

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 13 April 2005

The **SPEAKER (Hon. R.B. Such)** took the chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

CRIMINAL LAW CONSOLIDATION (CRIMINAL NEGLIGENCE) AMENDMENT BILL

Her Excellency the Governor, by message, assented to the bill.

REPLIES TO QUESTIONS

The **SPEAKER**: I direct that the written answers to the questions as detailed in the schedule I now table be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

Credit Union Christmas Pageant

Victoria Lamb	250
Seana O'Brien	400
Van Driel Creative Group	1,300
Hayley Bestic	5,184
David Blight	5,490
Jill Halliday	9,650
Lyn Ferrauto	1,840
Gary Lee-Gaston	24,408
	\$48,522

Jacobs Creek Tour Down Under

Sally Heading	1,000
Terry Roberts	25,146
	\$26,146

2005 Great Australian Outback Cattle Drive

Keith Rasheed	15,000
Paul Victory	1,200
Claire Dalton	3,000
	\$19,200

Mitsubishi Adelaide International Horse Trails

Ewan Kellett	1,400
Caroline Kernaghan	1,750
Mik Pineo	1,750
Craig Gordon	4,220
	\$9,120

Other

Suzie Austin	1,890
David Clayton	4,400
	\$6,290

SCHOOLS, SOLAR PROGRAM

In reply to **Hon. W.A. MATTHEW** (7 December 2004).

The **Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH**: The initial concept for the SA Solar Schools Project was for an allocation of \$1.25 million by the State Government to assist 50 DECS sites with supply and installation of grid connected photovoltaics (solar panels).

This was based on two thirds of the estimated installation cost of \$35 000 to be met by the State Government and the remaining one third to be met by the site.

As a result of a highly successful across-government procurement process undertaken by DAIS, significant cost savings for installations have been achieved. Installation has now been completed in the first

CONSULTANTS AND PERSONAL SERVICE CONTRACTORS

In reply to **Mrs HALL** (25 October 2004).

The **Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH**: On 21 June 2004, the honourable member asked me what is the difference between consultants and contractors. My answer to this question is in the *Hansard* of 25 June 2004.

PERSONAL SERVICE CONTRACTOR EXPENDITURE

In reply to **Mrs HALL** (25 October 2004).

The **Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH**: In 2002-03, the South Australian Tourism Commission spent \$178 000 on personal service contractors compared with \$110 000 in 2003-04.

PERSONAL SERVICE CONTRACTORS

In reply to **Mrs HALL** (25 October 2004).

The **Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH**: In 2003-04, the South Australian Tourism Commission identified the following personal service contractors:

Credit Union Christmas Pageant Designer

Credit Union Christmas Pageant Artist

Pageant Float Designer

Credit Union Christmas Pageant Props Artist

Credit Union Christmas Pageant Float Artist

Credit Union Christmas Pageant Float Artist

Credit Union Christmas Pageant Chorographer

Credit Union Christmas Pageant Float Artist

Assisted the Jacobs Creek Tour Down Under

Support for Jacobs Creek Tour Down Under

Assisted the 2005 Great Australian Outback Cattle Drive

Assisted the 2005 Great Australian Outback Cattle Drive

Developed Cattle Drive Packages

Horse Trails Course Builder

Horse Trails Course Builder

Horse Trails Course Builder

Horse Trails Course Builder

Risk Management Planning Facilitator

Assist with preparation of Encounter Trails report

24 sites at an average cost of \$21 000.

This will allow the program to be extended well beyond the 50 sites initially envisaged and installations will be rolled out for a second round of the program during the 2004-05 financial year, with a third round of funding available in the second half of 2005.

In keeping with my commitment to the Honourable Member, I have now confirmed that rebates on installations completed have been sought through the Commonwealth Government's Australian Greenhouse Office Photovoltaic Rebate Program (PVRP) and that \$192 000 has been received to support installations in the first 24 schools.

The Australian Greenhouse Office has indicated availability of a further \$520 000 for Round Two of the program through the PVRP.

At this stage there has been no commitment by the Commonwealth to continuing the PVRP beyond June 2005.

The careful funding strategy, cost efficiencies and the PVRP rebates will assist in meeting the State Government's target of 250 'solar' schools in the next 10 years.

LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE

Mr HANNA (Mitchell): I bring up the 19th report of the committee.

Report received.

QUESTION TIME

GOVERNMENT BOARDS

The Hon. R.G. KERIN (Leader of the Opposition): Has the Premier decreased the total number of government boards, councils and committees in accordance with the promise he made in 2003? The Economic Development Board made a report in 2003 that recommended that the number of government boards be reduced. On 18 April 2003, the Premier was quoted as saying the following:

Within six weeks of receiving the final report of the board I will be publicly announcing those boards and committees that I want abolished.

The latest figures available to the opposition show an increase in the number of government boards at an extra cost of about \$1 million.

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Premier): I am delighted: it is another dorothy dixer. I am delighted to be able to announce that we have eliminated dozens and dozens of boards and committees. I want to pay tribute particularly to the Minister for Environment and Conservation, who has been leading the charge to eliminate many, many boards and committees. I am also told that, with other ministers, there was a bit of a competition going on to eliminate boards and committees. I will be delighted to report back to the Leader of the Opposition. I am delighted that the Leader of the Opposition is on the Dorothy Dix list of the government.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I warn the member for Mawson, who has already started breaching standing orders. The Leader of the Opposition has a supplementary question.

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: In the interests of the people of South Australia, will the Premier please release a list of the boards that have been abolished and also the boards that have been set up?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I am very pleased always to keep the Leader of the Opposition fully informed, because I think a fully informed opposition makes for good government and good democracy.

The Hon. Dean Brown interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Deputy Leader is out of order.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Attorney is out of order and the member for Bright is on a very dangerous path.

EYRE PENINSULA BUSHFIRES

Ms BREUER (Giles): My question is to the Minister for Tourism. What is the government and South Australian media doing to support tourism on the Eyre Peninsula following the recent bushfires?

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH (Minister for Tourism): I thank the member for Giles for her question relating to the Eyre Peninsula post-bushfire recovery program. As members would know, the January bushfires had a devastating effect both individually on people's lives and on communities, bush lands and farmlands, but generally they spared the coastal areas and particularly many of the tourism areas of Streaky Bay, Coffin Bay, Tumby Bay and Port Lincoln which, fortunately, remained untouched. We had a fear that following this massive human and natural tragedy, there might be an economic tragedy that would affect those people who had so far been spared from the natural disaster. Therefore, we worked together with SA Great, who drove an initiative to work with media outlets in the state and the state government (the SATC) to find a way of supporting the peninsula. SA Great led this initiative and, under the title 'There has never been a better time for some fresh Eyre', a very substantial program of advertisements, both on television and radio and, of course, in the print media, has already begun. Together with *The Advertiser*, Channels 10, 9, 7 and regional TV stations, as well as radio stations 5AA and Nova, have pledged their support and given significant amounts of in-kind support for air time and page space. It would be a particular tragedy if an economic disaster followed the one that has already occurred.

People should know that the Eyre Peninsula is definitely open for business. While some tourism products and destinations have been affected, the vast majority have not been damaged. Some people believe that the camp ground at North Shields had been substantially damaged but, in fact, only some of the permanent sites had significant damage, and the rest of the site, including all the ablution blocks, the shop and all the facilities, were absolutely intact. There is definitely no better time to get some 'fresh Eyre'. We urge people across the state to add their support to the Eyre Peninsula. I particularly acknowledge the extraordinary efforts of SA Great and all the media outlets in South Australia, who have come together to help those in distress to make sure that a natural disaster will not be followed by an economic disaster in the area.

URANIUM MINING

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop): Does the Minister for Environment and Conservation agree with the Treasurer's comments in the house on 10 March this year regarding the Labor Party's changed position on uranium mining? He said:

But I can say this: these companies have licences to mine and explore in this state, and they can do so with the full support and confidence of this government.

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Minister for Environment and Conservation): I have a couple of points to make. First, I am not responsible for statements made in this place by any other minister, particularly when he is talking about issues to do with federal Labor Party policy. All members of the Labor Party are entitled to have a view in relation to that, and the Treasurer, of course, is also entitled to his view. I refer the honourable member to the answer I gave to another member on the same question a week ago.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Mawson is taking a long time to learn the standing orders.

CONSERVATION COUNCIL

Mr CAICA (Colton): My question is also to the Minister for Environment and Conservation. Is the government aware of any funding threat to the state's peak environment group, the Conservation Council? If so, what action will the government take to ensure that this organisation can continue to advocate on behalf of the environment?

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Minister for Environment and Conservation): As members know, the Conservation Council represents some 55 South Australian volunteer environment groups, such as Greening Australia, the Wilderness Society, Friends of the Parks, Birds SA and Trees for Life, to name some of the bigger ones. They do great work in advocating for the environment and for carrying out important, on-the-ground work, and they have been part of the landscape of South Australia for 30 or so years. The role of standing up for the environment means that the Conservation Council is, at times, critical of government but, in a democracy, it is an important role, and one that this government respects. That is why we support the Conservation Council with a base grant of \$71 500 (including GST) in 2004-05. In the past, the federal government has provided something like \$85 000 a year. So funding for the Conservation Council has been done on a bipartisan basis—that is, until now.

Just this week—just months after an election—the federal government announced that it is slashing funding to the Conservation Council from \$85 000 to a maximum of \$10 000 per year. Clearly, it wants to shut the Conservation Council up, and it does not want criticism of its inept policies. I can announce today that I will be writing to the federal minister for the environment (Hon. Ian Campbell) to ask him to reinstate funding for the Conservation Council.

Mr Brokenshire interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. HILL: It would be great if the opposition in South Australia would help in this campaign. Stand up for the environment, Robert Brokenshire; tell us where you stand.

Mr Scalzi interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Hartley was pursuing a dangerous course last week. He does not seem to have learnt either.

URANIUM MINING

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop): Has the Premier sought to put uranium mining on the agenda of the next Labor national conference and, if not, why not? Federal Labor resource spokesman Martin Ferguson said recently:

If the South Australian government wants to open new mines after the next election, if Labor is in government in Canberra, then that will have to be subject to a policy discussion, but I might say there is nothing stopping Mike Rann or Kevin Foley putting on the table at the forthcoming national conference the debate about uranium. That's for them to decide.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Premier is not accountable to the parliament for the policy of the Labor Party. If he chooses to answer the question, he may.

