation to that, it would be fairly silly, if you are about to go into negotiations with the private sector in relation to public/private partnerships, to put all of the case on the table at this stage. Obviously you would wait until the contracts are let. That, I would have thought, is the obvious answer; but if the Minister for Infrastructure wishes to add anything further I will get his comment.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: Well, it would be highly unlikely and highly stupid if you were to release the information before you had negotiated a contract. I do not think anyone ever does that. Of course, once contracts are signed it is a different matter.

The Hon. J.F. STEFANI: I have a supplementary question. Is the Leader of the Government aware that on page 5 of the Auditor-General's Report, tabled today, the Auditor-General clearly advocates tabling in parliament the full details of intersectoral agreements regarding matters of critical continuing public interest? I add to that that he does in fact state that, in his opinion, the documents, notwithstanding claims for commercial confidentiality, should be tabled in parliament. He continues on page 6 of the report in relation to that particular subject.

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: I understand what the Auditor-General is saying but I think you would agree that you have actually got to sign contracts before you would release any information.

PRISONS, DRUG USE

The Hon. A.L. EVANS: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Correctional Services a question about a device called the itemiser.

Leave granted.

The Hon. A.L. EVANS: Earlier this year I asked the minister a series of questions on the itemiser. The itemiser is a machine purchased by the previous government to use in our prisons. The purpose of the machine is to detect the presence of drugs. In response to my initial questions, the minister advised that, due to the issues regarding the device's reliability and the appropriateness of existing legislation to support its use, the government intended to introduce into parliament a bill that would ensure the full use of the itemiser. Would the minister advise when the government intends to introduce the Correctional Services (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill 2003 to address the current deficiencies preventing the itemiser being widely used in our state prisons?

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS (Minister for Correctional services): I thank the honourable member for his question and his continuing interest in the itemiser. The situation is that we have increased the activities surrounding searches and the use of the dog squad in relation to searching visitors to prisons and prison cell searches, which has produced an increase in results. As I have said in this place on many occasions, it is difficult to keep drugs out of prisons and Correctional Services will look at any new invention or tool that may be able to be used to detect drugs before they enter the prisons.

Some tests are being done at the moment with devices that pick up dust off clothing and so on to test for explosives and a whole range of things that were not detected before, and we will be keeping an eye on that. I cannot give the honourable

member an exact date for the introduction of the bill, but certainly I will get a briefing for him in relation to the time frame in which the bill will be introduced and get it to him as soon as possible. That will include any changes to the act that may be required to allow the itemiser to be used. It may be that technology has advanced, because I understand that the itemiser has been in storage for some considerable time. I will check to find out whether technology has superseded the itemiser or whether it has been improved and will bring back a reply for the honourable member.

PARLIAMENTARY COMMITTEES

The Hon. A.J. REDFORD: 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 secrecy.

Leave granted.

The Hon. A.J. REDFORD: On 7 August 2003 the Minister for Industrial Relations caused a notice to be lodged in the *Government Gazette* entitled 'Parliamentary committees' referral of certain matters to the parliamentary committee on occupational safety, rehabilitation and compensation notice 2003', in which the WorkCover Governance Reform Bill and the Safe Work (SA) Bill, introduced in a previous parliament, were referred to that committee pursuant to section 16(1)(b) of the Parliamentary Committees Act.

Further, on 16 July this year this council referred a series of matters to the Statutory Authorities Review Committee for inquiry in association with WorkCover. Each of the issues that have been referred to these committees are important to this state and obviously the new chair of WorkCover, the old chair, former and current members of WorkCover's board and former and current WorkCover employees all have in their possession information that might assist these two parliamentary committees in their important task.

In answer to a question on 16 May last year, the Hon. Paul Holloway said that the committees do important work. The Premier on 8 July last year said, in relation to parliamentary committees, the following:

Under this government all ministers will be expected to be open and cooperative with all parliamentary committees.

In a letter to the Statutory Authorities Review Committee dated 19 September, the chair of WorkCover stated that the release of information to that committee was subject to section 112 of the Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation Act and other issues of confidentiality. Further, in a letter to the Occupational Health and Safety Committee, the chair of WorkCover, Mr Bruce Carter, further refused to release information because of the same section 112, which is entitled 'Confidentiality to be maintained'.

It would seem that while the Americans have the fifth, we in South Australia, in relation to WorkCover, have the 112th. Section 112 provides:

A person must not disclose information (except as permitted by subsection (2)) if—

- (a) the person obtained the information in the course of carrying out functions in, or related to, the administration, operation or enforcement of this act; and
- (b) the information is—
 - (i) about commercial or trading operations; or . . . (iii) the information provided in a return or in response to a request for information under the act.

Subsection (2) provides:

A disclosure of information is permitted if it is—

- (a) a disclosure in the course of official duties; or . . . (d) a disclosure required by a court or tribunal constituted by law, or before a review authority; or . . . (g) a disclosure made under the authorisation of the minister.

In the light of the difficulties currently being experienced by parliamentary committees under this government, my questions are:

1. Does the minister agree with the Premier's comments that all ministers will be expected to be open and cooperative with all parliamentary committees?
2. Will the minister authorise the chair of WorkCover to disclose information sought by the parliamentary committees pursuant to section 112(2)(g) of the act?
3. Notwithstanding any authorisation, does the minister agree that any disclosure by any WorkCover board member or staff member pursuant to a request of a parliamentary committee is not a breach of section 112 because the disclosure is such that it would be made in the course of official duties?
4. Will the minister consider a legislative amendment to implement more open and accountable government to this parliament?
5. Has section 112 ever been used to circumvent the Whistleblowers Act, or its intention, on the part of any WorkCover employee?

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation): I will take those questions on notice and refer them to the minister in the other place and bring back a reply. I will add that, in my own experience in relation to committees and gathering information, it is generally the committee's insistence and the prioritisation that the committee puts on the collection of that information that determines how—

The Hon. A.J. Redford interjecting:

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: I understand what the member is saying, but I am not quite sure whether the chair of the committee has written to the relevant minister or to the—

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

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: Thank you. I take that as a compliment from the honourable member. The committee acted in a bipartisan way, and that took a lot of the bickering out of the process. It is important that the committee itself go through a process whereby an official rejection is given to the chair of that committee and that that matter is taken up with the relevant minister. However, I will refer those questions to the minister in the other place and bring back a reply.

NUCLEAR WASTE

The Hon. J.F. STEFANI: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation, representing the Minister for Environment and Conservation, a question about nuclear waste.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.F. STEFANI: During the debate on the establishment of a national low level nuclear waste repository in South Australia, the Minister for Environment and Conservation (Hon. John Hill) confirmed that an independent study was being undertaken by the Environment Protection Authority to identify all nuclear waste material stored in South Australia. The minister further publicly stated that an EPA report would identify a suitable location for the storage

of all nuclear waste material presently stored in South Australia. My questions are:

1. Will the minister advise the parliament whether the EPA has in fact completed the report? If so, has he received a copy?
2. Will the minister table the EPA report in parliament? If not, why not?
3. If the EPA has not completed its report, will the minister advise when the report will be completed and when it will be tabled in parliament?

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

CADELL TRAINING CENTRE

The Hon. J. GAZZOLA: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Correctional Services a question regarding work done by prisoners at Cadell Training Centre.

Leave granted.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J. GAZZOLA: Are you ready for this? I understand that the minister visited the Cadell Training Centre in the Riverland to inspect some of the work being undertaken by prisoners. I have noted with interest some of the other projects that both the prisoners and those involved in community corrections have undertaken in the past. Given that we often hear about the negative aspects of Correctional Services, I think it is important that we are also informed of the positives that occur in this area. Therefore, can the minister outline some of the positive ways in which Cadell prisoners are contributing to the Cadell area and the benefits this has for prisoners?

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS (Minister for Correctional Services): I thank the honourable member for his question and his continuing interest in this matter. I point out to members opposite that I did not have to take a miner's lamp to inspect any of the work being done by the Cadell prisoners: the work was above ground, and it involved the RSL hall at Morgan. The previous government encouraged activities of connection between the prison and the community by having work programs within the Morgan-Cadell area, and we are continuing that work.

The Hon. J.S.L. Dawkins: What further work beyond that?

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: We are looking for opportunities, and one of the things we are doing is advertising through the good work that has been done and trying to project forward ventures that the community will pick up. I have to thank the members of the community who have been supervising the work done on the RSL hall, and certainly the RSL members themselves are most grateful. As the previous government probably knew and understood, the work done on the museum at Morgan probably would not have occurred if it had not been for the prisoners working with community corrections, the community and the supervising officers in Morgan. The museum is still holding; the work that was done is still in good shape.

The reason I went up to inspect the work was to give it a profile so that we could engage the community in trying to get other community corrections projects going, and I am sure that there will be no shortage of suggestions. I met with the

Morgan RSL President, Mr David Church, and he certainly passed on to me the expressed gratitude of the community and RSL members for the work being done. Again, I thank them for their supervision and their work with Correctional Services officers and the prisoners in carrying out this work.

I met with the prisoners after we did the inspection. I was accompanied by Tim Weatherald, one of the victims of the Bali bombing, and he spoke to the prisoners about his experiences and his second chance. The prisoners were enthralled by his contribution, and I thank him for talking to the prisoners. They certainly had a lot of respect not just for what he had to say but also for Tim as an individual. He is certainly one of those people who are referred to as someone with a lot of strength and courage in being able to sit down with a group and talk about their experiences. He also went out onto the football field (which I could not do) and kicked a football around with the prisoners, and the prisoners certainly gained a lot more respect for him. I did try an attempted screwy but it did not work, and I think I threw a cartilage out.

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

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: I don't think I will be. He was able to pass on a lot of tips to the prisoners and the prisoners certainly respected that. If we as a government are able to build up a relationship inside the prison services system to try to normalise the conditions that prisoners will face when they exit prisons, then we will be carrying on the work in a bipartisan way so that it makes it easier for prisoners to exit the system with some normalisation, and some understanding and respect for how communities operate.

FAMILY AND YOUTH SERVICES

The Hon. KATE REYNOLDS: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the minister representing the Premier a question about Family and Youth Services staffing. Leave granted.

The Hon. KATE REYNOLDS: For months now we have been told that the Department of Family and Youth Services has reached crisis point because of inadequate staffing levels. This was reinforced in the Layton report, which called for a significant injection of funds for FAYS. This recommendation recognised that South Australia is the lowest spending state in terms of child protection. My office has received a copy of an internal FAYS report outlining cases that have been marked 'Resources prevent investigation', or RPI, with 33 cases not investigated in just one week because of a lack of staff. This report, which also featured in *The Advertiser* today, tells of a three-month old child living in allegedly filthy conditions in an isolated home.

Inside this house there were chickens, droppings, an infestation of mice, 20 open garbage bags with decaying food, and a blocked septic. There were also numerous other reports detailing extremely substandard and, some would say, dangerous conditions in which children are being forced to live as FAYS staff are simply unable to intervene. Their situations involved serious emotional and physical abuse, possible sexual abuse and serious neglect. The Public Service Association, on behalf of FAYS workers, last week requested an urgent meeting with the Premier to discuss funding to enable 32 extra staff to be allocated to underresourced offices.

These staff are needed to start work immediately on reducing the enormous case load facing existing workers,

who still tell us that FAYS is unable to meet its mandated responsibilities to children at risk and children and young people in the care of the minister. The Premier, when interviewed on ABC radio last Wednesday, said in relation to the PSA's claims, 'I guess they would say that,' and went on to state that the government 'could not write blank cheques for everyone: the PSA knows that'. The Minister for Social Justice was today reported as saying that the PSA is self-serving. My questions to the Premier are:

1. Will he meet with the PSA this week to discuss funding requirements for child protection workers within FAYS offices? If not, why not?

2. If \$1.5 million cannot be found, as the Minister for Social Justice indicated last week, to employ 32 more workers, how then will the government fund the recommendations in the Layton report, in particular recommendations 39 and 45 which recommend that extra staff be allocated to FAYS to meet its obligations under the Children's Protection Act?

3. When will the government's response to the Layton report, entitled 'Our best investment', be released?

4. Does the Premier have any evidence that the PSA is serving its own interests rather than the interests of children in relation to this issue?