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Premier): I am delighted to answer this question. As far as I am aware a date for the next national ALP conference or indeed a location has not actually been determined. I am not sure if it will be this year, next year or the year after; certainly, no-one has put up resolutions for agenda papers yet. Let me just tell you this: we are determined to secure a go-ahead for the next stage of Roxby

Downs, and you will be pleased to know I hope that you will be—

Mr Williams interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I will answer the question the way I want to answer it.

Mr WILLIAMS: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, my question, as the Premier knows, is related directly to changing Labor Party policy. Roxby Downs already has all the licences it needs. This is about new uranium—

The SPEAKER: Order! The question was technically out of order, as I indicated before, but the Premier may answer if he wishes to do so.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I can assure you that whatever is done at the next ALP national conference—

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: Probably better. On a point of order, Mr Speaker, quite clearly—and this is public knowledge—the Parliamentary Labor Party's policies are bound to the ALP convention. Therefore, a question in this house about what a government position is going to be since the party opposite is bound by it is not out of order.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Premier is not here to explain the policy of his party, neither is the Leader of the Opposition.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I can announce today, controversially, that it is the policy of this government to support a go-ahead for the second stage of Roxby Downs. This will mean in the construction phase an extra 10 300 jobs and some 8 500 jobs permanently. That is why we have been working with Western Mining and why I have been talking to Chip Goodyear from BHP Billiton. We are strongly supporting an expansion of Roxby Downs and Olympic Dam just as we are supporting the mining industry. I know it worries members opposite, but we now have in this state an 18-year high in mineral exploration.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Premier is debating the answer.

Mr WILLIAMS: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, the Premier has not gone anywhere near answering my question, which is about what he is going to do to overturn the Labor Party's policy against uranium mining in Australia.

The SPEAKER: Order! I uphold the point of order to the extent that the Premier was starting to debate the issue.

COURTS, WITNESSES

Mr SNELLING (Playford): Will the Attorney-General inform the house how the government provides a safe environment for children and other vulnerable witnesses who give evidence before criminal courts?

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON (Attorney-General): Members will recall that the Layton report identified this as an area where improvements are needed. The government has been working towards making courts more comfortable for witnesses, particularly vulnerable witnesses. As members may recall, last year the Mount Gambier court was fitted out with permanent closed-circuit television equipment which allowed children and other vulnerable witnesses the opportunity to give their evidence from a room outside the court. I was pleased to attend the first use of that equipment. There is a bit of regional infrastructure for the opposition to note. The court—

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Bragg is out of order, and the interjection is out of order.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: The feedback from alleged victims who have used the new monitors and televisions in Mount Gambier has been good. I am pleased to be able to inform the house that the government has now made advances towards installing similar monitors and televisions in the Sir Samuel Way Building. Two more courts will be fitted with closed-circuit television using video conferencing technology, which is in addition to the two courts already set up in the Sir Samuel Way Building.

Mr Brindal: Why do you need so many?

The SPEAKER: The Attorney will ignore interjections.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: The member for Unley asked why we need so many. Sometimes there is more than one criminal case going, for the information of the member for Unley. He seems to think there are too many. The remote witness room will be located in another building and will, therefore, avoid the embarrassment of a witness coming across the accused within the Sir Samuel Way building. As members can appreciate, this is often traumatic for the alleged victim, and it may also mean that the court does not receive the best evidence possible from that witness. The location of the two witness rooms—

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Attorney will ignore interjections.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: The location of the two witness rooms will be in a secure location, which will also include comfortable waiting rooms next to the rooms where the witnesses will be giving—

Mr BROKENSHERE: Sir, I rise on a point of order. I ask you to explain to the house standing order 107. It appears to me that these sorts of examples the Attorney is giving should be in the form of a ministerial statement, under standing order 107, not a question, which he is clearly reading—and it goes on for five or seven minutes.

The SPEAKER: Sometimes the pots call the kettle black. Ministers have the option of a ministerial statement. I do not believe the Attorney has gone to an excessive length.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: No, certainly not. Unlike members of the opposition, the member for Playford has a genuine interest in the criminal justice question. It is a bona fide question, which I am answering. It is important that there is provision for supporters accompanying the vulnerable witness to be close at hand. The projection screens in the courtrooms will be state of the art and will give all the parties in the court an excellent view of the witness. The audio will be linked into the court reporting system to maximise the best sound for everyone in the proceedings. The new technology will also include document cameras in the courtroom that will enable counsel to show witnesses in a remote location any documents that form part of the evidence produced to the court.

I am pleased to advise the house that this project will be achieved as a result of the cooperation of different parts of the justice portfolio, with funds contributed from several sources within the portfolio. The tender was advertised in early February. It closed on 25 February, and the evaluation and negotiation process is well advanced. The work is likely to begin in the next month, and the monitors and televisions should be operational by the end of June 2005. Sometimes a change of government does make the world of difference.

ABRAHAM, Ms W.

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg): My question is to the Attorney-General. Is it not the case that, if Ms Wendy Abraham QC

had accepted the offer to be appointed to the bench, she would have had to withdraw her application for the position of Director of Public Prosecutions?

Ms Rankine: For goodness sake. She couldn't have done—

The SPEAKER: The member for Wright is out of order.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON (Attorney-General): Let me help the member for Bragg here. Generally, District Court judges do not serve as Crown Prosecutor or Director of Public Prosecutions. What I can tell—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The deputy leader is out of order. The member for Mawson will be named in a minute if he breaches standing orders again.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: I think it is just so tacky and such bad taste for the member for Bragg to be harping on this topic. Normally when I make offers of appointment to the bench to lawyers—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, the member for MacKillop!

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON:—it is much preferable that those offers remain confidential. After all, I go to a great deal of trouble, before judicial appointments, to consult about 22 members of the legal profession about whom to appoint to the court—and there are three members of the opposition whom I consult (not the member for Bragg, admittedly, because her experience is confined to the Family Court). It is bad taste for the member for Bragg to be going down this line. The member for Bragg would have no idea how judicial appointments are made and she would have no idea of the protocol surrounding them.

Because of the member for Bragg's vulgar question last week about what I had done to keep Ms Wendy Abraham in South Australia, I was compelled to reveal to the house that I had offered Ms Abraham a position on the bench. I did not want to reveal that, but the member for Bragg's conduct compelled me to reveal it. As far as I can tell, the appointments that I have made to the Supreme Court, the District Court and the Magistrates Court have been universally acclaimed. You do not hear in the Arab street outside the courts people sitting down to coffee complaining about my appointments the way they complain about some of the appointments of previous governments and some of the appointments of the Hon. K.T. Griffin. But what I can tell the member for Bragg is that, at the time I offered Ms Abraham an appointment to the District Court—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, the Minister for Infrastructure!

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON:—Ms Abraham was not under consideration to be appointed DPP. Ms Abraham was out of the race. A panel had been appointed and the panel, as I have disclosed to the house previously, had made recommendations of two people who would be the best people for appointment as Director of Public Prosecutions. Ms Abraham was not one of them.

EVIDENCE

The Hon. I.P. LEWIS (Hammond): My question is directed to the Attorney-General. I ask him to assure this house that this government would do nothing of the kind that the Goss government did in the Heiner affair in shredding evidence vital to the effective prosecution of an offence against a minor whilst in the care of the state—in this case, the John Oxley Centre.

The SPEAKER: The question is borderline hypothetical, but if the Minister for Police—

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Minister for Police): That clearly is a police matter, Mr Speaker.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: It is a police matter if such an event as described by the member for Hammond has occurred. It would clearly be a matter for the police and I would encourage the member for Hammond to do the right thing. If he has any evidence, he should immediately proceed to deliver it to the police. Clearly, this government would not condone any type of behaviour such as that, and I would implore the member for Hammond, if he has evidence, to proceed immediately to the police. The track record in terms of the behaviour of the member for Hammond would suggest otherwise but, if it is the case that he has evidence, he should immediately provide it to the police.

The Hon. I.P. LEWIS: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, that is a clear reflection on my integrity, and I ask that it be withdrawn. I have delivered to police and will continue to deliver to police any evidence I have of any crime.

The SPEAKER: Order! That is not a point of order. The Minister for Police was getting pretty close to reflecting on the member for Hammond.

PARLIAMENTARY PRIVILEGE (SPECIAL TEMPORARY ABROGATION) BILL

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite): Was the Attorney the prime architect of the Parliamentary Privilege (Special Temporary Abrogation) Bill that has been criticised nationally for its attack on accepted parliamentary practice, and does the Attorney still support this proposed legislation? If not, will he move to discharge the bill in accordance with standing order 195?

The SPEAKER: I do not believe that the question infringes standing orders. Does the Attorney wish to respond?

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON (Attorney-General): Mr Speaker, I do not wish to canvass the merits of the bill. However, what better member to be seeking to kick this disgrace along than a member who has been shouting out across the chamber Craig Ratcliffe's allegations for a whole sitting week, but carefully avoiding being mentioned in *Hansard*.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, that is a false allegation, and I call on the Attorney to withdraw it.

Mr Scalzi interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The house will come to order. The member for Hartley will be in strife shortly. The chair has not heard the banter across the floor. I remind members that their behaviour in this place should not reflect on others, and it should not be designed to provoke other members. We should be focusing collectively on acting in the best interests of the people of this state, not engaging in personal feuds. I call the member for Torrens.

DISABLED, CARE

Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens): Thank you, sir.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, the Attorney was in the middle of answering a question. He has not yet answered it.

The SPEAKER: I cannot compel the minister to add anything more. If he so wishes, he can, but he does not wish to. The member for Torrens.

Mrs GERAGHTY: My question is to the Minister for Families and Communities. What is the state government doing to address the issue of younger people living in nursing homes?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Minister for Families and Communities): I thank the honourable member for her important question. Sadly, 389 people under 65 years of age are living in nursing homes because of issues surrounding their disability. Their condition is such that they need nursing care around the clock.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for West Torrens is out of order, and so is the Attorney.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: This clearly is not a situation that is optimal. Since coming to government, we have been working on a number of strategies to address this situation. We have spent \$4.2 million extra in three years on accommodation services for clients with intellectual disabilities, brain injury, and physical, psychological and neurological conditions. Eighty-three extra clients are now being housed in the community. In the area of supported accommodation for people with intellectual disability, our spending has grown by 7.8 per cent over two years, an increase of \$2.9 million. So, accommodation services have actually been growing during this period.