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY (Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries): Those questions are really for the Minister for Social Justice and should be referred to her for a response. I know that my colleague has already issued some statements and I am also aware that staff within FAYS was increased significantly earlier this year. I am also aware of some comments that have been made by Mr John Bastian recently. He made the very important point about how there needs to be some restructuring of that department in relation to child abuse issues. A significant amount of material has been put out into the public arena by my colleague. If she wishes to add further to that, I will provide the question to her and give her an opportunity.

CRIMINAL LAW (UNDERCOVER OPERATIONS) ACT

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY (Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries): Before I resume my seat, I indicate that when I tabled the ministerial statement from the Attorney-General earlier in relation to the Criminal Law (Undercover Operations) Act, that also included the tabling of a report required under section 5 of the Criminal Law (Undercover Operations) Act of 1995. I wanted to indicate that that was also tabled as part of that ministerial statement.

SMOKING BAN

The Hon. NICK XENOPHON: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Leader of the Government, representing both the Premier and the Treasurer, questions about smoking in gaming rooms and the casino.

Leave granted.

The Hon. NICK XENOPHON: *The Advertiser* of 3 October 2003 reported that potential revenue losses of up to \$70 million a year were likely to delay the introduction of smoking bans in South Australian hotel and club gaming rooms. The report referred to chapter 7.1 of budget estimates which states that experience in Victoria following a ban on

smoking in gaming rooms has seen an initial decline in gaming activity of between 10 and 15 per cent. The adverse impact of a similar decline in South Australia would see an initial reduction in gaming tax and general purpose grant revenue of between \$45 million and \$70 million. The government has yet to make a decision on this issue. As a result of smoking bans in Victoria (instituted since 1 September 2002) in gaming rooms and in most of the Crown casino, losses on poker machines have declined by some 8.9 per cent, according to a report in *The Age* of 8 August 2003. My questions are:

1. On what basis was the estimate referred to in the budget papers made by Treasury?
2. Will the government revise this figure in light of the Victorian experience?
3. Did Treasury receive any submissions and/or modelling from the Australian Hotels Association in relation to projected revenue losses and, if so, what were those submissions and/or modelling; and were they relied on or adopted in whole or in part?
4. Is the issue of whether smoking should be banned in gaming rooms and the casino a conscience vote for Labor MPs?
5. Has the Premier previously made a ruling on this issue and, if so, when; and, if so, what was the ruling?
6. Has the government made any estimates of the potential savings to the health budget in this state if such bans were introduced based on experience in other jurisdictions, particularly California?

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY (Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries): The honourable member asked some questions in relation to the framing of the budget. Obviously I will refer those matters to the Treasurer for a response. I point out in relation to the issue of smoking that the government did establish a task force. I understand that task force (which includes industry, unions and others involved in this issue) has been established for some considerable time and it continues to examine the issue. In relation to the issue of this matter being a conscience vote, that would be determined within the Labor Party by the appropriate structures at the time of a decision being made. Certainly from my experience, the determination in relation to conscience votes as far as gambling is concerned is restricted to matters relating to any increase in relation to gambling. Normally issues such as this are regarded as administrative matters, and that has certainly been the way that conscience votes have generally been interpreted by the Labor Party. For example, in relation to the past—

The Hon. A.J. Redford interjecting:

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: If you were banning gambling, obviously you would be changing the level of gambling. I am just enlightening the honourable member about the way in which conscience votes are determined in the Labor Party. However, until a matter arises, it is entirely a hypothetical situation.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: Members opposite can laugh, but the fact is that—

The PRESIDENT: Order! Members cannot hear the answer.

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: We know the way in which the Liberal Party operates in relation to these matters. The Labor Party has always been very up front in relation to its use of the conscience vote: it is part of the rules of the Labor

Party. It has been transparent for almost 100 years and remains that way.

The Hon. NICK XENOPHON: I have a supplementary question. Did not the Labor Party caucus consider this issue last year in light of legislation I introduced to ban smoking in poker machine rooms and the casino?

The Hon. A.J. Redford interjecting:

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: No; it goes directly to the point. When an issue comes before the party then the rules of the party are determined in relation to that issue. The honourable member asked me about matters that are currently before a task force that is examining those issues. The honourable member has introduced his bills on a number of occasions and determinations have been made in relation to the conscience votes on those issues. The interpretation I gave a few moments ago accurately reflects the decisions that were made in relation to those matters at the time.

The Hon. NICK XENOPHON: I wish to ask a supplementary question, sir.

The PRESIDENT: A precedent has been set in allowing a question and answer to be completed after expiration of question time.

The Hon. NICK XENOPHON: I will ask the question another day, Mr President.

The PRESIDENT: I believe that is an appropriate action.

REPLIES TO QUESTIONS

FAMILY AND YOUTH SERVICES

In reply to **Hon. KATE REYNOLDS** (15 July).

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

1. *When will she request a meeting with the PSA to resolve this issue?*

A number of meetings have been held between representatives of the Office of the Commissioner for Public Employment, Department of Human Services and the Public Service Association (PSA) in an attempt to resolve workload issues within Family and Youth Services (FAYS).

Both parties have attended voluntary conferences at the Industrial Court in an attempt to resolve industrial issues. These discussions are continuing.

2. *Is any offer currently on the table in relation to additional staff for FAYS officers?*

The Department of Human Services has offered 38 positions as an interim solution while the work measurement study is undertaken. The study will provide the basis of a further submission to Cabinet for additional resources for FAYS.

3. *What did cabinet approve yesterday, and when will that information be released to the PSA, to FAYS staff, to the parliament and to the public for scrutiny?*

Cabinet approved additional funds of \$1.5 million to DHS for the recruitment of interim staff to FAYS.

The offer (outlined in the response to question two) has been the subject of considerable discussion with the PSA.

4. *Is the government committed to developing both short-term and long-term solutions to the problem of under-staffing in FAYS offices which will enable FAYS to meet properly its mandated responsibilities?*

From the \$1.5 million provided, 38 positions have been created. 27 of these are ongoing and 11 are temporary positions. This is an interim measure pending a longer-term analysis of the workload in FAYS. Recommendation 45 of the Layton Child Protection Review *Our Best Investment* recommended a comprehensive budgetary and workload analysis, which should take into account socio-economic and trend data. This analysis is occurring and will be used for ongoing discussion regarding future resourcing of FAYS.

5. *Will the minister acknowledge that a doubling in the number of children under guardianship orders at the Murray Bridge*

office from 67 to 124 in the past 12 months means that the office should have the staffing entitlement of an A level office, not B?

The figures quoted are incorrect and require clarification. A comparison of data during the period July 2001 to June 2003 shows that the number of cases handled by the Murray Bridge office has gone from 97 in July 2001, to 96 in July 2002 and to 107 in June 2003.

During the same period there was an increase in the general workload within the Murray Bridge office, with the office receiving the highest number of additional resources in the allocation of new monies i.e. two additional social workers, and one additional OPS3 staff member. Two social workers and a senior financial counsellor were added to the office establishment in 2002-03.

6. For the purposes of staffing, how many other regional offices are classified at a level below their actual client workload, and will the minister provide details about which regional offices are forced to use their local flexible funds to employ social workers on short-term contracts because funding from the central office is not adequate to meet their basic staffing needs?

The workload measurement process is being undertaken to provide information on client workloads against staffing complements. The process is not yet completed.

The allocation of funding to District Centres needs to be clarified. FAYS operates a decentralised model, and each centre has autonomy to expend their budgets within their approved allocation. Managers are approved to employ social workers on short-term contracts if their salaries budget allows. Slippage is often available if there is a delay in filling a vacancy and it is a normal management tool that short-term contracts are offered.

The Minister has called for a budget review of the FAYS base allocation to address any shortfalls in the baseline budget, and to form the basis of further discussions in Cabinet about FAYS funding.

HOME AND COMMUNITY CARE PROGRAM

In reply to **Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK** (10 July).

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

1. In the 2002-03 Home and Community Care (HACC) funding round approximately 130 projects received new or expanded HACC funding. As at 10 July 2003, 80 contracts had been forwarded to agencies, 51 of which had been finalised. Of the contracts yet to be sent, negotiations are occurring with the relevant agencies to finalise the outputs. These negotiations were unable to take place until formal joint announcement of the new funding by the relevant State and Commonwealth Ministers, which occurred on 5 June 2003.

In addition to the above contracts, there were approximately 15 agencies with contracts expiring on 30 June 2003 which did not receive new or expanded HACC funding in the 2002-03 funding round. Interim arrangements have been entered into with these agencies extending the contracts until 31 December 2003 which has involved the formal exchange of letters to satisfy legal and related administrative requirements. This arrangement has been necessary given the need to review agreements with a large number of agencies at the same time.

2. No agencies have received, or will receive, new funding from the 2002-03 HACC funding round until a funding contract is negotiated and signed.

However, the following 10 agencies were due to receive new funding in the 2002-03 round and had existing contracts for recurrent funding due to expire on 30 June 2003:

- Adelaide Central Mission;
- the Barossa Council;
- the City of Charles Sturt;
- Colebrook Community Centre Inc;
- the City of Holdfast Bay;
- the Corporation of the City of Mitcham;
- the District Council of Mount Barker;
- Multicultural Aged Care Inc;
- the Rural City of Murray Bridge and
- the City of Port Adelaide Enfield

These agencies were advanced a first quarter payment for 2003-04 under the terms of their existing contracts. New contracts, taking into account additional funding from the 2002-03 round, were being negotiated concurrently. An advanced payment was made to best meet the needs of these agencies and to avoid disrupting service provision.

In these circumstances, the existing contracts are deemed to remain in force by mutual consent of the parties.

The contracts for the District Council of Mount Barker and Multicultural Aged Care Inc have since been finalised.

3. I am pleased to say that there will be a HACC funding round for 2003-04. Total recurrent program funding will rise by 7.7 per cent to \$102.362 million, with approximately \$7.350 million in additional recurrent funding becoming available. After payment of cost indexation for current HACC projects, there will be \$5.093 million in recurrent growth funding to provide new and expanded services. There will also be approximately \$3.2 million in one off funds available for short-term projects.

A call for expressions of interest in providing services using the additional funds will occur shortly.

TRANSPORT SUBSIDY SCHEME

In reply to **Hon. T.J. STEPHENS** (1 April).

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

South Australian Transport Subsidy Scheme (SATSS) members are entitled to sixty vouchers every six months. SATSS vouchers are provided to members for their own use and are not given specifically for medical treatment, with many members using their SATSS vouchers for recreational and social purposes. It should be noted that many SATSS members do not reach their full allocation of vouchers and therefore at this time 60 vouchers every six months is considered adequate.

I am not aware of any election promise to remove the limit on the number of SATSS vouchers for members.

OPEN SOURCE SOFTWARE

In reply to **Hon. IAN GILFILLAN** (15 July).

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

1. During the period between 1 July and 14 July the minister's position in regard to the value of open source software has not changed. The SA Government continues to actively observe the desktop and software market in Australia and overseas, is communicating with other States and the Commonwealth on Open Source Software (OSS), and has trials related to OSS in progress.

Already a range of OSS implementations are in use within SA Government agencies to support specific services, such as the use of Linux/Unix in web hosting and operational environments. The SA Government is currently conducting a feasibility study of Open Source solutions for the desktop environment.

The government's objective is to establish an informed and considered direction that will advantage the government, business and the community.

2. As part of the government's continued research and investigations into the use of Open Source Software within agencies, there is a need to take a range of actions to ensure that consideration is given to open source solutions in the development of future ICT policy and procurement decisions. The government's emphasis must remain on procuring the best software solution at the best possible price and the rationale for this should be provided within the appropriate tender documentation. Where both open source and proprietary products are offered in response to government tenders, a detailed evaluation will be undertaken.

The development of this type of policy will ensure that the government, when procuring software solutions, provides a level playing field to the market, and goes to market with detailed functional and technical specifications, as well as detailed standards (performance and interoperability) within which the products sought must operate.

3. No.

TAXATION, PROPERTY

In reply to **Hon. CAROLINE SCHAEFER** (17 July).

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

The issue of stamp duty on the transfer of aquaculture leases is one that has been raised with both RevenueSA and myself in recent months. In the context of your question, the relevant section of the *Stamp Duties Act 1923* ("the Act") under interpretation is section

71CC, which provides an exemption for the interfamilial transfer of farming land, or land and goods.

RevenueSA advises it is discussing the issue with Crown Law whose advice is being sought to clarify the application (if any) of section 71CC of the Act to the transfer of aquaculture leases between family members. Until the advice is received I am not in a position to comment further.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.
(Continued from 25 September. Page 255.)

The Hon. SANDRA KANCK: In delivering his speech for the opening of the 51st parliament, Mr Bruno Krumins, the Lieutenant-Governor, acknowledged the Rann government's creation of a new Office of Infrastructure and a new Minister for Infrastructure. I would like to take the opportunity in this speech to deal with an area of infrastructure that is wreaking havoc in South Australia; I refer to the electricity industry. I believe that with the current situation the government has three courses of action open to it. One is to get back into the business of generating electricity, thereby creating some competition in the South Australian region of the national electricity market, or NEM, as it is commonly known. The second option is to lead the way in reform of the market by ensuring that the single price pool as a mechanism for running the NEM is abandoned; and the third is to withdraw from the NEM altogether.

The alternative to decisive action is to allow the great electricity heist to continue unabated. That is not a viable option for either this parliament or the people of South Australia. Consequently, today I am calling on the government to establish a powerful independent committee with the authority to compel the attendance of witnesses and the production of documents to investigate and report upon all aspects of the operations of the electricity industry in South Australia—something similar to the inquiry that Robyn Layton conducted last year. The committee would be charged with developing a plan to protect and advance the interests of electricity consumers in South Australia.

Our electricity industry was once called the Electricity Trust of South Australia. Mr President, the public has lost its trust in more ways than one. ETSA was once an important part of state development as a source of reasonably priced and reliable power for industrial and domestic consumers alike. Today the price of electricity is a significant drag on economic development in South Australia and the curse of many domestic budgets. This year's 30 per cent increase in the price of electricity for households and small businesses has pushed many budgets into the red. We now have families sitting in cold, dank rooms because they cannot afford to heat their houses and, come summer, pensioners will forgo the use of their air conditioners for fear of facing monstrous electricity bills. People are being forced to borrow money to pay for an essential service that until recently was provided at a reasonable price. The 30 per cent increase in the price of electricity has been hardest on the poorest in our state (which is an interesting observation in Poverty Week), particularly for those who spend most of their time at home: the disabled, the unemployed and pensioners.

Skyrocketing electricity prices mark the complete failure of the Olsen Liberals' privatisation program. Members will recall that the former premier threatened this parliament with a State Bank-like disaster if ETSA was not privatised. Huge losses to Treasury income were predicted if ETSA remained publicly owned. Well, huge losses have come to pass—but, ironically, as a consequence of privatising ETSA. My own quick, back of the envelope calculations demonstrate the magnitude of the financial disaster that is the privatisation of ETSA.

The 1997-1998 financial year was the last year that ETSA produced consolidated accounts for the whole of the electricity industry in South Australia. In 1997-1998, ETSA had sales revenues of \$1 072.5 million, that is, South Australians spent a little more than \$1 billion on purchasing electricity that year. The average 30 per cent increase in the retail price of electricity now, means that South Australians will pay \$350 million extra for electricity in 2003 than they did in 1998. Indeed, the figure of \$350 million underestimates the increase in revenues to the now private owners of South Australia's electricity industry because it does not include increases in the consumption of electricity in this state during the past five years.

This shocking price rise has little to do with an increase in the cost of supplying electricity. Hence, had the Liberals not privatised ETSA, Treasury would have reaped hundreds of millions of dollars in additional revenues from our publicly owned electricity companies. Yet the transfer of windfall profits from the public purse to the privatised electricity companies is but one part of this disgraceful equation. On the other side of the ledger, the South Australian taxpayer also lost hundreds of millions of dollars per annum as a consequence of the Liberals choosing to retire debt at a time of historically low interest rates. One of the propaganda sheets produced by the carpetbaggers hired by the Liberals to bolster the case for privatisation contained some pertinent facts.

According to the document entitled 'The Risks of Ownership-The Cost of the State's Debt', \$5.03 billion of state debt was due to mature by the end of 2000. When the state bank exploded in the face of the Bannon government, it forced the state government to borrow long at relatively high rates of interest. As a consequence, that \$5 billion of maturing debt had a weighted average interest cost of 8.8 per cent, costing \$440 million per annum in interest payments. Those borrowings could and should have been rolled over in the low interest rate environment that prevailed at the turn of the millennium. Instead, the carpetbaggers argued the following:

Clearly, when evaluating the state's possible interest savings against ETSA and Optima's profit, the relevant interest rate should be somewhere between 7 and 9 per cent.

The actual figure is closer to 5 per cent. The South Australian taxpayer paid more than \$115 million for that type of woeful analysis. Further, the consultants argued that the price of electricity would fall in a deregulated market, thus reducing the revenue stream to Treasury. Yet, a World Bank study of 61 privatised electricity companies in 18 countries found that their profitability rose an average 45 per cent. I can think of no better example of consultants telling their masters what they wanted to hear—and, by the way, the masters not seeming to understand that they were being conned. Had the Liberals decided to keep ETSA in public ownership and refinance the debt as it fell due, Treasury would have reaped interest rate savings approaching \$200 million per annum. Add to that the lost additional stream of revenue from the

electricity industry and, conservatively, South Australian taxpayers are out of pocket by \$400 million alone this year.

Next year, depending on the price of electricity, the cost of ETSA's privatisation could be higher again. That is a disgrace. The man responsible for overseeing this financial disaster, the then treasurer, is now the shadow treasurer. That man, the Hon. Mr Lucas, has no credibility in relation to this matter. Think of how that money could have been used. Had we retained public ownership, and with the same prices for electricity, within a decade almost \$5 billion of debt could have been retired without having to sell ETSA. That is, we could have paid the debt and kept the state's silverware. Or, some of the money could have been used to provide relief for those families burnt every day by purchasing the most expensive electricity in the land.

Alternatively, some of the windfall profits could have been used to bolster South Australia's electricity generating capacity, creating some genuine competition in the market and thereby reducing the price of electricity. Instead we have had a massive transfer of money from South Australian electricity consumers to the shareholders of multinational companies.

In the face of this, the new energy minister Conlon does nothing but posture at the present time. I remind him that he was part of the Labor Party in opposition that supported the legislation that set up the national electricity market. In 1996, when the National Electricity (South Australia) Bill was debated by state parliament, the Democrats were the only ones to oppose it. Indeed the Labor opposition supported the legislation to the extent that it went through all stages of debate in both houses in just three sitting days. I commented at the time that 'it must be record time for such a radical reform'.

At the time of that debate I predicted that large users of electricity would be the winners from these market reforms and that has been the case. Those lower down the feeding chain—small businesses and domestic consumers—have been the losers. I raised my concerns then that the national electricity bill and the other bills we were debating during that week were precursors to privatisation. The Labor Party supported those bills, despite being opposed to the privatisation of ETSA. Hence, it is little surprise that in government the ALP has been entirely clueless as to how to reverse the catastrophic impact of the spiralling price of electricity.

During the last election campaign the Labor Party made great play of its intention to increase the powers of the then electricity regulator. It promised to put in place protection for electricity consumers; it promised comprehensive plans to tackle South Australia's power price crisis. So in government it moved the Essential Services Commission Act, which established the Essential Services Commissioner as the new industry regulator. In fact, the new industry regulator is like the old industry regulator: impotent in regard to the generation and retail market. Granted, there is a little more transparency due to the price justification regime, but there has been no relief from the outrageously high prices for electricity in this state. Indeed, the government admitted as much in the second reading explanation to that bill last year in stating:

This government inherited these price supply and reliability problems. Our first response has been to call a halt to any further privatisation of government assets. Our second response is to consider how price, supply and reliability problems in essential services can be addressed. Our choices in this regard are effectively limited to ensuring that the regulatory regime is sufficiently directed and powerful.

With transmission and distribution systems being monopolies, it is of course the market sections of the industry—retail and generation—that have driven the unjustifiable increases in the price of electricity in South Australia. The theory of deregulation was that when higher prices eventuated it would act as a signal to attract new generation into the market, thereby driving down the price of electricity. Yet, despite massive increases in the price of electricity in South Australia, there are no plans for any significant new base load or intermediate generation. The only new generation being built in South Australia is the wind farms and that is not because of market forces but rather it is driven by the federal government's mandated renewable energy targets. Further, these wind farms, as welcome as they are from an environmental perspective, will place little or no downward pressure on the price of electricity in South Australia.

The Labor Party made its support of the Riverlink interconnector a central part of its election campaign. The recent ACCC decision to regulate the Murraylink interconnector has effectively ended Riverlink as a likely addition to the state's generation capacity. South Australian electricity consumers will now have the dubious pleasure of ensuring that the operators of Murraylink turn a guaranteed profit on the operation. The promise of Riverlink providing relief from the high prices is now dead.

So, what is to be done? We need to drive down the price of electricity. Despite government reluctance to take the bull by the horns, there are possibilities that must be seriously considered. As a first option, government must investigate the possibility of investing in new base load generation plant as a means of pulling down prices to reasonable levels. Labor acknowledged as much in its election materials, stating:

Ultimately more acceptable power prices will come from having increased supply of power, particularly base-load power and increased competition. If the market is not going to provide that competition, then the government may have to.

The US state of Montana might provide a pertinent example here. Sharon Beder records in her book *Power Play* that Montana deregulated its electricity industry in 1997. This saw electricity prices soar, resulting four years later in the Montana state government setting up a public power authority to construct a new generating plant for the delivery of electricity at a regulated price. Beder states that the price of electricity dropped immediately.

I recently attended the opening of the Starfish Hill wind farm and chief among the invited guests was the Queensland minister for energy. Why was the Queensland minister for energy there? He was there because Tarong Energy, which operates these new generating assets in South Australia, is owned by the Queensland government. The argument put forward by our former Liberal government, that the NEM was too risky for government to be involved in, is shown as the lie that it always was by the fact that, five and a half years on from John Olsen's announcing his government's intention to privatise our electricity assets, the Queensland government retains ownership of its electricity assets. Given the privatisation debacle we are now in, with no immediate prospect of control, there is a supreme irony that the latest addition to South Australia's electricity supply is publicly owned, albeit by the Queensland government.

I remind members of the government that the Hon. Kevin Foley, then shadow treasurer and now our state's Deputy Premier, said on 29 May 1996, whilst supporting the National Electricity (South Australia) Bill:

I hope that over time this Government and future Governments will acknowledge and understand the very important need to maintain our own electricity generating capacity in this State. We must never forego the ability to generate our own electricity.

He further stated:

Through whatever means are available we should continue to be creative and use all available options to develop generating capacity in this State.

That is something the Democrats agree with. Another option available to government to address the electricity problems we now face is the abolition of the single price pool. In fact, this happened in 1997 in the United Kingdom, birthplace of the single price pool, when it became apparent that price manipulation by the generators made the pool unworkable. With nearly 40 generators supplying electricity to the UK pool, they could not make it work. Indeed, the evidence is that it needs about 200 generators competing to make the pool workable and that is simply impossible in Australia. Other commentators have similar misgivings about the pool mechanism. The following quote is from a local publication, *Power Politics*, edited by John Spoehr. In writing about the South Australian situation, he says:

The pool pricing mechanism is flawed and dangerously susceptible to manipulation. Competition from remote generators is limited by interconnection capacity and increases in that capacity are some years away. In any event, pool prices are equally open to manipulation in the other NEM regions. A fundamental rethink of the NEM design is likely to be required if consumers are to see any real long-term benefit, either in South Australia or the NEM as a whole.

A third option, which government needs to consider, is withdrawing from the national electricity market altogether and the reregulating of the generation and retailing of electricity in South Australia.

The Democrats understand that these are radical options and that they must be addressed in a considered manner. But considered they must be, because the government cannot allow South Australian electricity consumers to continue to be fleeced. In 1996, in responding to the second reading debate on the National Electricity (South Australia) Bill, the then infrastructure minister John Olsen said:

We want to ensure that any investment in industry in South Australia has access to electricity at competitive prices equal to that in any other state in Australia to ensure that we do not impact on investment decisions for South Australia in the future. More importantly than that, in a national context we want to ensure that industry in this state is able to compete competitively internationally.