Of course, the recently released state housing plan includes a number of measures to provide expanded housing opportunities for people with special needs in the community. Importantly, we are also in talks with the commonwealth. As members would be aware, this is an issue facing the whole country. Although there are relatively low numbers of people with disabilities in nursing homes in South Australia compared with other states, there is still much work to be done here.

I recently met with the federal Minister for Ageing, Julie Bishop, on this very issue. She has created a fund she calls the aged care innovative pool of funding. It is aimed at supporting, in the short term, creative ways of moving younger people who are in nursing homes into more appropriate accommodation. Officers of the Disability Services Office have been in talks with the commonwealth about two proposals here in South Australia. One involves Julia Farr Services and a plan to move 12 to 15 people out of aged care beds in that institution into supported accommodation in the community. The Disability Services Office is also working on ways to divert any person who is under 50, and who is under threat of entering a nursing home, directly to Julia Farr Services. They will then assess that person and work with them to provide the support and accommodation that they need in a community setting.

The other proposal involves Minda and a plan for a joint aged care facility with Anglicare. It will involve a 120-bed facility with 60 beds for older Minda clients with disabilities, and 60 mainstream aged care beds. We are continuing to raise these matters with the commonwealth. Just because a younger person has a disability, it does not mean that they should be housed with much older people, with whom they may share none of the connections that are necessary to avoid the isolation that can exist for people with a disability.

At the same time as we have obligations to provide appropriate accommodation, it is also true that the commonwealth needs to face up to its responsibilities for older people

who have prematurely aged because of the nature of their disability who, we would argue, belong in the aged care system. We are having that dialogue with the commonwealth, there is some money from the commonwealth on the table, and I hope to be able to report to this house in due course that we have been able to achieve both a win for the younger people with disabilities who, unfortunately, are located in nursing homes, and also a solution to the state's massive funding needs in the disability sector.

ATTORNEY-GENERAL

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite): My question is to the Premier. Given that the Attorney-General was the chief architect of the doomed Parliamentary Privilege (Special Temporary Abrogation) Bill; given his role in the collapse of the government's relationship with the former speaker, the member for Hammond; given that he has set in train the controversy surrounding the appointment of the new DPP; and embroiled the government in the stashed cash affair, does the Premier feel—

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: On a point of order, sir—

The SPEAKER: Order, the member for Waite will not shout over the chair! The Minister for Infrastructure will resume his seat. The member for Waite was commenting at least three times in what was meant to be a question—if that was the point of order.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: The point of order is that he should make a grievance later if he wants to.

The SPEAKER: Members need to read the standing orders. A question is a question; it is not a statement and it does not have debate or comment in it.

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Premier): The honourable member wonders why his nickname is Private Pike.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: He will not like that; he has a glass jaw.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: On a point of order, Mr Speaker: the previous Speaker ruled very clearly that reflections on members on the basis of former military service was out of order. I am quite happy to take insults from members opposite, but I ask whether your ruling will protect prior military service—as requested by the RSL.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The house will come to order.

The Hon. K.O. Foley interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, the Deputy Premier is out of order!

The Hon. K.O. Foley interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I will warn the Deputy Premier in a minute if he is not careful. Behaviour in here should not involve, in any way, trying to reflect on a member or act in a way which is disparaging towards them. If the member for Waite takes exception to that remark, I ask the Premier if he is willing to withdraw it.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Absolutely, sir. Can I just say this: that I admire his service for his country. I was simply referring to delightful personality quirks, and I will stick to Frank Spencer in the future. What was the question again? Do I have confidence in the Attorney-General?

The Hon. K.O. Foley interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Some parliaments do have them. I want to commend the member, because I saw the Alex

Kennedy piece that launched his bid for the Liberal leadership. He even posed for the photo, I am told, then later on said that he did not realise what the article was about.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Premier is now debating.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Point of order, Mr Speaker. This afternoon it appears that there has been very liberal policy towards the ministerial frontbench in terms of upholding standing orders, and I wonder if you would like to uphold them.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is no special—I was calling the Premier to order because he was debating the issue. The Premier should answer the question or sit down.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I do have absolute confidence in the Attorney-General. The great thing about this Attorney-General compared to his immediate predecessors is this: that he has pioneered (with some strong support from above) the biggest changes to the criminal law in the history of this state in terms of toughening up the criminal law. It is very interesting that the people who criticise us for being tough on the criminal law are the Liberals.

Mr Hanna interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Mitchell is out of order.

Mr Hamilton-Smith interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Waite was seeking the protection of standing orders, now he is breaching them; he cannot have it both ways. The member for Norwood.

DENTAL PILOT PROJECT

Ms CICCARELLO (Norwood): Can the Minister for Health inform the house about the results of the two-year dental pilot project conducted in Adelaide's inner southern suburbs?

The Hon. L. STEVENS (Minister for Health): I thank the member for Norwood for this very important question. I am pleased to be able to inform the house about this particular dental health care initiative. In conjunction with the GPs, we have conducted a two-year pilot project in Adelaide's inner southern suburbs which involved more than 1 500 people aged 75 years or over. This group was targeted because we know that poor oral health in older people has been linked to poor nutrition and a range of serious medical conditions, including pneumonia and cardiovascular disease. Under this project, as part of a general health assessment coordinated by their own GP, each older person underwent a simple oral health assessment to gauge whether they were experiencing oral pain or dental problems. Those who were holders of a pensioner concession card and who identified as needing dental care were then offered—

Mr Hanna interjecting:

The Hon. L. STEVENS: No, no; it is not a four year wait.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! It is impossible to hear the minister.

The Hon. L. STEVENS: If the member for Mitchell would just listen, this is a pilot project in his area that he should take note of. As I was saying, those who were holders of the pensioner concession card and who were identified as needing dental care were then offered fast-track treatment through a public dental clinic. The program, developed and managed collaboratively by the South Australian Dental Service, the Australian Dental Association, Southern Division of General Practice, and the aged care sector, has been

assessed as having a major impact on the lives of those people treated. After participating in the program, many people reported far less dental pain and increased comfort and pleasure in eating. Even more encouraging was that they also reported significant improvements in their ability to go about their normal day-to-day activities both at home and in the community. Similar improvements were also seen in general emotional well-being. This has made a real difference to people's lives.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. L. STEVENS: 'Oh, yes,' says the member for Bragg. Well, it actually does make a lot of difference to people aged 75 and over. Improvements in oral health and quality of life that have resulted from this initiative may have even wider effects, helping many older people to keep well and live independently in their own homes. This is an example of this government's health reform agenda in action. This project is based on a collaborative primary health care approach, including the medical, dental and aged care sectors all working together to make a real difference.

The Hon. W.A. Matthew interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Bright is out of order.

HOSPITALS, WAITING LISTS

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): My question is to the Minister for Health. Why has Mr Robert McMahon of Prospect received four letters in the past two months from the Royal Adelaide Hospital asking if he wanted to remain on the waiting list for urgent surgery to be done on his nose, when he has been waiting for that surgery for more than two years? The minister, in a letter through me, wrote to him on 3 March 2005 stating that he was a priority patient and that, 'She was assured that Mr McMahon's surgery would be undertaken within the next two months.' Last night, Mr McMahon told me that he was sick and tired of filling out detailed forms stating that he still wanted surgery, when his long wait for that surgery had already been raised in a formal letter with the minister on 5 February this year. The four letters from the Royal Adelaide Hospital threaten to remove his name from the surgery waiting list within a month, unless he completes the detailed form and contacts the hospital.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. L. STEVENS (Minister for Health): I thank the deputy leader—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The minister will resume her seat. I do not know whether or not members are interested in the answer, but we will find out when they come to order.

The Hon. L. Stevens: I doubt that they are really.

The SPEAKER: The minister will not comment either. I do not think that the deputy leader wants an answer, so we may go to the next question.

The Hon. L. STEVENS: I will look again at the issues related to the gentleman mentioned by the deputy leader today. I want to make a couple of points to the house about this government's efforts in terms of elective surgery.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Point of order, Mr Speaker. The minister is now trying to debate the issue entirely away from the issue I have raised.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: That is entirely in breach of standing order 98. Mr McMahon and I want an answer about the four letters.

The SPEAKER: Order! The deputy leader will not enter into a tirade. The minister should answer the question. If she needs to obtain further information, she can indicate that.

The Hon. L. STEVENS: As I was saying, I am very happy to look again at case of Mr McMahon. However, I say that, since this government came to office, it has put in an extra \$28 million in terms of elective surgery. In relation to the comparison with the effort of the former minister for health, the deputy leader, every year he was minister his effort in elective surgery went down.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. L. STEVENS: This government has done more surgery each year it has been in office, and that is the difference between us and them.

The SPEAKER: If members do not want an answer, there is no point their asking a question.

ADULT COMMUNITY EDUCATION

Mr RAU (Enfield): My question is to the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education. What cooperative arrangements are being developed between Adult Community Education and TAFE?

The Hon. S.W. KEY (Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education): I thank the member for Enfield for his question and identify the fact that he has been a great advocate for looking at the Adult Community Education grants, particularly with regard to education courses. As members in this chamber know, the courses enable people to improve literacy and numeracy skills, enhance employment opportunities and participate in programs that broaden their social participation and personal interests. This year, over \$1.3 million is being spent to support 68 community-based organisations that deliver ACE programs. I imagine that members of this house would be aware of them, because they are throughout the state, and I know that many electorates have received notification of money spent in their particular area.

TAFE and community educators have been working together to ensure that ACE courses feed into activities and qualifications provided through the TAFE system. For example, eight different community educators have been involved in TAFE's Learning to Work literacy and numeracy program and have assisted 413 adults to improve skills that help them return to the work force.

Mr Brokenshire interjecting:

The Hon. S.W. KEY: I must say that I am a bit disturbed to hear that the member for Mawson does not seem to think that literacy and numeracy programs that help people get jobs are important. Unlike members opposite, I am also impressed that the Douglas Mawson Institute of TAFE and Café Enfield (which is one of the reasons I identified the member for Enfield as being an important contributor) have provided Certificate 2 in Community Services to mothers who have children at the Enfield primary school. The qualification equips them to get into child-care training.

There are numerous examples that show that adult learning enables people to build up their self-esteem and gain the confidence that is needed for them to go on to further education and training. These skills are important to enable people to contribute more broadly in their communities. The

ACE providers and the TAFE people who have been involved in this program I believe need to be congratulated—unlike members opposite, particularly the member for Mawson and the member for Bright—to make sure that people do connect and have a career and future employment.