Those sentiments are as valid today as they were in 1996, except that the Liberals got it wrong in how they set about achieving it, and we now have the worst power prices in Australia. So, what do we do? The first thing we need to do is to get all the facts on the table. As I said at the beginning of my speech, that is why the government needs to set up a powerful, properly resourced, independent committee of experts. Should we do nothing, we will fail the South Australian people. This state cannot afford the drain of hundreds of millions of dollars out of the local economy for overpriced power.

The committee that I am suggesting will need to investigate all aspects of the operation of electricity in South Australia. Companies will have to expose revenues, supply costs and profit margins to thorough examination. The operation of the pool would be examined minutely. The regulated sectors of the industry would also need to be put under the microscope. Experts from all fields would be called upon.

This parliament is full of people from both government and opposition who are responsible for this dismal situation. It is now time for them to consider how past mistakes can be righted. The Liberals really have no choice but to back such a committee. Equally, government ministers must stop behaving as though their hands are tied. This state government will need great courage to implement meaningful reform of this industry, but it is a challenge that it must not ignore. Quite simply, South Australians cannot afford it.

The Hon. IAN GILFILLAN: I support the motion and, in doing so, thank the Lieutenant-Governor on representing the Governor in his opening address to the Third Session of the Fiftieth South Australian Parliament. I begin by reflecting on some of the observations that the Lieutenant-Governor made in his contribution. With due respect to the Lieutenant-Governor, I cannot share the euphemistic tone of the material which was presented to him to deliver as his speech and which covered several areas.

First, this government has played on the fears of the community but has done nothing that will make the streets safer. It has enacted the 'twin prisons policy'—that is, build more prisons for criminals and encourage the level of fear in the community to grow, making people feel like prisoners in their own homes. Secondly, this government has decided that South Australia is too risky to invest in. By dogmatically selling South Australia short, it has put at risk the future prosperity of our state. Thirdly, this government has procrastinated on the issue of genetically engineered crops. It has failed to introduce legislation to safeguard our farming communities, despite agreeing that these GE crops pose a considerable risk. Fourthly, this government, after promising that there would be no more privatisation, has announced a multimillion dollar public-private partnership for six police stations and four courthouses. Honourable members will recall that I raised this issue in a question today.

Before I go on to another area that I will discuss further in my contribution—that is, privacy in the public domain—I will look a little more closely at financial accountability. The Lieutenant-Governor indicated that the government will continue its commitment to financial accountability. This troubles me, because the actions arising from this commitment are greatly misdirected. Currently, any public project of \$4 million needs cabinet approval and is referred to the Public Works Committee. Yet, in his speech, the Lieutenant-Governor indicated that the government will be introducing legislation to remove this requirement.

I ask: where is the financial accountability in removing the mandatory reference to the Public Works Committee of public projects costing taxpayers up to \$10 million? The government also seems to be continuing with its policy of not borrowing money. It sees this as evidence of its fiscal responsibility. Further, the Treasurer is at great pains to tell us that South Australia has to have a AAA credit rating. I heard him—

The Hon. Sandra Kanck interjecting:

The Hon. IAN GILFILLAN: Yes, indeed, a good observation by my colleague—on radio and was amazed at how passionately he advocated that we had to have a AAA rating, but he failed to say what benefit South Australia would derive from it. I make the observation to the Treasurer that maybe it is time to consider a simple lesson in economics. The benefit from a AAA rating is in financing debt—and that is it. It makes the cost of financing debt cheaper, but we are currently governed by a government that is absolutely

determined not to have any continuing debt, thereby curtailing the expenditure on public facilities and benefits to the people of South Australia.

I point out that the difference in cost between financing a responsible level of debt with a AA rating and a AAA rating is small on a relative scale. Further, a move to a AAA rating will affect only future financing arrangements and not the existing ones. So, one is forced to ask: if we do not intend to use the credit rating for debt, why bother chasing the AAA holy grail?

The Democrats believe that, for the long-term benefit of the state, the government would be better to place its AAA aspirations on hold and, instead, allow a degree of responsible borrowing and to invest that strategically in South Australian infrastructure. It is interesting to observe that the Economic Growth Summit acknowledged this and made that finding quite plain in its report. It also made the observation that it saw the Labor government's obsession with debt as irrational.

It is irresponsible for this government to try to convince the public that all we have to do is to get the AAA rating and the future of this state will suddenly be rosy. By doing this, it is diverting money from other areas of government and selling out the future. If the government is not prepared to invest in South Australia, who will? It is interesting to make the observation that the younger citizens who are in the gallery (to whom I know I should not refer) may very well be paying for the cost of the policy of transferring public debt to the privatisation and then the rental of property. In fact, that is a disguise for debt, because the rent eventually transforms into an ongoing cost to future citizens, who will not thank the government for its short-sighted and erroneous determination to privatise public assets. However, I was distracted and probably should not have made that observation; nonetheless, it is probably valid.

To establish genuine economic development, the government has to provide the infrastructure that will give businesses the confidence to operate in South Australia. The Treasurer seems to forget that the government is responsible to the people of South Australia and not to those at Standard and Poor's. John Spoehr, the Executive Director of the Centre for Labour Research at Adelaide University, and John Quiggin, who is a professor of economics at the University of Queensland, recently wrote on this topic in the *Adelaide Review* as follows:

It is time for the state government to use its capacity to borrow on favourable terms to modernise our social and economic infrastructure and thus help to ensure a more prosperous future for all South Australians.

The previous government was hamstrung by the view that public sector borrowings would harm South Australia's financial position, rather create the conditions for improving it—an unfortunate legacy perpetuated by misconceptions about the economic and financial benefits for improved credit ratings.

The strategic challenge for the Rann government is to recognise that minimal public investment will harm its intended higher rates of productivity, employment and economic growth. A focused public infrastructure investment strategy using borrowings is likely to result in a structural improvement in the state budget over the medium term—which will also result in improvement of the state's credit rating.

The first step for the state government is to act upon the Economic Development Board proposal for a review of the government's 'zero' net borrowing policy.

I believe this highlights the obsession of this government. I have spoken of this ghost of Labor's past before, and I will continue to do so until the government stops its fiscally irresponsible and dogmatic approach to the state's develop-

ment and instead puts the future of South Australia ahead of its own concerns about re-election.

I now want to make a few more observations about genetically engineered crops. As honourable members would well know, this is an issue that has exercised my interest and concern for many months; in fact, it is now getting into years. Although we have yet to see the legislation, the Democrats have great misgivings about the model the government has chosen for dealing with the commercial release of genetically modified (I would prefer to call it 'engineered') crops in South Australia. The commonwealth Office of the Gene Technology Regulator has already approved the release of a variety of GE canola developed by Bayer CropScience, and the approval of the release of Monsanto's Roundup Ready canola appears to be just around the corner.

Although the new season of canola will not be planted until next year, the fact that we currently have no legislation in South Australia that will safeguard the supply chain from being contaminated with GE crops is troubling. The Lieutenant-Governor and the minister have both indicated that the government will be introducing legislation to the parliament soon. With five sitting weeks left this year, I urge the minister to immediately reveal his draft legislation for us to consider, even before it is introduced into this place.

The government has chosen to accept the recommendations of the select committee that inquired into genetically modified organisms. These recommendations recognise the value that would arise from growing GE free crops, so much so that it recommended that Kangaroo Island and Eyre Peninsula be completely quarantined from the commercial release use of GE crops, on the proviso that a plebiscite of the farming community approved it. In both cases, I have little doubt that they would.

However, the rest of the state is left to fend for itself. I note here that, prior to the last election, Labor promised to establish GE free zones not only in these two locations but also in the Adelaide Hills. I therefore challenge the government to extend this quarantine to the Hills and, really, if common sense prevailed, to the whole of the state. Our main concern with the proposed model is that it would leave the decision to allow the commercial release of GE crops in South Australia in the hands of the minister.

I recognise that recommendation 3 of the select committee report recommended as follows:

The select committee on GMOs recommends that:

Before the commercial release of a GM crop could be permitted, three conditions must be met.

1. Industry must be able to guarantee coexistence to meet market demands for different classes of crops and products (e.g. GM free, non-GM and GM).

2. This must be done through the establishment of rigorous and cost-effective segregation and IP systems throughout the total production and supply chain which must cover pre-farm, on farm and post farm activities, protect from both direct and indirect contamination, include a rigorous paper trail, and cover by-products of GM crops.

3. The segregation and IP systems must be agreed upon by the whole of the production and supply chain.

However, there is a wide ranging debate in the industry on what is required to maintain the integrity of GE and non-GE crops in a system of coexistence. In its application for commercial release of Roundup Ready canola, Monsanto recommends a 10-metre buffer zone between GE and non-GE crops. Incidentally, as Monsanto's application is for canola, we know that there is extensive drift of pollen far wider than the 10 metres—and possibly up to 10 kilometres—while evidence from on the ground in Canada suggests that the 10-

metre buffer zone is a farce. In fact, the experience in Canada shows that coexistence in itself is just not feasible. It has completely contaminated their canola crop, so they cannot now market any acceptable non-GE canola. The important question left unanswered is: what criteria will be used by the minister as a measuring stick in assessing whether the industry is 'able to guarantee coexistence to meet market demands for different classes of crops and products'.

I now turn to the issue of privacy, a subject which is becoming more and more critical in the community today and in the world at large. I make the observation that I listened to a program on Radio National last week in which Philip Adams chaired a panel of Australian and international commissioners on privacy. They focused very significantly on the risk to quality of life that citizens are becoming more and more prone to through the erosion of what we have taken for granted in the past in relation to privacy.

Members who have been paying attention in this place will recognise that, on occasion, I have mentioned the theft of public space, notably parklands. I am concerned about something even more esoteric than open space, that is, the theft of personal private space. To use a metaphor, it is widely known that a frog in a saucepan of hot water will jump straight back out again. The same frog will swim around blithely if that water is slowly increased in temperature until the frog's untimely death by boiling. That, I believe, is symbolic of our community today where, bit by bit, there is a gradual incremental loss of privacy. I do not believe that any of us want to be the frog victim under those circumstances. In recent times, we have given up a lot of our privacy, but it has happened very slowly. New technologies have given snoopers unprecedented access into our lives and, in many cases, we are not aware of it, and we certainly have not been smart enough to respond. It is now time for us to look at it critically.

In relation to workplace privacy, employees are routinely told that their email communications are being monitored, as is their internal internet access and, in many cases, even their telephone calls are logged and monitored. I have no doubt that some members would feel comfortable about this, but I certainly am not. I am uncomfortable for two reasons: first, we are all aware that employers are expecting people to work longer hours and, in many cases, those extra hours are unpaid. It means that people have less time to manage their private lives and have fleeting access to recreation. I think that, in Australia, South Australia is at the forefront for employees giving extra time to their working hours.

If we must accept this encroachment on our private time as a normal fact of business and employment, we should also, as a matter of quid pro quo, make some concessions. If employees cannot access banks during those extended working hours, it is entirely appropriate for them to use the internet to do so. If they cannot keep up with friends, it is entirely appropriate that they should exchange some emails for personal reasons. It is especially appropriate when you consider that the marginal cost of an email is effectively zero, unlike a telephone call, which always costs at least 25¢. Some would still argue that private communications should be scrutinised by employers because they take place on an employer's equipment. I do not agree with that analysis. It is unacceptable to me that someone's personal messages should be scrutinised just because they can be. I would challenge every member to consider how they would feel if outside entities, such as the media, had access to their every com-

munication through whatever means available in this place, such as email, telephone, fax, or whatever else one uses.

This brings me to the worst aspect of workplace monitoring. Employers are placing cameras in workplaces to spy on employees. I am very concerned, because I feel that it is not a good form of intrusion into what I regard as the precious privacy of individuals in our community. The sense of oppression in an environment monitored by cameras 24 hours a day is a palpable thing. Everyone works with the weight of other people's eyes over their shoulders. Under constant observation, everyone is diminished. Management texts advise people to treat their employees like respected citizens, but, instead, we find people are being treated as criminals.

Workplaces become prisons, debate is stifled, creativity dulled, and every employee tends to become angry and hostile to their employer. And that is an undesirable outcome. The intrusion into people's lives is happening in the public arena as well. In London, people are monitored by cameras wherever they go. London has the highest density of closed circuit TV cameras in the world. Season tickets for the railways monitor every entry and exit from a station, and this data is linked to the credit card of the ticket holder. The railways have recently admitted that they keep this data for some considerable time.

We are no doubt considering smartcard systems ourselves, as they have a number of positive benefits, but the thought that these could be used to monitor the movement of all citizens in South Australia who use public transport is an unacceptable concept. We are heading towards a future where speed cameras may be in operation at every intersection. I have no objection to the intended use of these devices, that is, to catch people who break speed limits, but they record an image of a vehicle, including its registration number, and I am advised that it is a trivial task for a computer system to find the registration number in a picture of a vehicle and then save that registration number into a database. If this is not already being done in South Australia, it is only a matter of time before it will be.

Of course, the cameras only record the images of speeding cars or cars that run red lights now. Where video cameras monitor traffic conditions, the same thing can be done. How do members feel about their movements being tracked through traffic cameras? Does it make us feel more or less safe? I admit that this possibility disturbs me: not because I fear that this government necessarily will abuse the information possibilities offered but because of the potential that somewhere, some time, someone, either government, individual or department, will be tempted. In the United States, criminals have monitored the output of closed circuit cameras to case buildings before burglaries. This turns out to be a very simple technology hack. All they need is a radio receiver and a TV card in their lap top computer.

Similarly, many closed circuit systems transmit information across networks, sometimes even across the internet. Information transmitted is information that can be intercepted. All it takes is someone with a little equipment and time on their hands. A new device that has been attracting attention for itself recently in the press is the radio frequency identity device, or RFID. These tiny computer chips send information about themselves to the outside world. They are an absolute boon to a farmer or livestock manager who wants to set up automated feeding stations to deliver specific supplements to individual animals. Obviously, there are other practical advantages of this system in the rural sector, but they are also a marvellous way for a manufacturer to keep

track of stock that moves from place to place within their inventory system.

For a secure organisation such as the military or the police they are an effective way to track the location of important files or pieces of equipment. They even allow stores to know exactly what item has been sold and when. But there is a downside to these whiz bang technologies. What happens if you buy a new tie or scarf that contains one of these devices concealed in the seam and then walk down the street? Every time you pass a scanning device—and typically these devices would be in shop doorways, but hand-held scanners already exist—someone learns something about you and your movements. Recently, Benetton announced in Europe that it would be using RFIDs in all its clothing, and there was a sudden consumer backlash against that company. And rightly so.

Do we as citizens want everyone eventually to be able to find out which restaurant we visited or when we went to the doctor, and which doctor? It would be very rare that any citizen would not ever make visits that they do not want the whole world to know about. I would say it would be truly a remarkable person who has no private moments, circumstances or situations that they want to remain private. And that is the essence of privacy and the retention of the protection of privacy. This is where we see this insidious invasion of the computer world. It is very easy to store information and make links from one data source to another, and the sooner we as a community and this parliament realise the potential for the destruction of privacy through this technology, often presented with the benign face of improving the apprehension of criminals, facilitating the tracking of manufactured products or livestock, the better.

We would be ignoring our responsibility if we did not focus very strongly on the potential downside of these privacy matters. As for genetic privacy, which links with DNA, I want to comment on what I see as the government's delight (particularly that of the Attorney-General) with DNA databases and its apparent zeal to increase the size of these databases. Using tired old catchphrases like 'if you've done nothing wrong, you have nothing to fear,' the 'big brother' advocates are trying to persuade us to adopt this technology with manic zeal. I must make the comment that it has been and will be a very useful tool in the apprehension of criminals, some of whom, after many years, are being shown to have been guilty of offences for which up to this point they have been able to elude capture.

We owe it to the community—not just the contemporary community but the community in the future—to look critically at the potential for the misuse and erroneous uses of the DNA whiz bang technology. We ought to recognise that, as previously with blood typing and fingerprinting, the technology can be prone to failure. The question must be asked: how hard is it to fake DNA evidence to frame someone for a crime? In the simplest form, it is trivial beyond belief—collect from someone a few hairs from their hairbrush or an article of clothing from any source that is available, even from a rubbish bin. It is easily done by anyone with access to someone else's home, in these days of shared housing, which is a day-to-day reality for many people. A crime scene could be seeded with DNA in this fashion by any thief or intending thief.

It is only when we look at the possibilities offered by someone with resources that the DNA evidence becomes really chilling. Dr David Berryman from Murdoch University has outlined the simple method for contaminating a crime

scene. Step 1: get a sample of someone's DNA; for example, from a toothbrush. Step 2: place the sample in the DNA profiling kit and vary the kit's temperature for a few hours. Step 3: put the now vastly multiplied DNA sample into a spray bottle. Step 4: spray DNA from a bottle around a crime scene, and voila—a crime scene is now totally contaminated with someone else's DNA. Thus, the potential is there to defeat the DNA evidence if someone has a mind to.

What of the possibility of two people having the same DNA? It is a rare thing, but it is not a unique situation. First, anyone who has an identical sibling shares 100 per cent of that person's DNA. Secondly, we do not identify a person's full DNA profile. We identify only a series of genetic markers to identify that person's DNA. And what does that mean? In a population the size of Australia's, we would always expect a minimum of two people to share the same markers. In some racial groups we would expect even lower genetic diversity, giving a higher rate of false positive matches.

I would like to identify a fundamental reason why I am concerned with the collection and storage of DNA profiles. The larger the database, the greater the likelihood of people being falsely accused and also of the system being misused. In this society we do not subscribe to the Code Napoleon, where a person is considered guilty unless they can prove their innocence. Everyone knows that DNA evidence is compelling. Unfortunately, this is a case where the fact that everyone knows does not necessarily make it true. Imagine the fate of someone who has matching DNA markers with those found at a crime scene. Imagine their situation when they cannot prove that it was not them.

What I am expressing in this observation, through our concern as Democrats, is that the extensive collection of a partial DNA database is not a guaranteed, 100 per cent, never-failing system for crime detection. However, it does offer an enormous range of opportunity for breaking down the personal privacy of each individual in our community. I am intending to draft some legislation, which, generically, I would like to call 'the Democrat privacy suite', and I think that I have already explained some of the reasons at least why I believe that these bills will be necessary in this parliament. I think it is time to take a stand against unwarranted intrusion into people's lives.

I am foreshadowing the introduction of a workplace privacy bill to reduce the employer's ability to collect information on an employee. I will be looking to introduce a public privacy bill, which will regulate the use of data collected through cameras and scanners in public areas, and I am foreshadowing the introduction of a genetic privacy bill, which will place strict limits on the collection and storage of DNA profiles. I feel that it is significant for us now to start to address seriously what our community can develop into if we do not put in the checks and balances to ensure that we as citizens can continue to have and enjoy the privacy to which every individual is entitled, yet not exclude the advantages of some of the beneficial technologies which have become available to us. With those observations, I support the Address in Reply.

The Hon. KATE REYNOLDS: I rise to speak to the Address in Reply and thank the Lieutenant Governor for delivering the opening speech for the current session of parliament. The Address in Reply provides an opportunity for members to highlight issues which sometimes fail to capture the attention of the government, the parliament or even the

general public. It also provides the timely opportunity to address those issues from the too-hard basket which sometimes slip off the government's agenda, particularly when it appears to be transfixed by the view of the credit rating agencies, so today I will speak about poverty.

Poverty is about people's lives being affected by constant frustration, stress or worry because of their low income. In affluent countries such as Australia, poverty is related to inequality. Inequality leads to deprivation, isolation, ill-health, poor relationships, low self-esteem, loss of choice, loss of opportunity, loss of social cohesion and loss of community capacity—the language of social exclusion.

While the federal government has a major role to play in preventing poverty among Australians, state and territory governments and, to some degree, local governments also share that responsibility. I draw members' attention to the fact that earlier today National Anti-Poverty Week was launched in Adelaide with an event held at the Torrens Building. Sadly, the Australian Democrats were the only parliamentary party represented. This first ever anti-poverty week aims to strengthen public understanding of the causes and consequences of poverty and hardship around the world, in Australia and South Australia, and encourages research, discussion and action to address these problems. It will encourage action by individuals, communities, organisations and governments, and I congratulate the organisers and the speakers who put strong cases for government to address the growing gap between the obscenely wealthy, the well-off, the poor and the marginalised.

In industrialised countries, poverty and inequality are fundamentally tied to adequacy of income. The success of state level action on poverty will be aided or impeded by federal income security policy. The current income security system by international comparison is a solid and active system (if we discount the impact of harsh penalty regimes, but that is a subject for another day). Understanding the social and cultural context in which poverty occurs, not just the material and financial factors, is critical if governments are genuine about making a substantial policy and program response to individual, family and community hardship. The SACOSS submission to the parliament's Social Development Committee's poverty inquiry said:

The images that come to mind when people think about poverty typically include malnourished children and their families living with inadequate food, clothing, shelter, and running water.

This is referred to as absolute poverty because life's basic necessities are not being met, a characteristic typical of many of the poorest third world countries. Poverty in the industrialised nations is not often conceptualised in this manner but rather is referred to as relative to the living standards of the rest of the population.

Relative poverty occurs when a group of people are unable to participate in the full life of the community due to inadequate income. Most researchers now agree that a relative measure of poverty based on average earnings is more appropriate because it reflects the living standards of the rest of the population and avoids the value judgments involved in defining 'adequacy' and the composition of a basket of goods and services that is required in the formulation of an absolute poverty line. Both types of poverty are typically identified by applying a 'poverty line' to the distribution of incomes across the nation.

Defining and measuring poverty are far removed from the concerns of a person or a family battling a life of daily hardship. To them poverty means not being able to withstand

unexpected but common occurrences such as sudden illness, the breakdown of a hot water service, an accident or the repair of a fence. It means disappointing their children with no treats and no birthday party, or the children having to go into a strange class because they cannot afford the school camp. It means dropping out of team sports, no regular haircuts, moving house frequently, no car insurance, no meals out and poor health care.

The Social Development Committee's poverty inquiry received evidence about a range of services and programs aimed at reducing poverty and lessening the impact on younger generations. The inquiry's report stated:

It is clear, however, that poverty and the risk of inter-generational poverty remain significant issues in some sectors of Adelaide's communities. Furthermore, many strategies tend to be reactive rather than preventative.

The Social Development Committee proposed that there should be a major shift in emphasis towards early childhood intervention and prevention in the approach to poverty and stated:

Early childhood intervention initiatives have been shown to reap significant benefits as well as economic savings in the long term. . . evidence suggests that inter-generational poverty can be cyclic and self-perpetuating. While there continues to be the need for some services to be targeted towards crisis intervention and interventions to remedy existing problems, future strategies should focus on the phase of the cycle that will efficiently and effectively reap the greatest benefits. Evidence clearly suggests that greater focus should be placed on early childhood intervention and prevention and on improving parenting skills.

The committee recommended that, in order to address poverty in the long term, there must be a commitment by all stakeholders and political parties to ensure that goals and strategies are not limited to the agenda or life of only one government or party.

The report identified that South Australia lacks a coordinated approach to poverty and has no overarching state policy or strategy to reduce poverty in the long term. It stated that other countries such as Ireland have achieved success through implementation of such policies and strategies. In Ireland, the establishment of a 'Combat Poverty Agency', with responsibility for implementing their national anti-poverty strategy, led to a reduction in poverty by nearly two-thirds from 1994 to 2000. In relation to inter-generational poverty, the committee found a range of anecdotal evidence on inter-generational poverty in Adelaide and abundant research from developed nations, including Australia, that there is an increased risk of lifelong poverty amongst children growing up in poverty. And we know that poverty is not confined to the city and urban South Australia. Some rural and regional communities experience continual or cyclical poverty on a scale that is probably way beyond the comprehension of some of the well, well-off, and well-connected urban dwelling members of this parliament.

The report stated that it was clear that the state's resources had been disproportionately focused on crisis management where the cost of significant outcomes in terms of poverty reduction was relatively high. Evidence also showed that the cycle of poverty was often interconnected with early and sole parenthood. There is a distinct lack of support for young sole mothers, especially to assist them to continue with education to improve their long-term employment prospects. The report found there was a need to better link education and training strategies with sustainable employment.