TRAMLINE

Mr BROKENSHIRE (Mawson): My question is to the Minister for Transport. Given that the minister said that last week's infrastructure announcements were based on sound business plans, will the minister table the sound business case for extending the tramline 1 104 metres down King William Street, given that apparently the service will be free? In answering a question in parliament on Monday about why the government has not planned for public transport to the airport, the minister said that the government required infrastructure projects to have a sound business case. He stated: 'We require such things to have a sound business case.' He went on to say, 'It must be a sound business case, because that is how you do business.'

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Minister for Transport): We finally get it clear: they are opposed to the tramway extension to North Terrace.

Mr Williams interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, the member for MacKillop!

Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for West Torrens is out of order.

The Hon. W.A. Matthew interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, the member for Bright!

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: We will send the transport officials around to brief the shadow minister on the benefits of the extension of the tramline.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister for Infrastructure will answer the question.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I am waiting for them to calm down. I am trying to turn over a new leaf, but until they behave I cannot speak in a quiet voice. Isn't that nice.

Mr BROKENSHIRE: Mr Speaker, I rise on a point of order under standing order 98. This is a simple question: are the parliament and the taxpayers entitled to see a business case, and will it be tabled?

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Mawson is defying the standing orders. The minister needs to answer the question, but it is hard if no-one is abiding by the standing orders.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I am waiting for them to behave like grown-ups so that I can answer the question in a quiet, orderly fashion. Of course we made a full analysis of the costs and benefits, and we will brief the shadow minister on that. It all adds up. It is a very good idea, we support it, the public supports it, Rex Jory supports it, *The Advertiser* supports it, the people out their support it—apparently, the only people who don't support it are the members of the opposition.

Dr McFetridge interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: The member for Morphet supports it. He said it was a great idea.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: He did. He said it was a great idea. Everyone supports it except the member for Mawson, apparently. We are prepared to brief him on the cost benefit

analysis. I can tell him that it adds up better than the business plan for the wine centre did.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The house will come to order.

GAMING MACHINES

Ms BEDFORD (Florey): Will the Minister for Gambling update the house on the establishment of the gaming machine entitlement trading system and when the reduction of gaming machines will occur in this state?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT (Minister for Gambling): Members would remember that parliament passed the Gaming Machines (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill in December last year, and the majority of the provisions of the act came into effect on 1 February this year. This legislation provides for a reduction in gaming machines in this state. It provides that this reduction cannot occur for at least four months after the commencement of related provisions. As was always intended—and as has been made clear to all parties—a round of trading in gaming machine entitlements is to occur prior to the reduction in the number of machines. The trading system is required to be established in regulations. I am pleased to advise the parliament that those regulations were developed through consultation and cooperation with the gaming industry and the opposition and were gazetted on 31 March this year.

The Office of the Liquor and Gambling Commissioner has kept, and continues to keep, all licensees informed of the regulations and progress on the reduction through regular bulletins. Licensees are now considering whether they wish to buy or sell gaming machine entitlements. An advertisement will appear in *The Advertiser* and the *Gazette* tomorrow advising holders of gaming machine licences and the holder of the special club licence to make applications to buy or sell gaming machine entitlements by 4 May.

A gaming machine entitlement trade will be held on 11 May. That will enable the matching process of the trade, and licensees will be informed and make payments or receive proceeds in late May and June. That process will be completed in June and will enable the initial cut in gaming machine numbers, which will yield an immediate reduction of 2 168 gaming machines in the state, to occur on 1 July this year. That will be a landmark day in the gaming sector in South Australia. We are the first and only state to have a cut across the state. This is historic legislation. This timetable is in line with that initially provided to the parliament. I would like to thank the gaming industry for its assistance in formulating the trading system, and I urge all gaming machine licence holders to give consideration to their intentions to either buy or sell gaming machine entitlements.

OFFICE OF THE NORTH

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop): My question is to the Minister for Administrative Services. Why is it that the Office of the North requires a computer connection of a quality superior to that required by any non-metropolitan office of the Department of Transport and Urban Planning wide area network? The government ICT web site—

Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for West Torrens will be warned.

Mr WILLIAMS: The government ICT web site identifies that the Department of Transport and Urban Planning—

Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I warn the member for West Torrens. The member for MacKillop has the call.

Mr WILLIAMS: Thank you, sir. The government ICT web site identifies that the Department of Transport and Urban Planning will provide a connection via its wide area network for the Office of the North. That office in Port Augusta, which is run by Justin Jarvis, the Labor candidate for Stuart, is shown as having a requirement for a five megabyte connection, whilst Transport SA officers at Mount Gambier, Port Lincoln, Port Augusta and Murray Bridge on the department wide area network are shown to have fewer requirements.

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT (Minister for Administrative Services): The member for MacKillop may not be aware—but he should be aware—that the Office of the North is in the planning portfolio. I would be delighted to refer that question to my ministerial colleague, the Hon. Paul Holloway. But I can confirm that we have an excellent candidate for the seat of Stuart, as is well known by the member for Stuart—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: —and we look forward to Justin Jarvis being the next member for Stuart.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The deputy leader is out of order. The house will come to order.

The Hon. P.F. Conlon interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Minister for Infrastructure is out of order.

Mr Brokenshire interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! If the member for Mawson wants to be named, he is about to be named. He wants to be very careful—and he will not remonstrate with the chair or he will be named. The member for Bright.

MARION TRAIN/BUS INTERCHANGE

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW (Bright): Will the Minister for Infrastructure advise the house whether the proposal to develop a train/bus interchange with a focus on the Marion shopping centre will be accompanied by the additional infrastructure that was proposed when the initial proposal was first developed? In 2001, the City of Marion developed, with the former government, a proposal to locate a state swimming centre adjacent to Westfield Marion, to relocate the Oaklands railway station to Morphett Road adjacent to Westfield Marion, to develop a bus-train interchange, to reconfigure the surrounding roads and to redevelop the surrounding land owned by the South Australian Housing Trust and the City of Marion. These plans were advanced through Planning SA, the Public Transport Board, the South Australian Housing Trust, the Department for Recreation, Sport and Racing and the Department of Transport. Concept drawings were prepared. This work was stopped on the change of government and has remained at a standstill for three years.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Minister for Transport): The member for Bright left out one little bit. All they did not have was the money for it. This is in the category of 'the knockers can step aside' as a project. They had 8½ years, and if they had just got a little longer he would have transformed the area, but of course there was no money in the out years for it. Please! Honestly! We are doing something for those people

in the south, and the Marion interchange is very welcome. I am sure the member for Mitchell thinks this is a good idea. This is terrific news for people. It is not some grandiose invention of the member for Bright that he was going to build without any money: this is actually real and committed, and we are going to get an interchange for those people. As a local member—or as a soon-to-be former local member—Sir Robin decided bravely to turn his tail and flee, but as a local member you would think he would be happy about this. I am sorry that we do not have the delusions of grandeur that he had when he did not have any money, but we do have a very good solid project for the people of the south and the people around the Marion area.

Mr HANNA (Mitchell): I have a supplementary question, Mr Speaker. Will the Marion project just referred to have additional infrastructure to provide for the additional traffic it will generate along Morphett Road south of the Oaklands intersection?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: There are a number of transport works proposed in the interchange. I will get the member a full briefing because I know he will have a genuine interest. But let me go on. Some of the other infrastructure works referred to by the member for Bright included their PPP for a swimming pool that was going to pay for itself. Do members remember that one? They did not need money because it would pay for itself. This government has done better than that and has committed \$15 million to it. We are in the process of talking to the federal government (I think the Minister for Administrative Services has carriage of it) to see whether it will meet the commitment of the state government and the Marion council. If the member wants to achieve something, he can stop whingeing about the good work we are doing and go and talk to his federal colleagues about funding some infrastructure as well. We have put our money forward and laid it down. Instead of being mealy-mouthed, he should go and talk to his federal colleagues and help to secure that piece of infrastructure for the people of the area as well.

The SPEAKER: Order! The minister was debating the answer at the end.

Mr BRINDAL: I have a point of order, Mr Speaker. In answer to a question in terms of the provisioning of computer services in the Office of the North, the Minister for Transport appeared to link the candidacy of Justin Jarvis with the provision of those services.

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: I did not say anything about the Office of the North.

Mr BRINDAL: Sorry, the Minister for Administrative Services. I do apologise. My point is: is it for you, as chair, to refer this matter to the police as a possible abuse of public office, or is it for the opposition to do so?

Mr O'BRIEN: I have a point of order, Mr Speaker. Justin Jarvis does—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

Mr O'BRIEN: I am clarifying the situation. Justin Jarvis does not—

The SPEAKER: The member for Napier will resume his seat. Order! The chair was trying to hear the issue raised by the member for Unley. I am not quite sure what his point is.

Mr BRINDAL: Linking Justin Jarvis, a Labor candidate for a seat, with the provision of public moneys to service his office, clearly may be an abuse of public office. There is an

ex public official standing trial for just that sort of thing now, so maybe somebody in here should be as well.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: On a point of order, sir—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I think the member for Unley might need to get some legal advice as to whether or not this is a matter that needs to be explored in the direction he is hinting at. I do not think it is up to the chair. It is hard to make any meaningful comment on the basis of that information. If the member for Unley wants to provide some detail, I am happy to consider it. However, I think it is really a question of his getting legal advice.

Mr O'BRIEN: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, the explanation I was attempting to offer is that Justin—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I advise the member for Napier that it is not a time for debate.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The chair wants to hear the member for Napier. What is the point of order?

Mr O'BRIEN: The point of order is that the member is not providing accurate information to the house. Justin Jarvis does not work for the Office of the North. The Office of the North is based at Edinburgh Park in the council area of Salisbury.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The house will come to order. Points of order are not the time for people to engage in debate but to raise matters relating to procedure. The member for Napier should not have dealt with that matter in the way he did. If he believes that someone has misled the house, there is a mechanism to deal with that matter. Members have access to grievance debates and other avenues.

FOX BAITING

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Minister for Environment and Conservation): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.
Leave granted.

The Hon. J.D. HILL: Yesterday, the member for Stuart made statements in relation to the bait 1080. In particular, he indicated that the Victorian government had apparently banned this bait. He went on to make a claim, I guess, that the government of South Australia was considering similar action. I advise the house of the following. The Animal and Plant Control Commission, through its local animal and plant control boards, is licensed under the Controlled Substances Act to supply 1080 bait materials to landholders, both public and private, for the control of specific—

The SPEAKER: Order! Will members please take their seats or leave the chamber. About 10 members are standing.