Training strategies would struggle to achieve significant outcomes for the population as a whole unless economic

policies and strategies stimulated job growth, including within local areas experiencing economic and social disadvantage. While it was imperative that all schools provided a full range of equitable opportunities for students, there was also a clear need for better communication between industry and schools to ensure that future job vacancies could be accessed by local communities. Local industries should be able to provide opportunities for local school leavers who do not wish—or, under this federal Liberal government, who increasingly cannot afford—to pursue higher education.

The Social Development Committee determined that the level of income available to people who were unable to work or unable to find work was clearly inadequate, given increasing living costs, including recent electricity price increases. The Australian Democrats support the view of SACOSS that all South Australians have the right to live a decent life. This includes having somewhere to live, food and clothes, access to employment, justice, education and health, having enough money, feeling safe, being able to get around and having access to information and services.

Underpinning any anti-poverty policy must be a strong commitment to developing good social policy for South Australia. A key change over the past two decades has been an increase in poverty amongst the aged. This is reflected in this state, where currently 56 per cent of single people over 65 now live in poverty, compared to 5.3 per cent in 1981-82. A number of recent studies also provide evidence that the effects of poverty are more profound for children in jobless families than for those in low income families where one or both parents are engaged in some employment, even where income levels are similar.

We know that families battling poverty need significantly more help to reduce the incidence of child abuse and neglect, and we cannot expect children at risk to wait patiently for the government's response to the Layton report. Members who take an interest in such unsexy issues as poverty would know that Ferrymen Park in the western suburbs was recently identified as the poorest suburb nationally, with 28.7 per cent of residents living in homes where the head of the household was unemployed and 27.2 per cent of adults and 36.9 per cent of children lived below the poverty line.

Industry experts interviewed as part of the poverty inquiry have reported increasing demand for services over the past five years and expressed concern over their inability to meet genuine demand. The increasing problem has also led to greater wear and tear in schools in disadvantaged areas as well as increased stress on teachers in those schools, as the Australian Education Union continues to highlight. The poverty inquiry's report chapter titled 'Demand for services and resources' states that a number of contributors to the inquiry commented on the impact of public policies that have resulted in cuts to public and community services funding, causing a number of services to struggle to respond to even basic community needs. SACOSS and Shelter SA argue that insufficient affordable housing supply policies have caused increased homelessness and have increased the demand for emergency accommodation.

Another key issue identified through the report was the difficulty for many low income people in meeting added costs associated with education, including those for adults wishing to return to study or training and families in poverty attempting to meet education costs for school aged children. For these families the main issues were the lack of money for direct educational resources such as fees and books but also money for other requirements such as school lunches, school

uniforms or excursions. Recommendations in the poverty inquiry report included the importance of early childhood intervention; the need for long-term holistic and preventive approaches; the need to address structural factors; a focus on social inclusion and community capacity building; the need for multi-agency and multi-sector collaboration, especially between the education, health and welfare sectors; and the importance of service continuity, longevity and evaluation.

The challenge for the state to address poverty was again highlighted by the newly released figures from the Roy Morgan research survey, which showed that thousands of South Australians are still living well below the poverty line. That research showed that a South Australian family of four spends \$647 a week on basics, which leaves unemployed parents reliant on social security payments \$128 short. Pam Simmons, the Executive Director of SACOSS, said in response to the survey that the shortfall was the difference between two meals and three a day. It also counts out going to the show or the football, and home ownership is a sick joke.

SACOSS has welcomed recent announcements for new services to prevent homelessness but, like the Australian Democrats, SACOSS has repeatedly called for a more comprehensive approach to alleviating the worst impacts of inadequate income. This includes measures such as affordable housing, a freeze on rising TAFE fees, more job assistance and an increase in electricity concessions. Pam Simmons said:

If we think it's tough for young aspiring home owners to buy their first home, think of the struggling family falling short by over \$100 every week.

Mr President, I remind you and all honourable members that research by SACOSS and the Social Policy Research Group of the University of South Australia way back in 2001 shows that poverty and inequality are continuing to rise in this state and have actually doubled since 1982. The Democrats and social welfare organisations have been calling for the government to establish a social policy council, with the same clout as the Economic Development Board, to provide advice to cabinet and develop a new social strategy for the state.

SACOSS and its member organisations highlight in their 2002-03 budget submission that the most urgent issue identified by front line community health and welfare agencies is the increasing depth of poverty and the rising numbers of people vulnerable to extreme hardship. South Australia is the lowest income state in Australia. We have the dubious honour of having less inequality than the other states, because we have relatively more low income earners and relatively few high income earners. Since 1981 the rate and depth of poverty has increased in South Australia, in line with the rest of the nation. Single people and sole parents report higher rates of poverty in this state and sole parent households experience the greatest depth of poverty once housing costs are considered.

The federal government's latest welfare breaching laws are hitting hard at those who can least afford it. In many instances the breaches are unintentional, but the penalties are severe. It is well past the time for the state and federal governments to act on the poverty traps caused by poor welfare and tax policy and unwieldy funding regimes. The Democrats have been telling governments for years that their policies are creating a disincentive for those seeking to get off welfare.

The federal government knows that reform is needed in the interaction of the welfare and tax systems. The best way

to provide tax cuts to all Australians is simply to increase the tax-free threshold. The Democrats provided details of a tax cut plan that raised the tax-free threshold so that tax cuts would benefit all working Australians equally. This could reduce the high effective marginal tax rates by 17 per cent. We presented this fully costed option to the government before the federal budget and again following the Howard government's last tax cut announcement, but the poverty trap is not limited to those receiving welfare benefits. Since 1996 approximately 60 per cent of new jobs created since the mid 1980s have been in low paid casual sectors. Just 8 per cent of new jobs created in the past two years were full-time, while the other 92 per cent were part-time. We are seeing a decrease in job and economic security for many employed Australians, showing a worrying trend away from full-time work towards part-time and casual work.

Tax measures which will help the increasing number of working poor in Australia should be embraced by the government, because poverty and disadvantage are no longer confined to those on welfare. The new working poor, Australia's latest economic casualties, have little or no job security because of part-time and casual work, are paid low wages and have great difficulty making ends meet. The Democrats have consistently argued that maintaining or raising the living standards of low income wage earners is less effective if addressed principally through the Australian Industrial Relations Commission in isolation from tax and welfare policy.

For the employee, for every dollar increase in wages, low income workers can lose up to 70¢ in welfare benefits. Since they have to pay 17¢ income tax as well, this can lead to a crippling effective tax rate of 87¢ in the dollar. This situation is desperate for people who are already struggling, and very little is being done by the Howard government to address the problems because the Howard government has steadily absolved itself of responsibility for all manner of social and community services.

We have seen the federal government outsource its employment services to church and charity groups and now it is doing the same thing with basic necessities like employment, education and health. At a state level, the Rann government is persisting with competitive procurement regimes for essential community services—regimes which are shown to actually reduce cooperation between government and non-government service providers.

The Australian Democrats were seriously disappointed that the Lieutenant-Governor's speech made no mention of any plans to develop an anti-poverty strategy for this state. In fact, it did not even mention the report of the South Australian parliament's Social Development Committee's poverty inquiry, tabled on 14 May—five months ago. In good faith, 30 organisations and individuals made submissions to the parliament about how to address poverty in this state. Committee members and staff spent many hours deliberating and preparing their recommendations. The report was tabled in parliament in May 2003, but the government is yet to respond. The gap between government rhetoric and reality is becoming increasingly obvious to the social welfare sector and remains glaringly obvious to the thousands of individuals and families struggling every day to put food on the table and to pay their essential bills.

I cannot talk about anti-poverty measures without making special mention of indigenous Australians. Infant mortality is still more than three times that of non-indigenous Australians; nearly one in ten indigenous young people either do

not attend school or leave before they turn 14; job seeking is often a fruitless task; housing is the poorest in the nation and the loss of language, identity and cultural heritage is immeasurable.

I must acknowledge the plight of thousands of refugees in South Australia on temporary protection and bridging visas struggling just to survive, sometimes with no income, let alone build a new life far from the torment and persecution from which they fled. It is the role of a responsible government to set spending priorities to ensure that the infrastructure and basic necessities are in place to reduce poverty and inequality in this state, for all South Australians. If the Labor government's concern about a fair go for all actually means everybody, then it must take action on family support, concessions, education, training and housing right now, and not just prior to the next election.

Poverty and inequality breed individual and community anger, discontent, frustration, blame, cynicism, division and hostility. The Premier talks about social inclusion, yet five months later, we are yet to see any government response to the poverty inquiry. The critical challenge for this, and all future governments, until we start getting it right, is how to make life a little easier for people and families who are undeniably struggling with the every day expenses of a modest lifestyle.

In closing, the Australian Democrats call on the Rann government to acknowledge that there has been enough talk, and that what is now needed is a genuine public commitment followed by decisive action to reduce poverty in South Australia for both the short and long term. If the state is to reach the Economic Development Summit's vision of a prosperous South Australia, the government must reprioritise its spending to allow its poorest citizens to benefit from whatever prosperity we achieve. Without this, the state might be seen to be increasing its wealth but it will also be seen to be morally impoverished. Investment in people's lives and futures must move to the top of the government's agenda rather than a fixation with a AAA credit rating which is of little interest to anyone other than the credit rating agencies such as Standard and Poor's. The lives and futures of children who live in poverty depend on it. I support the Address in Reply.

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY (Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries): I thank members who have made a contribution to the Address in Reply. There are a few comments I would like to make in relation to issues that honourable members have raised in the debate. The Leader of the Opposition made a number of comments about the taking of points of order. In fact, in his address in reply speech, he said:

My point is that this is about trying to keep a government accountable. If opposition or non-government members cannot use the words 'serial misquoter', 'deceitful', 'dishonest' or whatever in attacking the government of the day, it is a serious inhibition on an opposition in terms of trying to keep a government accountable.

Similarly, the Leader of the Opposition made a number of claims in relation to that. I think it is worth referring to some statistics from the library. Let me first put in a caveat in relation to these statistics that it is not always clear from the *Hansard* record whether a point of order has been formally taken or whether that point of order has been upheld. Nevertheless, I think there is a pretty useful approximation in relation to it.

If we refer to the period February 2002 to the present, one can see the number of points of order that have been taken. The results are that for the ALP there were 34 points of order, of which 12 were upheld and 22 were denied. For the Liberal Party there were 31 points of order, of which 2 were upheld and 29 were denied. For the Democrats there was one point of order, which was denied. There were no points of order from Family First. There was one point of order, which was denied, from No Pokies. For the Independent/SA First there were two points of order, which were denied. So, from those statistics, one can hardly say that points of order have been having any inhibitive effect on debate within this chamber.

I think it is well known within most parliaments—and I have been following parliamentary debate for many years; I used to listen to federal parliament regularly—that points of order are very often taken as part of the debating tactics. I remember some classic cases in the federal parliament where points of order have been taken as much as anything to distract debate or to score a political point as part of the process. I guess they have been used as a legitimate tactic within debate in all parliaments in the past, but I certainly would say that there is absolutely no evidence that points of order have been used to stifle debate in this place.

In relation to the points of order that I have taken, there have not been a great deal. My concern is to protect other people who are not here to defend themselves. As far as I am concerned there should be robust debate in this parliament, and I am certainly not concerned about what is said in relation to me. I will give the Leader of the Opposition credit in that he is not one who is normally a squealer either in relation to these matters. I think that the parliament has to be careful to ensure that, if people who are outside the parliament are maligned and do not have the capacity to defend themselves, it is legitimate that the standing orders that we have to protect those people are upheld. I certainly would not accept the Leader of the Opposition's point that there has been any hindering of debate in this place. They are essentially the main points that the leader made in his contribution. I do not think I need to spend more time in relation to those.

The Hon. Caroline Schaefer made some points in relation to the agriculture portfolio. I think it is appropriate that I make a response to those points. In her address in reply the Hon. Caroline Schaefer referred to global economic conditions, calling them far from robust, and I wish to briefly respond to those comments. The World Bank has forecast a pickup in global growth from 2 per cent this year to 3 per cent in 2004. The US economy is set to grow at its quickest pace in four years during the second half of 2003 as corporate profits strengthen, business confidence picks up, the global economy improves and concerns over the war on terrorism recede.

The latest forecast is for the US economy to grow at 4 per cent in 2004. A decline in the value of the US dollar is reflective of a country with a huge deficit on its balance of payments. In the USA there is tentative evidence that employment is stabilising six months after official hostilities ended. The G7 countries have sent a clear message to countries such as China and Japan to allow more room for the markets to set their exchange rates, thus sharing the burden of US depreciation. There is a rather interesting discussion in *The Australian* today that canvasses some of those issues as to whether those arguments are more for US domestic consumption rather than for China and Japan. Nevertheless,

a decade of continuing strong growth in China is bullish for Australian commodity prices and volumes. The SARS crisis has not reignited, despite Asia heading into its more flu-prone winter months.

The longer-term outlook has been clouded by the collapse in September of the World Trade Organisation talks in Cancun, Mexico, after rich and poor nations failed to agree on trade reform. The setback is likely to further delay changes to trade, distorting farm support measures until after 2005, particularly hurting Australia's sugar, dairy, beef and sheep meat industries. In South Australia, retail spending has grown by 3.4 per cent in the year to June 2003, while employment grew by 3.7 per cent and motor vehicle sales were up by 18.5 per cent. The key growth industries were cars, wine, electronics and defence.

Prof. Richard Blandy has predicted the state's economy would continue to grow at a rate of 3.5 to 4 per cent, like the rest of the national economy. Business investment in South Australia had increased by 28.5 per cent over the past year, compared with a national average of 14 per cent. Early signs of an economic recovery in the US and Japan, coupled with strong demand from China, have raised expectations of solid earning growth for Australian companies in the 2004 financial year. Rising farm investment, an expected increase of about 25 per cent in grain production and a turnaround in rural jobs are expected to add up to 1 percentage point to gross domestic product this financial year, pushing the growth rate to about 3 per cent. In rural Australia drought conditions continue to abate.

The Australian wheat crop is estimated at around 24 million tonnes, with excellent conditions on the whole in South Australia and the potential for the second largest crop on record. South Australian grain production in 2003-04 is estimated to be 7.7 million tonnes at a value of \$1.5 billion on an estimated silo return basis, including \$4 million tonnes of wheat valued at more than \$700 million and 2.5 million tonnes of barley, valued at more than \$450 million. Interest rates at 4.75 per cent are conducive to investment in farm machinery, as evidenced at the recent field days at Paskeville. Reportedly, tractor sales are up 10 per cent on last year, with machinery dealers saying that sprayers, minimum tillage planters and grain storage and handling equipment have been sold out, particularly in broadacre areas, until after planting next year. World commodity prices are firm on the back of droughts in the European Union and central and eastern Europe, so there should be enough to compensate for a firming exchange rate against the US dollar which, despite a 30 per cent rise over the past two years, is still only back to about its long run average.

The US trade-weighted index has declined by about 20 per cent since its peak early in 2002. Combined with weakening in the Euro after its float in January 1999 and strength since January 2002, this has caused substantial volatility in and realignment of many currencies. One result has been the strengthening of the Australian dollar, a matter specifically raised by the shadow minister, against the currencies of most of its trading partners and competitors. I have a purely statistical table in relation to that, and I seek leave to have it incorporated in *Hansard*. It shows the movements against the Australian dollar of between 11 to 26 per cent by currencies of Australia's main trading partners over the past year. The exceptions are the Euro area, where it has been 5 per cent, and New Zealand, where it has been 2 per cent.

Leave granted.

Table 1: Currency movements against the \$US and \$A—8/10/02 to 8/10/03

Country	Currency unit	Currency Units per \$US			Currency units per \$AUS		
		8/10/02	8/10/03	% change	8/10/02	8/10/03	% change
United States	dollar	1.00	1.00	0	0.55	0.69	-26
New Zealand	dollar	2.07	1.67	19	1.13	1.15	-2
Euro Area	euro	1.02	0.85	17	0.56	0.58	-5
United Kingdom	pound	0.64	0.60	6	0.35	0.42	-18
Japan	yen	124.26	109.54	12	67.97	75.54	-11
South Korea	won	1254.00	1149.42	8	685.94	792.70	-16
China	renmimbi	8.28	8.28	0	4.53	5.71	-26
Singapore	dollar	1.79	1.72	4	0.98	1.19	-21
Hong Kong	dollar	7.80	7.73	1	4.27	5.33	-25
Australia	dollar	1.83	1.45	21	1.00	1.00	0
Argentina	peso	3.30	2.86	13	1.81	1.97	-9
Chile	peso	743.54	647.67	13	406.72	446.67	-10
South Africa	rand	10.53	6.84	35	5.76	4.72	18

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: Despite the SARS virus, terrorist fears and the growing disadvantage from the Australian dollar strengthening, Australian wine exports grew by 21 per cent in volume and 17 per cent in value over the year to August 2003. This represents a slowing in growth compared with the previous year, but a significant achievement nonetheless. South Australia remained the leader in wine export. It is noteworthy that growth was strongest in the US market, up 39 per cent in value and 50 per cent in volume for the year to August, despite the 26 per cent currency movement over that time. The lower average Australian dollar value of exports is partly from the currency movement, but also from the fact that the current growth opportunity in the US is in the popular premium bracket from \$2 to \$5 a bottle FOB. That is at a lower price point than previously.

There is some concern that with thinner margins this price point vulnerability to further Australian dollar appreciation is greater. One reason for the continued competitiveness of Australian food and beverage exporters is that the currencies of other exporting nations have also strengthened, except for South Africa, not by as much as the Australian dollar. In relation to South Africa, relative to the Australian dollar, the table shows that the South African rand has depreciated by 18 per cent against the Australian dollar, whereas most other countries have appreciated.

There is clearly industry concern about the vulnerability to present and possibly continued Australian dollar appreciation. However, the South Australian wine grape utilisation and pricing survey conducted in mid-2003 indicates that a 2 per cent rise in expected wine grape demand for 2007 reaffirms the 2002 forecast of continued growth in wine grape demand at around 6.4 per cent per annum.

The Hon. Caroline Schaefer also made reference to what she called this government's lack of support for the dairy industry, particularly in the Lower Murray flats, which should also be addressed. On 2 July 2002, the Premier launched the South Australian dairy industry strategic plan for 2010. The state dairy plan was developed with industry by the Dairy Industry Development Board and identifies realistic opportunities and targets for industry expansion in this state, including: milk production increasing from 700 million to 1.5 billion litres; processing capacity expanding from 480 million to 1.6 billion litres; direct and indirect employment increasing from 3 000 to 6 500 people (many of these new jobs being in regional areas); and export values rising from \$47 million to \$570 million.

On 22 August this year the government announced that it has allocated \$320 000 over the next three years towards further development of the South Australian dairy plan. This funding will support the appointment of a program manager to coordinate the dairy plans development and implementation strategies with industry, government and regional dairy communities. Industry, through the South Australian Dairy Farmers Association, is contributing a further \$15 000 towards this challenging program and a proposal for an expanded program with matching funds from the commonwealth's agricultural development partnership (ADP) program is at an advanced stage of development. If successful, this expanded project will accelerate the drive for internationally competitive and sustainable dairy development in the South-East and Murraylands regions. The proposal has been developed in collaboration with industry and the Murraylands and Limestone Coast regional development boards.

A number of other issues were raised by members during the Address in Reply. The Hon. Andrew Evans made some comments in relation to the operation of the Legislative Council and such comments all members in this place would appreciate. He made the following point:

Contrary to some views, it is rare that the house—that is, this house—

is responsible for legislation not being passed. This council is absolutely essential and ought never be abolished.

The honourable member made some comments in relation to areas where he thought that the parliamentary processes could be improved. He mentioned one area concerning the length of speeches in the Legislative Council and asked why we could not adopt a similar rule to that of the other place of a maximum of 30 minutes per speech. Fortunately, not too many speeches in the council have lasted for more than 30 minutes. This is an issue to which I have given some considerable thought down the years, having also been a member of the Legislative Council.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: I apologise; the House of Assembly. Given that we can deal with every bill that is passed by the other place and are able to do so in less time, because we have only 22 members compared with 47 in the other place, it would be unfortunate if time limits were introduced. I know that there are some views for that opinion; however, personally, I think that most members in this place

accept that, given the advantage of not having any time limits, there is some obligation not to speak with undue prolixity. The Hon. Andrew Evans went on to say:

Tradition aside, I would like to see sitting times commenced earlier in the day—perhaps late morning.

I know that this is an issue with which we have often grappled, but the problem is that with party and committee meetings, with the exception of Thursday, it is very difficult to sit on mornings during the week. Certainly, since I have been Leader of the Government in this place, I have attempted to limit the length of time we sit on any day. In the 18 months that this government has been in office, there have been only several occasions when parliament has sat beyond midnight. It is my obligation, as leader of government business, to try to ensure that we can finish at a reasonable time—say by 10.30 or 11 o'clock at night at the latest. Certainly, as long as I am leader of government business, I will do my best to try to manage the business within that time frame.

The Hon. A.J. Redford interjecting:

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: It is not a matter of laziness: it is a matter of being able to deal with all the legislation within a reasonable time. However, if one is talking about members who exceed 30 minutes per speech, the honourable member who has just interjected is probably the greatest offender of doing so. If there were to be a 30-minute limit, I suspect that the Hon. Angus Redford would be the most impacted upon. Nevertheless, I stand by what I said—it would be a pity if we were to introduce time limits.

The final point made by the Hon. Andrew Evans in his speech was about the scheduling of parliament during school holidays. Recently, I released a draft sitting program for next year. We have done our best to try to achieve the objective of not sitting during school holidays. We have not quite been able to succeed completely, because there is some difficulty with Easter occurring when it does. However, apart from one week of the school holidays in April, I think we have been able to avoid sitting days in all the school holidays next year. I certainly accept the point made by the Hon. Andrew Evans, and we will do our best to try to ensure that those members who have families are able to have that time available should they so wish. When the honourable member sees the parliamentary sitting dates for 2004, I hope that he believes that we have done our best to try to take those issues into account.

A number of other matters were raised by honourable members. The Hon. Angus Redford raised the issue in relation to Professor Thomas. He also has a substantive motion on that matter, so perhaps comments made on behalf of the government can wait until that debate.

In his speech, the Hon. Terry Cameron made some comments that I think reflected rather adversely upon the Auditor-General, and I think that they were most unfortunate. During the debate, the Hon. Terry Cameron asked for a copy of the letter from the Premier to the Auditor-General regarding the Ashbourne matter. I also understand that the honourable member has made a freedom of information application for the same document, as well as a number of others. I am advised that the application is under consideration, and a determination will be made by the FOI officer in the Department of the Premier and Cabinet within the time frame established under the FOI Act.

It is probably also worth mentioning to the council that, in his report issued today, the Auditor-General has commented on this matter. I think that I should read those

comments into the record, because I believe that is appropriate. I could say much more in relation to the Hon. Terry Cameron's comments but, given that the matter is currently before the courts, it is appropriate that any comments I make are left until after that time. However, I will read the relevant comments from page 15 of the Auditor-General's Report, because I think that *Hansard* should record some response to those matters raised by the honourable member. It states:

The Atkinson/Ashbourne/Clarke Matter

This matter has involved myself, as Auditor-General. There have been issues raised in the Parliament regarding the nature of my involvement, and suggestions to the effect that my Office has been involved in some communications with the Executive Government that may in some unspecified way not be appropriate in the circumstances.

Being mindful of the bounds of propriety to be observed pending the outcome of matters before the court, there are, nonetheless, some matters that should be communicated to the Parliament regarding the involvement of this Office in this matter.

Notwithstanding the fact that the Acting Premier responded to questions regarding my involvement in this matter, further communication by another Member of the Parliament has been made with me requesting my comments on whether the statements made were in fact correct.

With respect to those who have every right to pursue their interest in this matter both within and outside of the Parliament consistent with the need to not be in contempt of any court proceedings, in my opinion, it is not appropriate to request me, as Auditor-General, to become involved in a matter that is now of party political contention otherwise than through proper processes, ie, the Parliament and/or as a witness in a court of law.

As a matter of record, I can state for the information of the Parliament that, following a request in writing from the Premier to review the then relevant material with respect to this matter, I agreed to do so.