The Hon. J.D. HILL: The Animal and Plant Control Board is licensed under the Controlled Substances Act to supply 1080 bait materials to landholders, both public and private, for the control of specific pest animals, particularly rabbits and foxes. The 1080 poison is an essential and relatively selective tool for vertebrate pest control. The Department for Environment and Heritage holds a separate licence allowing it to purchase and possess 1080 products for the purpose of fox control for biodiversity conservation. In some regions, DEH works with local animal and plant control

boards to make baits available to landholders to achieve broad-scale biodiversity conservation benefits.

I inform the house most plainly that the South Australian government recognises the important role of 1080 poison as a tool in the management of vertebrate pests, and there is no plan to ban its use.

HEALTH SERVICE, GAWLER

The Hon. L. STEVENS (Minister for Health): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. L. STEVENS: Yesterday, the member for Light asked me a question about obstetric and gynaecological services at the Gawler Health Service, and I undertook to come back to the house with an answer. I have been advised that the existing contract for obstetric and gynaecological services at the Gawler Health Service will continue under the current arrangements until 31 December 2005. Discussions about future arrangements have been ongoing between Mr Gary Stewart, Wakefield Regional General Manager, and the Department of Health. Both the region and the Department of Health agree that future service arrangements will need to proceed via normal procurement arrangements. As part of this process, the Wakefield Health Region will need to approve these arrangements prior to submission to the Department of Health's Procurement Unit, which will then manage the process. The Wakefield region and the Gawler Health Service will both be active participants in this. There is a government commitment to openness and transparency, and the intended process provides opportunities for all interested parties to participate.

HOSPITALS, WAITING LISTS

The Hon. L. STEVENS (Minister for Health): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. L. STEVENS: In question time today, the deputy leader asked me a question in relation to a Mr McMahan and elective surgery. The Royal Adelaide Hospital has advised that Mr McMahan is scheduled to have his surgery on 2 May. I am advised by the hospital that it is a minor corrective procedure. Mr McMahan has been categorised as a priority patient as part of the government's determination to clean up long waits for elective surgery following the injection of \$10 million of extra funds into the system in October, or thereabouts, last year. My letter to the deputy leader on 3 March said that surgery would occur within the next two months and it has been scheduled as such. During my answer in question time today, I said that the government had put in an additional \$28 million dollars to provide for elective surgery; that should have been an additional \$21 million above the base level of elective surgery carried on in our hospitals.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

VICTIMS OF CRIME

Mr VENNING (Schubert): A couple of weeks ago the Hon. Jennifer Rankine made note in this place of her new grand daughter, Olivia. I met her the other night and I was very pleased that young Olivia is making very good progress. I want to also proudly announce the arrival of my first

grandson. He arrived a few weeks ago and his name is Harrison Adrian Haynes, weighing in at 10lb 1oz. When this happens to a person it is quite significant—when the generations are passing by. I have two grand daughters, Kate and Jaimee Venning, but the first grandson was a milestone. I appreciated the Hon. Jennifer Rankine, the member for Wright's, mention of her grand daughter, and I am very pleased to put on the record my grandson as well. So, Harry Haynes, my first grandson, and hopefully not my last grandson, is doing very well, as are the proud parents, Anthony and Jo Haynes, and, of course, so are the proud grandparents, Kay and I.

Today I want to speak about a constituent in my electorate who is a victim of crime, and who has no right to receive compensation under the current legislation because he did not sustain bodily injuries. The incident that I am referring to occurred on 14 September 2004, when police were in pursuit of a male offender near Mount Pleasant. Mr Robert Guthrie, a local resident, had his grader (which was a form of income for him) locked up in his shed. The offender broke into the shed, started the grader, and stole it in an attempt to escape police. I am not sure if anyone remembers that incident—I can—but it was quite an unusual occurrence at the time. The offender proceeded to escape from police and, in doing so, revved the grader flat out in low gear, put it under immense pressure, and eventually it blew up. Police then shot the offender in the cab of the grader. Since this time Mr Guthrie's grader has been inoperable. He is losing money in an earning capacity because of this incident. The grader had third party insurance, the necessary level of insurance for this type of vehicle, and Mr Guthrie did everything possible to help police with their pursuit and the investigation. To this day, Mr Guthrie has received no compensation for his grader, and with the replacement cost estimated at around \$55 000 Mr Guthrie's financial position does not enable him to purchase a new one.

Mr Guthrie contacted my office for assistance, and we subsequently wrote a letter to the Minister for Police in December last year. My office received acknowledgment of the letter at that time, but as the months slipped by we heard nothing. Another letter was written in February, and no response was received. The same letter was faxed to the minister's office two weeks ago and there has still been no response. All the while, Mr Guthrie is losing money. He is a victim—

The Hon. P.F. Conlon interjecting:

Mr VENNING: I hear what the minister says. I am happy to wait on the new minister; he is the new minister, and I am not holding you personally responsible at all, minister. Thank you for that assurance, minister; I am pleased. Mr Guthrie is a victim in all of this, yet nothing has been done to help him or thank him for the assistance he gave the police during and after the incident occurred. Had Mr Guthrie injured himself during the incident, he would have been classed as a victim of crime and entitled to compensation. Because it was a grader there is apparently no form of compensation. More to the point—even if Mr Guthrie was in a financial position to replace the grader—should he? Is he the one responsible, or should there be a change in the victims of crime legislation or insurance policy for heavy vehicles of this nature? I urge the minister to fast track this issue—apparently he has signed a letter today; I am pleased to hear that—and investigate any possible solutions to the problem currently experienced by Mr Guthrie.

I also make note here today of the demise of the St John's Ambulance in Crystal Brook. After 38 years of service, St John Ambulance of Crystal Brook has closed—ceased operation. It is a very sad day in the community like Crystal Brook. It purchased our first ambulance right back in the fifties. It built and owned its own buildings and facilities; it has four OAMs amongst its volunteers. It is a disgrace that it has come to this after what the government has done by taking away the importance of the operating ambulance by St John. This is always going to be the downside. Of all the work that St John's has done in the community like Crystal Brook is now gone—confined to history. I pay a tremendous tribute to all those who have put in over all the years, because we have appreciated it. It is a pretty sad day that St John's have pulled down the blind in Crystal Brook and walked away from the buildings—with no debt; everything was fully paid for, and in fact there was money to distribute to the community. It is a pretty sad day.

WHITE, Hon. P.L.

Ms BREUER (Giles): Today I want to pay tribute to the former minister for transport, the member for Taylor, the Hon. Trish White, and commend her on the excellent work in her previous portfolios of education and transport. I certainly had a very good working relationship with her when she was shadow minister. I was assured on day one when we came into government of something very dear to my heart, that we would not be closing any schools in Whyalla, which I was very happy about, particularly Whyalla High School. I continued to maintain that working relationship with her right through her portfolios.

I am very disappointed to see that there has been some criticism of her resigning to be with her family, from her ministry. A number of articles were put out at the time that she resigned, and one in particular from Matthew Abraham, which says:

The sensible decision by Trish White to walk away from a job she did not love to make more time for those she loves must have left the other girls in the ALP not just surprised but deeply confused.

She is, after all, breaking the unwritten rule of the Labor Sisterhood—that a woman can do everything.

More than this, the unwritten rule states that not only can our Labor women do everything, she *must* do everything.

I thought that criticism of us as Labor women was a bit unfair, because I say congratulations to the member for Taylor, and well done on her decision to spend more time with her family, to realise that it was very difficult for her to hold that portfolio and fulfil her biggest obligation which is, of course, to her children. I say congratulations to her because I believe that, by doing that, she has opened the way for so many other women now to feel comfortable about making the same decision. I think it is interesting that when the member for Light stood down from his shadow ministry three years ago, nobody really questioned his actions. I remember him saying at the time that he wanted to spend more time with his family; his family was growing up. It was not seen as an issue for him as a male but, of course, once again, as women in politics we get continual criticism whatever we do, and we certainly have to be not of equal merit but much better, I think, than a lot of our male colleagues to get credit for what we do.

She has actually said to other women, particularly young women, is that it is okay to look at your life and options, and to see what you are during and say, 'No; this is not what I want to do; I think other things are more important in my

life.' I am a feminist from way back; I started back in the sixties. I have always promoted feminism in my life. I have always promoted it with the women that I have worked with. My daughter has certainly been raised as a very strong little feminist, and I am very pleased with the way that she has turned out.

I have worked all my life, and I have had only about two years off during that time, that is, 12 months with each of my two children. I have been very lucky. I lived in the country and was only three or four minutes away from work and child-care facilities. I also owe a lot to the support of my mother, who played a great part in the raising of my children. She was there and available and, when the children were not in child care, she was able to look after them for me, and I knew that they were in a warm and safe environment. That was very comforting for me because, of course, guilt is the biggest problem for working mothers, and we continue to feel guilty for what we are doing. I certainly missed opportunities to be with my children; I regret that, because you have your babies for about only 15 years before they turn into very independent young people who go off on their own way. However, of course, they constantly come home for money!

Nowadays, young women have opportunities that certainly women my age did not have, and I believe that is due to their feminist mothers and grandmothers who created those opportunities for them. However, we now have this 'super' idea that young women have to be able to do everything, including working, raising a family and so on. Women have far too many demands on their life nowadays, and I think it is really important to sit back and look at quality of life. By her action, the member for Taylor was able to say to these young women, 'Look at your priorities, decide what you want to do and make those choices, and nobody should criticise you for them.' I thank the member very much for giving women of this time that opportunity.

What the member for Taylor did also raises questions about how unfriendly and difficult this place is for families. We now have lots of fathers with young babies who I am sure are facing similar issues relating to the hours spent away from home. As MPs, we are not expected to have a life, and most of us find that, when we come into this place, our personal and social life certainly suffers. We are expected to be MPs 24 hours a day and, consequently, everything suffers. It is not possible to continue to work these hours and do a good job, unless we are able to look at our life and do something about it.

Time expired.

REGIONAL SITTING

Mr BRINDAL (Unley): The proposition that this parliament should reconvene at a date to be fixed in Mount Gambier is a matter creating much debate, since I believe that it is within the province of this house to entertain an adjournment motion to such place as it sees fit. In anticipating the will of the parliament, I think that it is amusing. Having said that, I can count, and I believe that if the government is indeed determined to adjourn to Mount Gambier, this parliament will, with the help of others in its employ, adjourn to Mount Gambier.