There is then a note to which I should refer, as follows:

The issues inherent in this matter fall within the audit mandate under the Public Finance and Audit Act 1987.

The report continues:

My approach to dealing with this matter has been no different to that of similar matters that I have dealt with over past years. Any suggestion otherwise is utterly rejected by me.

As Auditor-General, I am available to attend as a witness before relevant Parliamentary Committees. I have not to-date been requested to do so in regard to this matter. I am of course available should such a request be made to me.

As I said, I do not wish to make any further comments in relation to matters raised by the Hon. Terry Cameron, given that the issues are before the court; perhaps at an appropriate time in the future it will be possible to do so.

A number of other issues were raised by members in relation to other portfolio areas. I will ensure that those matters are drawn to the attention of the relevant ministers. I conclude again by thanking the Lieutenant-Governor for his address to the parliament, and I thank all members who have contributed to the debate.

Motion carried.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (ANTI-FORTIFICATION) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 24 September. Page 218.)

The Hon. A.L. EVANS: I speak in support of this bill which operates to prevent criminal organisations from fortifying their clubrooms and other premises to prevent police access. The bill amends the Development Act by changing the state's planning laws to prevent fortification by bikie gangs. The relevant authority (typically, a local council) is under an obligation to refer a development application to

the Police Commissioner. Once the Commissioner decides that a proposed development involves the creation of a fortification, the Commissioner will advise the local council that it must refuse approval or provide approval subject to conditions.

The bill also amends the Summary Offences Act by empowering the Police Commissioner to seek a court order (a fortification removal order) by requiring the occupier of the premises to remove or modify fortifications. Alternatively, the Commissioner can be empowered to do so. I understand that there are six or seven bikie gangs around Adelaide which have heavily fortified clubrooms. Most of the clubrooms are in residential areas, and residents are upset that bikies are setting up around them and families are feeling unsafe.

Often, bikies use the same security measures as other people. The problem is not in the security measure itself but the reasons behind it. These fortifications are often used to keep police and rival gangs out. We have seen, in the last few weeks, reports in *The Advertiser* that at least two bikie gangs have given our Premier and the Police Commissioner an open invitation to visit their premises, with offers of keys to access any premises at any time. Presumably, they are saying that they have nothing to hide. If that is the case, they should not fear this proposed legislation.

A fortification removal order can only be made by the court if the court has reasonable grounds to believe that the premises are being used, or are likely to be used, in relation to a serious criminal offence, which is defined in the bill. Under amendments to the Development Act, the Commissioner is not required to be satisfied that there is a serious criminal offence, but he does need to be satisfied that the fortification is a structure designed to prevent police access, has the effect of preventing police access, and is excessive for the particular type of premises.

An application for development approval will often not be made in the name of the bikie gang but, rather, a cleanskin company or an apparently law-abiding citizen. Under this bill, the Commissioner will be able to examine the nature of the proposed security measure in light of the type of building. For instance, where it is proposed to fortify a sporting club with six-inch bulletproof gates, that should put the Commissioner on notice that it would be reasonable for him to conclude that the structure is a fortification, as defined in the bill.

Some adjustments are being made in the bill as a result of submissions made by the Local Government Association, in particular, to ensure whether it is the Police Commissioner or the council which is responsible for determining whether a structure is a fortification. I understand that there may be some further government amendments, and I will consider them during the committee stage.

I am satisfied that the bill contains sufficient safeguards, and I do not believe that an innocent owner-occupier will fall victim to this legislation. An unsuccessful applicant for development approval has the usual rights of appeal. They can appeal and seek to convince a court that the fortification was not intended to prevent police access. The occupiers or owners of the premises can seek a review of the fortification removal order, and there is also right of appeal against the court's decision. An order can be enforced only after all rights of appeal have been exhausted.

The bill is aimed fairly and squarely at the outlawed motorbike gangs who are involved in very serious criminal activities. It is entirely justified, and I am hopeful that it will

achieve that for which it is intended. Family First commends the government on its introduction.

The Hon. CARMEL ZOLLO secured the adjournment of the debate.

POLICE INVESTIGATION

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY (Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries): I lay on the table a copy of a ministerial statement relating to the police investigation into a minister made in another place by the Deputy Premier.

SUMMARY OFFENCES (OFFENSIVE WEAPONS) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 24 September. Page 222.)

The Hon. R.D. LAWSON: This bill represents another broken promise by this Labor government in the matter of law and order. The policy on the subject of knives which the Australian Labor Party took to the last election stated the following:

Labor will introduce legislation in the first year of government for a total ban on the carrying of knives at night both into and within 100 metres of licensed premises.

That is the first paragraph and, in a couple of respects, this legislation does not honour that promise. First, this legislation does not relate specifically to knives at all; secondly, it was not introduced within the first year of the government; and, thirdly, it does not contain any stipulation as to the distance from licensed premises from which it is an offence to carry a knife. I will continue with Labor's policy. It states:

The knife ban will cover all licensed premises at night—pubs, clubs, discos and night spots—with tough penalties for breaking the law.

There will be an important difference from the current laws covering the 'carrying of knives'. Our legislation will stipulate that no excuses will be accepted from patrons carrying their knives into or near licensed premises at night.

I interpose once again: 'no excuses will be accepted'. Yet this legislation, the terms of which I will analyse in a few moments, allows the very same excuses to continue that now apply to the carrying of offensive weapons. Labor's policy goes on:

The volatile mix of alcohol and knives has resulted in many stabbings, causing severe injuries and even deaths. Just last weekend, a nightclub security person was stabbed outside licensed premises.

Parents are justifiably worried about their teenage children being the victims of knife assaults in clubs.

Labor believes there can be no excuse whatsoever for a patron to be carrying a knife into or near licensed premises at night.

There will be tough penalties and no excuses for anyone who breaks our new law. Labor will not let people get away with lame excuses for carrying knives at night.

We in the Liberal opposition deprecate the carrying of knives into hotel premises and, indeed, anywhere in the community, when they are carried for an offensive purpose. We deprecate stabbings and knives and the like. However, this legislation does not do what the Premier said, in his policy speech, it would do. The Premier has recently been frequently quoted as saying that he does not like lawyers. I have to say that his Attorney-General has made a liar out of the Premier on this occasion, because the legislation introduced does not answer the description of the policy of the Australian Labor Party.

It is not legislation that is specifically related to knives at all. What has happened is that in the clear light of day the Premier's advisers have come to the conclusion that they could not achieve what the policy sought to do. What they have done, however, is simply to amend the law relating to offensive weapons. That is the law that at the moment provides that no-one can carry a baseball bat, a stick, a bludgeon or, to use the second reading explanation, a billiard cue, a screwdriver, a hammer, a length of pipe, capicum spray, blow guns and the like, which already fall within the definition of 'offensive weapons' in certain circumstances in the vicinity of licensed premises. The fact is that they cannot do that at the moment: it is against the law to carry an offensive weapon, not only in the vicinity of licensed premises but anywhere at all, 24 hours a day.

However, this piece of window dressing by this Labor government, which seeks to present itself to the community as tough on law and order, will not apply everywhere throughout the community. It will not apply for 24 hours a day. It will apply 'in or in the vicinity of licensed premises', and there is no definition of what is or is not 'the vicinity of licensed premises'. One is left to rely upon the common law to reach a conclusion about that. It will also apply between the hours of 9 p.m. and 6 a.m., so for the other hours of the day a person will not be caught by this particular law if they have an offensive weapon in the vicinity of licensed premises. This legislation is all about window dressing: it is not about improving public safety.

As I said at the outset, we believe that knives and offensive weapons should not be carried into licensed premises and that there should be tough penalties for doing so. But the same tough penalty should apply whether it is in licensed premises or in premises that do not have a licence. What is the difference between taking an offensive weapon into a milk bar late at night or taking it into a bowling club or a service station? What is the difference between walking past a bottle shop or a bowling club—

The Hon. A.J. Redford: What about in parliament, to cut a cake?

The Hon. R.D. LAWSON: My colleague interjects about carrying it around parliament. I am not sure that these are licensed premises: I am not sure that we actually require a licence here. But, certainly, no member of the public walking down North Terrace would necessarily know whether these or any other premises along the street were licensed. This is all about window dressing. It is not about providing additional resources to the police to detect and eliminate knives. It is not, as they have done recently in Victoria in their Control of Weapons and Firearms (Search Powers) Bill, about giving the police additional powers to search and seize weapons. It is all about simply increasing penalties and presenting to the public the idea that, somehow or other, community safety is enhanced by increasing penalties.

Increasing penalties by itself does not have the effect of making anyone in our community safer. The fact is that what has been done here—and this is why the Premier has been made to look a fool—is that they have created a new so-called aggravated offence with a higher penalty for carrying an offensive weapon, not necessarily a knife but any offensive weapon in licensed premises at night. That is illogical. Community safety will be as much enhanced if we have the tougher penalty—and we do not disagree with the tougher penalty—for offensive weapons and knives, but it ought to apply 24 hours a day and it ought to apply everywhere.

For many years, section 15 of the Summary Offences Act has made it an offence to carry, possess or use an offensive weapon. Amendments were made to the Summary Offences Act by the Liberal government in 2000. Section 15 of that act was extended to apply to what were defined as prohibited weapons and also to dangerous articles. Dangerous articles were items declared by the Summary Offences (Dangerous Articles and Prohibited Weapons) Regulations. Those regulations include ballistic and fighting knives, knuckle dusters, nunchukkas, crossbows etc. Comprehensive exemptions are provided in those regulations to apply to police, freemasons, members of Scottish associations, bona fide collectors and the like, so that the cultural necessity for some people on some occasions to have ceremonial knives, daggers, swords and the like was preserved by that means.

That section as amended prohibited the manufacturing, dealing in or possession of dangerous articles. Under this new bill, the definition of 'offensive weapon' and 'dangerous article' will remain the same as it is under the existing legislation. 'Offensive weapon' already includes 'a knife, a club, a bludgeon or other offensive or lethal weapon or instrument.' As I mentioned a little earlier, in the second reading explanation of this bill the following examples were given of offensive weapons: baseball bat, billiard cue, screwdriver, hammer, picket, length of pipe, capicum spray, blow guns etc. Some of these items become offensive only if they are carried for an offensive purpose, and that of course is the current law.

An accused person does have a defence if he or she can prove, on the balance of probabilities, that he or she had a lawful excuse for carrying or possessing the offensive weapon or dangerous article. Once again, that is the current law. Section 5 of the Summary Offences Act provides that, where an act provides that an act done without lawful authority, without reasonable cause, without lawful excuse or without consent constitutes an offence, the prosecution need not prove the absence of lawful authority, reasonable cause, lawful excuse, etc. and the onus is upon the defendant to prove any such authority, cause, excuse or consent upon which he or she relies. Once again, that is the existing law and it is unchanged. The existing offences, which are set out in section 15 of the Summary Offences Act, of carrying or possession of an offensive weapon incur a fine of \$2 500 or imprisonment for six months.

There is a penalty of \$10 000 or imprisonment for two years for, in a public place, without lawful excuse, carrying a loaded firearm. What is intended in this particular aggravated offence is to have the same penalty apply to the so-called aggravated offence of having possession of an offensive weapon in or in the vicinity of a licensed premises. In the second reading speech it is stated that these new offences 'should discourage people from carrying any type of weapon when they go to licensed premises at night'. That is pure hyperbole: that conduct is already an offence.

Increasing the penalty does not necessarily discourage people from engaging in conduct which is already an offence. However, as I indicated earlier, the position of the Liberal Party is that the tough new penalty should apply 24 hours a day to offensive weapons wherever they are carried. So, in principio, during the committee stage of this bill, I indicate that we will be seeking to amend the bill and seeking the support of the council to achieve that objective and to hold the government to its commitment to introduce some integrity and honesty into its law and order rhetoric, rather than the simplistic and misconceived way in which this particular bill

has been presented to the parliament. We will be supporting the second reading.

The Hon. CARMEL ZOLLO secured the adjournment of the debate.

VETERINARY PRACTICE BILL

The House of Assembly agreed to the bill without any amendment.

ADJOURNMENT

At 6.08 p.m. the council adjourned until Tuesday 14 October at 2.15 p.m.