I am tempted to wonder why, and I am led to speculate that somebody, who may well have been promised a ministry not only in this government but also in the next, might need a hand since, if that person, who now finds themselves sitting on a Labor bench enjoying all the prerequisites of a ministry,

went to the election professing their conservatism, they might need to be assisted to get over the line next time, because some of the good people of Mount Gambier might not have voted them into that office or onto that side of the house with the group of people with whom they sit.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: He'll bolt in.

Mr BRINDAL: The Attorney says that, but I am led to wonder why a Labor premier, even though he is bipartisan, should be led to help out a conservative MP at the expense of his own very talented back bench. I say that, because I read today that now we will all pay for it out of travel allowances. I do not think that any member of parliament would object to that, because it is taxpayers' money—it is all taxpayers' money, whether we pay out of our travel allowance or whether we pay separately. It does not matter much, as it is taxpayers' money. However, what does matter is the ability of this government to hide the true expense of this parliament. I call publicly today—as I will every day until it happens—for full and transparent accountability on this matter. If it is good enough for this parliament to assemble in Mount Gambier for good and proper purpose, it is equally right that the people of South Australia should know, to the cent, exactly what it costs. The proposition that we should draw this from our own travel allowance effectively hides at least \$50 000.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: Sooky, sooky, la, la.

Mr BRINDAL: The Attorney says, 'Sooky, sooky, la, la'. The Attorney as the chief law officer of this state should have his attention drawn to *The South Australian Government Gazette* of 15 February 2001 which states:

A member . . . [including the Leader of the Opposition]. . . whose place of residence is more than 75 km by road from the General Post office at Adelaide and who is required to stay in Adelaide overnight in order to attend not only to Parliamentary duties but also to the member's duty to be actively involved in community affairs and to represent and assist constituents in dealing with governmental and other public agencies and authorities and who incurs expenses in so doing, shall be paid an accommodation allowance. . . [at the rate of]. . . \$158 for each such night to a maximum of \$21 330.

This equates to 135 nights. Incidentally, where a country member lives more than 75 kilometres from Adelaide and travels to and from this place, he is eligible to receive a travelling to and from allowance at the rate of 41.9¢ per kilometre (unless he uses a public vehicle) or any airfares legally accrued.

Ms Breuer interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Giles is out of order.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: Stop putting on the poor mouth.

The SPEAKER: And the Attorney is out of order.

Mr BRINDAL: It includes taxi fares to and from the airport. So, we have a rule that has been in place for decades—

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: Let's debate this on radio.

Mr BRINDAL: We will. I am absolutely sure we will. We have a rule here which says that if you are a country member and if you have to go away from your home to attend to your business as a member of parliament you are entitled to certain allowances but, if you are a city member required to go to Mount Gambier, somehow these rules (which have been gazetted) no longer apply, because this government wants to hide the amount of money that it will cost.

This government is ordering green carpet for the theatre down there, and that will appear in the administrative services budget. This government will not declare the minister's

expenses or his officers' expenses, because they are listed separately. Most of the costs will be hidden, and they should not be. If it is good enough for this parliament to go to Mount Gambier, it is good enough for the government to tell the public exactly how much it will cost. We should not be part of a cover-up to bolster the re-election chances of the member for Mount Gambier. No other one of the 46 members will have this sort of money for pork-barrelling their election chances. If the government wants to do that—

Ms Breuer: It's the second-biggest city in the state.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr BRINDAL: If the government wants to do that and hide how much it is costing, then they can. I am not objecting to our going down there—much; I am mainly objecting to what I see as a cover-up of the cost. It became obvious today—and I will go on out about this every day—

Time expired.

SCHOOLS, NORWOOD PRIMARY

Ms CICCARELLO (Norwood): On Sunday afternoon I attended a reunion at Norwood Primary School on Osmond Terrace, which was attended by all past scholars who attended the Norwood Infants School, the Norwood Public School, the now-defunct Norwood technical girls high school and the Norwood boys technical high school, which is now Marryatville. The reunion was organised by the Old Scholars Association and provided an opportunity for old scholars to see their old classrooms and schoolmates. It was also an opportunity to collect details about past students which would assist the committee to organise future functions and activities. The association has already conducted two large 'get together' functions at the Marryatville High School but, as it was noted at these events that many of the former students attending these functions had attended only the schools on Osmond Terrace, it was decided that the primary school would be the most appropriate place for any future reunions.

Many children living in the Norwood district from 1877 received their education on Osmond Terrace adjacent to Norwood Oval and close to The Parade. This area, although changed somewhat, is still a highly regarded education precinct. What was once the infant school is now the Adelaide Central School of Art, and some of the artists associated with the school—Rod Taylor, Chris Orchard, Anna Platten and Nona Burden, just to name a few—have also been instrumental in helping the school to develop a very strong arts focus.

The Norwood Boys Technical High School in early years developed an excellent reputation and tradition and gave the boys hands-on practical skill training in sheet metal work and woodwork. As a result, many of the boys took up apprenticeships in building, plumbing, automotive and electrical trades. The school was relocated to what is currently Marryatville High School due to the growing numbers in 1953—and it is interesting to note that, after many years, there is a growing interest in the re-establishment of trade schools.

It was a very emotional experience for the several hundred former students crowded into the school hall, bubbling with excitement and pride to be there and bursting to relive their memories. The meeting finally got under way and it was established, following a show of hands, that the oldest person in the hall had attended the school in 1921. I had the opportunity to speak to several of the former students, and it was fascinating to listen to the many interesting experiences they

had to recount. Some of these stories would certainly challenge some people's perceptions about the Norwood area and how it has changed over the years.

One of the people I spoke to on the day was Jack Felstead, who attended from 1935 to 1937. His account of his school days included an anecdote that highlighted just how much things have changed. He said that the school was described by many at the time as the prep school for the reformatory. Apparently, when students failed to turn up at school for any length of time, it was assumed that they had been promoted to the reformatory up the hill at Magill. Most people were very poor at the time, because those were the depression years, and Jack said that, even if someone was lucky enough to find a coin on the ground, they would not dare pick it up for fear of being pounced on and beaten up by some desperate people.

Most of us in South Australia are probably familiar with the cannons at Fort Glanville, which were installed to protect the state from invasion, I think, by the Russians. People might be surprised to know that the wide median in Osmond Terrace was zigzagged with bomb shelters. Kath Evans and Marcia Colton Langsford, who attended the school during the war years, remembered those bomb shelters and the regular air raid practices that were carried out, where they were all required to shelter in the bomb shelters. Paul Demetriou, who is a counsellor at West Torrens, recounted that the boys and girls high schools were segregated at the time, but that certainly did not stop them from fraternising as soon as they were out of sight of the school, and they all had very fond memories of the school socials at the Norwood Town Hall.

The afternoon was very full of rich stories, and I think the current students at Norwood Primary School will collect some of the stories and also photographs and memorabilia, which will take pride of place in their library. The school currently boasts students from about 40 different ethnic backgrounds, and it will be good for them to understand the history of their school and its former students. An interesting thing to note, as Anzac Day is near, is that an obelisk on the school grounds was built by the students in about 1917, and I think it is the only such monument built on any school ground.

Congratulations must go to the Chairperson of the committee, Dick Fishlock, for his ability to bring so many people together, and it is particularly impressive when you realise that the former students came from as far afield as Meningie, Old Reynella and Windsor Gardens, and one was even from Queensland. Rob Harkin, the ever enthusiastic principal, must also be congratulated for his ongoing commitment to the school community, which is welcoming not only to the present intake but to anyone who has had an association with the school community. He certainly recognises the importance for the students—and, in fact, for all of us—of having a sense of place, a sense of identity and a sense of history.

Time expired.

DRIVING SKILLS EDUCATION

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY (Light): I rise today to grieve following an approach from a constituent, Mr Neville Kernick, who happens to be the Captain of the CFS at Freeling. Mr Kernick and his brigade cover the Sturt Highway and, as he said, 'end up scraping people off the road' along that highway. The concern he has raised with me is in terms of the government's lack of advertising and lack of

education for drivers regarding basic driving skills. What he has related to me is that plenty of money ends up being spent on speed cameras and laser guns and those sorts of things, but not on educating people as to why they need to stay a safe distance behind a car, why they need to indicate when they are changing lanes or entering onto a main highway and some other basic rules—knowledge which, as drivers, we all take for granted that people have and will use. But, unfortunately, we see on the road (and he is in a particularly good position to see this) cases where people do not use the commonsense and the knowledge that they needed to obtain their driver's licence in the first place.

One of the things that Mr Kernick said to me is that there should be constant reminders about bad driving habits, and he refers to the fact of signage along the main roads in the city. For instance, when I come in on Main North Road there are signs just past Gepps Cross which remind people about tailgating and seatbelts, and that is a good thing. But he said, 'You do not see that in the country.' And he is right: you do not see that along main highways in the country and, as we have seen from road statistics, the country is where most of our deaths occur. So, he raises a very good point, I believe, in terms of education.

He said to me, 'I see plenty of reminders about drinking and driving and all those sorts of things but we do not see as much about the fact of falling asleep at the wheel and of taking rests when they are needed.' I indicated to him that I know there is an amount of advertising about that and I have seen billboards and that sort of thing in the metropolitan area but, again, you do not see it in the country anywhere near as often. It is very rare to see that sort of signage in the country. That signage is being placed in areas in the metropolitan area where people are undertaking short trips rather than long distance travelling and, of course, their chances of having a 'microsleep' at the wheel are fairly minor because of the stopping and starting for traffic or traffic lights and the like, whereas when people are in the country they are doing long distance driving—on straight roads, on many occasions—and the chance of falling asleep at the wheel is much greater.

Mr Kernick also raised with me the fact of speeding and his dislike for speed cameras because of the fact that you are not actually given the jolt at the time that you are speeding—the infringement notice turns up three weeks later—whereas, if there is a policeman with a laser gun on the side of the road, you are pulled over immediately and chastised about the fact that you were speeding, and the message sinks far deeper than when you get the expiation notice three weeks later in the post. As he said, that gets down to needing more police on the beat and on that sort of duty, particularly on country roads and particularly on roads such as the Sturt Highway. I know the Nuriootpa police conducted a very strong campaign in the local area on the Sturt Highway a few months ago which was quite successful. It just shows that more police on the road with laser guns will slow down people and reduce the carnage that has been occurring on that road.

So, my call and Mr Kernick's call to the government is that some of this signage that is being placed around the metropolitan area should be placed in country locations, because that is where the accidents occur and that is where the message needs to get through.

EDUCATION, HIGHER

Ms THOMPSON (Reynell): I was very interested to read in last week's *Australian* of 6 April two articles about higher

education headed 'Call to lower bar for poor' and 'Public pupils close gap at uni'. The gist of the articles indicated that, while students from private independent and Catholic schools seem to have higher tertiary admission scores achieved at public examinations, the students from non-selective government schools (that is, the ordinary run-of-the-mill schools supported entirely by taxpayers, with some small contributions from parents) prepare students very well for higher education and that students from non-selective government schools achieve excellently at university. One of the comments in the article states:

Students from non-selective government schools entered university with generally lower scores but 'subsequently catch up to, and then overtake, their more privileged counterparts.'

'Perhaps the new equity category based on school types should be introduced,' said Dr Dobson, who has just finished a PhD on equity in education.

Further on in the article, it states:

The advantages afforded students of better resourced-schools evaporated on the 'level playing field' of university, where 'the talent of government school students starts to shine through', he found. But lower final-year scores meant government school students were under-represented at university.

The headlines reminded me of a lecture I heard some 20 years ago. With the help of the library, I was able to recall a bit more about the person presenting the lecture, Dr Colin Power from Flinders University. Together with others, he completed a series of studies relating to higher education for the National Institute of Labour Studies. Unfortunately, I was not able to locate the paper from which I remembered the extracts coming from. They showed very clearly that students from government schools had a lower rate of drop out than students from private schools, particularly male students. The highest drop-out rate was for male students from private schools who were studying subjects other than law and medicine.

However, I found it very useful to revisit the equity work that had been undertaken by Dr Power and others nearly 20 years ago to see how it has informed us about the efforts necessary to ensure that our community benefits from all the talent available to it, not just from the talent of the children from better off families. In looking at attrition, Dr Powers and others said:

Individual characteristics generally seem to be important in terms of the reasons for attrition, rather than the rate of attrition. Most studies have found that women and older students tend to drop out for non-scholastic reasons while men and younger students tend to do so for scholastic reasons. The relation between family background variables and attrition rates seems to be complex: attrition rates are generally higher for students whose fathers are in 'blue-collar' occupations, whose parents do not have a degree and for ethnic and minority groups. The median parental income of student's dropping out is significantly lower than that of students who continue their course. However, once the effects of students' high school achievement were taken into account, a number of studies have found no residual effect attributable to family background.

Thus, the success rate appears to be related to whether financial support is adequate.

My plea is to the federal government to better resource students from lower socioeconomic groups to enable them to realise their talent and to achieve at university, as well as to universities to again consider their admission criteria and whether their systems of admission really recognise the skills of many applicants from public schools.

Time expired.

HOSPITALS, WAITING LISTS

The Hon. L. STEVENS (Minister for Health): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. L. STEVENS: Further to my earlier statement regarding the issues raised by the deputy leader in question time concerning Mr McMahon and his surgery at the Royal Adelaide Hospital, I now have some further information from the Royal Adelaide Hospital about the three letters from the hospital to Mr McMahon to which the deputy leader referred. I am advised that the first letter asked whether Mr MacMahon still wanted the surgery, had not been operated on elsewhere or, for some other reason, no longer required the surgery; the second letter was to confirm that he would be scheduled to receive his surgery on 2 May; and the third letter confirmed an appointment with the specialist on 19 April for a check ahead of his surgery on 2 May. I would like to inform the house that all this is standard procedure.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: DEEPENING OF OUTER HARBOR SHIPPING CHANNEL

Mr CAICA (Colton): I move:

That the 213th report of the committee, on the deepening of the Outer Harbor shipping channel, be noted.

The Public Works Committee has considered a proposal to deepen the Outer Harbor channel to accommodate larger shipping vessels that require deeper draught to access to the Outer Harbor port. The existing shipping channel and turning basin are to be deepened from 12.2 metres LAT to 14.2 metres LAT, and the shipping channel is to be extended into Gulf St Vincent by approximately 3.5 kilometres beyond the current entrance beacon. I know that members in the house will be wondering what LAT is, and for their benefit I advise that it is the lowest astronomical tide. When complete, the dredged area will be approximately 11.3 kilometres long and the dredged channel will be approximately 120 metres wide. The turning basin diameter will be increased from 460 metres to 475 metres.

The committee was told that the port cannot accommodate the increasing size of shipping vessels unless it is deepened, and shipping lines may reduce the number of calls to the port. In that event, it could lead to less investment in the port and threaten its long term viability. If the container terminal closes, the state's importers and exporters would suffer the additional time and cost of land bridging their product to and from an interstate port. This would erode the state's competitive position and economic health. The committee understands that, without deepening the channel, some \$2.8 billion worth of trade could be lost by 2013—\$1.6 billion of this would be in exports—and \$6.2 billion worth of trade could be lost by 2023.

Alternatively, if the channel is deepened, the direct gain in increased profits and lower costs is estimated at \$465 million over 20 years. Further benefits will be derived from improved road and rail safety and a reduction in greenhouse gas emissions. These are calculated at \$29 million over 20 years and \$43 million over 30 years. The estimated total cost of the channel deepening project is \$45 million. The govern-

ment's contribution is a \$15 million grant to be provided during 2005–2006. Flinders Port is committed to complete the project in the event of a cost overrun. The committee accepts that the project should be proceeded but notes that the value of the public investment relies upon its economic projections, and upon export industries taking advantage of the cost competitiveness encouraged by an alternative to rail haulage.

The benefits of the project require proper coordination with related infrastructure projects, and in this regard the committee notes a number of issues with concern. Firstly, the sale of Ports Corp was accepted in November 2001 based upon the current channel depth. The decision to increase the depth occurred only seven months later in June 2002. The committee is not convinced that due diligence in November 2001 could not have foreseen the changed shipping trends that make the increased depth necessary. Secondly, the committee was told that the proposal will optimise the benefit of other infrastructure such as the Port River Expressway. However, the expressway was independently conceived and justified before the need for a deeper channel was identified. Further evidence did not identify the conceptual linkages or benefits to the earlier project. Thirdly, the operation of the new grain berth is targeted for the end of 2006 and, so, its full benefits require a contract for the first of the two new bridges to be awarded within the next couple of months.

The committee was told that three million cubic metres of dredged material will be removed from the shipping channel. Unfortunately, it is fine silt unsuitable for beach regeneration and will be disposed of in the Gulf St Vincent. The committee has been most concerned to satisfy itself that the disposal of the material will occur in a way that avoids damage to the gulf. The dump site has been selected because there is very little biological activity in the vicinity and seagrasses will not grow in water that deep. Nevertheless, the work will be monitored by independent environmental certifiers who work on behalf of the Environment Protection Authority. There is an area of seagrass adjacent to the shipping channel itself, and turbidity there would be deposited on the seagrass. However, the environmental management plan tries to control that turbidity. If the level becomes too great, dredging has to stop or, depending upon the wind and tide, move to a different position in the channel.

The project proponents have spent over \$200 000 on hydro-dynamic modelling prepared by Flinders University and some private research organisations. This has involved two comprehensive computer models of the wind and currents at the sea floor and on the surface of the impacts of turbidity at the dump site and the dredge site. The committee is pleased to learn that this information is on the public record as part of the environmental impact statement and development application report for this project. The committee is assured that one of the dredges being employed is going to come over early to dredge a trench across the channel and Outer Harbor. This is to avoid the *Caulerpa racemosa* weed being spread into the gulf. The weed will be caught and removed prior to the other dredging taking place. The community understands that two other potential projects could be undertaken by the dredging equipment whilst it is here, and this could save the state up to \$5 million. As a result, the committee recommends to the minister that urgent consideration be given to utilising the dredging equipment for any additional suitable projects while it is in the state.

Pursuant to section 12C of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991, the Public Works Committee reports to the parliament that it recommends the proposed public work.

Mr VENNING (Schubert): I certainly rise with a lot of pleasure today to support the notion of the Chairman of the Public Works Committee, not only as a member of that committee, but also as a grain grower. I do declare that interest again, as I have always done. My shareholding is diminishing as we speak, but still I have an interest as does my family. After all of these years of discussion, after all the political hoo-ha, at last it appears that we are getting something done at Outer Harbor.

Sir, you will remember the first report was done by the industry which recommended a port that was to be situated up the Port River near the current bulk-handling berth. You can imagine the amount of the dredging that would require. I did all the work possible, made a lot of public comments, addressed a lot of public meetings and had a report done myself that recommended that Outer Harbor be the spot. Eventually, it was agreed that Outer Harbor be the spot. But then the previous government—and members will be listening, and that is all right, it is all on the record—and the previous minister, for some reason, decided to place the new bulk-grain terminal near the power station. What for? I do not know. The Minister for Infrastructure has quoted me as saying that I would never support that. I am pleased that the current government has put it where it has—right alongside the container terminal, where it always ought to have been, without huge, long conveyor belts, and with a loop-line close to it so that trains can come in, unload their grain and continue on in the loop and out again. That way we can have continuous loop trains that do not actually stop.

We have come a long way. The government has got that right. With the delay and the amount of time that it has taken, I hope that now we have actually made the decision the dredging will start, as we have been told, this month. I am sure that the Flinders Ports will be so pleased that we have made this progress to dig the port out to 16 metres of water to allow the entry of Panamax ships. Without this the future of South Australia as an export state or as an export port was looking very parlous indeed, because we have the Victorian port of Portland so close; we have the port of Melbourne being upgraded; and a very efficient railway between them. We were looking at losing it. Once you have lost your port and your export outlet, you put your exporters at very serious handicap and risk, particularly with our wine industry, because everybody wants next day delivery, and it can be done by rail if you have the right access. I am pleased that we have at last made this decision.

I want to now put on the record some undisclosed facts. Members will recall that not too many years ago the Hon. Graham Gunn and I were on the front page of a paper in London. I now want to say why we were there. We have been hesitant to reveal this until now, but we were there to study the operator of the ports. There was a company called Forth Ports, and another associated company with Flinders Ports, both operating. We were there to have a look. We planned the trip after the sale was to be finished, but because the sale was in a very delicate situation we never did it. We were in London and we could not do that. Certainly, we spent the rest of the time visiting all of the embassies and the people that the Hon. Graham Gunn knew. I thought that the treatment of that by the media was disgraceful. We ought to have sued, because I am happy to put that on the agenda and make it public at any time. I do not believe that the Hon. Graham Gunn did any sightseeing, or anything at all—zero, nothing; whereas I went into the cathedral at about 6.30 one night. You can all recall that; it was on the front page of the paper.

It was all about ports; it was all about study, because we know how important this is. Here we are tonight; we have passed a very important milestone; we have put away \$45 million—\$15 million of government, \$15 million of industry, and \$15 million of saved dollars to a very important project.

I am very pleased to note that it was an idea of the Public Works Committee that, while the dredges are here, we should encourage the government to spend the extra money to save the \$5 million that it would cost to get them back to do any other job. Certainly, I am very, very pleased about that. Finally we are now making progress. I hope now that the dredging is underway the associated companies (ABB Grain, the rail, Flinders Ports) will now get on with building the infrastructure so that the moment that these cursed bridges open, we can be in business.

I will finish off by saying what worries me with these bridges. I just wonder how a lot of these decisions about the bridges were made. It is tied up with the dredging, because it is the way the grain gets to the port. It is all about us having a most efficient port. I just wonder who made the decision to build lifting bridges. Who did it? Was it engineers? Was it politicians? Was it the caucus? I do not believe that it was the caucus at all. I believe that this decision was made by four people: the two members of parliament down there, the state and federal members, and that includes our Treasurer, the Premier and the Minister for Infrastructure. I do not believe that the rank and file members on the other side had any input into this, nor was any engineer ever asked or invited for a comment.

I invite the Labor Party, the members of the government, to tell me where in the world there is a functional, operational and wide lifting railway bridge. You tell me. I am happy to visit it, whether it be Venezuela, South Africa, or anywhere at all—I am happy to go and have a look at it and see how well it works. Precision is required. Lifting road bridges are easy because cars can jump gaps of 20 centimetres; trains cannot jump any gap, because they will hammer that gap and wreck the rail and bridge because of the huge weights involved. I am happy to stand corrected. I am happy to be told by any minister or member of the government that rail bridges like this exist and are operating functionally.

I put on the record again that I believe that, if we have lifting bridges, they will be welded shut in my lifetime. It is all to do with the dredging of the river, and I hope that it is not too late. If members of the government, including those on the back bench, were to think about this, they would come up with a commonsense solution. I am confident that they can, because they were able to do so in relation to the location of this port—that is, right alongside the container terminal—and I give them credit for that commonsense. The right decision is that they tried lifting bridges, but they were not feasible and they could not afford it. They can compensate some of the yachties, put winches on their boats and lower their masts, because they will be fixed bridges. They will save the money, have good timetables and good government. I support the motion.

Mr BRINDAL (Unley): As a member of the Public Works Committee, I, too, support the motion and commend the government on this initiative. It is reasonably important, although, as I ventured to say when asking questions, one is sometimes left to wonder whether every state needs every facility. While I was a member of the government that supported this initiative, and while I know this government

supports the initiative, and I do not question that, nevertheless I think a germane question to ask is: will a port in central southern Australia be part of the transportation options in 100 years' time? I am sure that my colleague the member for Schubert will argue, as will most of the rural sector, that as long as we are exporting bulk products, such as wheat (and, perhaps to a lesser extent, wool) and certainly mineral products and wine, that justifies the existence of a port. The member for Schubert told the committee (and he was supported in this by technical experts) that the quicker you can get something onto a ship the cheaper the transportation costs become. Shipping as a means of freight is cheaper per kilometre than any other form of transport. So, when large quantities require transshipment to international destinations, insofar as they continue to occur, I think that the expense is justified.

However, in addressing this motion, I want to draw the attention of the house to another matter that is equally the province of the Public Works Committee. We examined the Port River Expressway. As I speak, unless the chairman contradicts me (and I do not think he will), the Port River Expressway is under way and heading quickly towards completion. We have now completed the investigation on behalf of the parliament, and cabinet has approved the deepening of the port. The bulk handling company, ABB Grain, is installing the infrastructure and facilities. From memory, it will all come together towards the end of 2006. However, there is a problem; that is, we will have a good grain terminal and an excellent, deepened port, but we will have a road that will almost get there—but not quite. That leads me to the next proposition about which we asked questions. Was the evidence given a month ago, Ivan?

The Hon. J.W. Weatherill: Get your facts straight.

Mr BRINDAL: I am just checking, because I do not want to mislead you. You would be the last person I would want to mislead. You are running that rotten department of yours as well as you can.

Mr Hanna interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: I am being berated by my friend the member for Mitchell. He obviously has a motion, so I will be quick. Three weeks ago, we heard evidence that it is necessary to call for tenders for the bridges within two months. We were told that, if this project is to come together, and if we are to avoid a situation where we have a good road going part of the way there, an excellent shipping terminal and all the facilities, and if we want to avoid all the grain trucks being diverted through Port Adelaide and avoid offloading and double-handling being involved (either of which is a possibility), the bridge needs to be opened by the end of 2006—'opened' in the sense of its being formally commissioned rather than its needing to be an opening bridge.

The Hon. J.W. Weatherill: Where do you stand—opening or closing?

Mr BRINDAL: In answer to the minister's interjection, I am not particularly fussed which sort of bridge we have. As a member of the Public Works Committee, I point out to this parliament—as I am duty-bound to do—that the evidence before us was that, if the government does not give the Public Works Committee details relating to the bridge within about five weeks, the bridge will not open in concert with the road and all the facilities. We will have a right royal shemozzle on our hands, and that will be the province of the new parliament. If I am not here, I will make sure that my colleagues who are know the exact date I made this speech. The member for Goyder has already announced that he will not be here,

so it will be no good telling him; however, I may well remind the member for Schubert.

I think that, in the next parliament, it will be very good to stand up and say that the reason the government is behind schedule, and the reason that there is chaos in Port Adelaide (the ex deputy premier's electorate), is simply that it dropped the ball and did not approve the project in time. It could also be said that, 'What is more, in commending the deepening of the port, the member for Unley said, "You've got to get on with the job, guys. You've got to do this within five or six weeks and, if you don't, the results will be on the head of the Labor government.'" Having said that, in deference to the member for Mitchell, whose temper I fear, I commend this motion to the house.

Motion carried.

ROAD TRAFFIC (DRUG TESTS) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 9 February. Page 1446.)

Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens): I move:

That the debate be further adjourned.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Is that seconded?

An honourable member: Yes, sir.

Mr VENNING: No.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The question is that the motion be agreed to. For the question, say 'aye', against, 'no'. I think the ayes have it.

Mr VENNING: Divide! It's a bloody disgrace!

Ms Breuer: That's unparliamentary.

Mr Venning interjecting:

Ms Breuer: Order him out!

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Venning: Forty-seven people are dead out there!

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The house divided on the motion:

AYES (19)

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

NOES (19)

Brindal, M. K.	Brokenshire, R. L.
Brown, D. C.	Buckby, M. R.
Chapman, V. A.	Goldsworthy, R. M.
Gunn, G. M.	Hamilton-Smith, M. L. J.
Hanna, K.	Kerin, R. G.
Lewis, I. P.	Matthew, W. A.
McFetridge, D.	Meier, E. J.
Penfold, E. M.	Redmond, I. M.
Scalzi, G.	Venning, I. H. (teller)
Williams, M. R.	

PAIR(S)

McEwen, R. J.	Evans, I. F.
Rann, M. D.	Kotz, D. C.
Foley, K. O.	Hall, J. L.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: There are 19 ayes and 19 noes, and I cast my vote with the ayes. The adjournment is agreed to.

Motion thus carried.

Mr Venning: You're a lot of hypocrites, that's what you are—hypocrites.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Sir, I rise on a point of order. The rather excited member for Schubert is yelling 'hypocrites' across the chamber. I ask him to withdraw.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: 'Hypocrites' is unparliamentary. I ask the member for Schubert to withdraw.

Mr VENNING: Sir, I will not withdraw. If you check what the *Oxford Dictionary* says about the word 'hypocrite' (and I just read it a while ago), you will see that it states, 'a person guilty of hypocrisy'. I will not withdraw.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Sir, my point of order is that it is plainly unparliamentary. There is precedent for it.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I direct the member for Schubert to withdraw. The use of the word 'hypocrites' is unparliamentary. I direct him to withdraw immediately and without qualification.

Mr VENNING: No, sir, I will not withdraw.

MEMBER FOR SCHUBERT, NAMING

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Then I name the member for Schubert.

Mr VENNING (Schubert): Sir, I used the word 'hypocrite' because the—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for Schubert will take his seat.

The Hon. I.P. LEWIS: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The honourable member is entitled to be heard in explanation—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I am taking advice from the Clerk. I do not need the assistance of the member for Hammond, thank you. I give the member for Schubert an opportunity to be heard in explanation.

Mr VENNING: I am unaware that the use of the word 'hypocrite' is unparliamentary. I checked the dictionary a moment ago. The word 'hypocrisy' is defined as 'dissembler, pretender or an actor'. We have heard many members opposite speak about the road toll, which is a very serious matter. Right now, 47 people have died on our roads, compared with 34 last year. It is a very serious matter. We have heard all the speeches about drink driving and everything else, and all the press releases have been out there circulating. They are speaking with a forked tongue. Here is an opportunity to address this subject. I have told members of the government that they can take over this bill and amend it—they can own it. But they have chosen not to do that. They just delay, delay, delay, delay.

I have to reassess my position. A lot of people over there have let me down. They have encouraged me to do this, and we have been debating it for over two years. First it was blood tests, then it was roadside tests, and now it is a bill in relation to swab drug testing. A lot of people have spoken forcefully about this matter, and I take this very personally. I am happy, after 14 years, to walk out of this place.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The chair has to say whether or not the explanation is acceptable. The explanation is not acceptable to the chair. The member for Schubert was directed to withdraw. He refused. I call the Leader of the Government.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Mr Deputy Speaker—

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Sit down. Enjoy it.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: No, I was first to my feet.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: But you didn't get the call.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Members will take their seat. I am asking for the indulgence of the house while I take the advice of the Clerk. I ask members to please bear with me while I do so. I call the Leader of the Government.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Mr Deputy Speaker, I was the first on my feet and, being the first on my feet, I therefore demand the right to move:

That the member for Schubert's explanation be accepted.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Is that seconded?

Honourable members: Yes, sir.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The deputy leader.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I have a right to debate that. I have sat in this house day after day during question time and I have heard the Deputy Premier, the Minister for Infrastructure and others refer to members in a general sense across this house as hypocrites. In fact, I have heard various rulings from speakers that, if it is a general reflection on the house, then there is no need to withdraw. In fact, I think we have heard a rather passionate explanation from the member for Schubert. I can understand that; he has been a very strong advocate, indeed, for this measure, and the government has now moved to defer this issue yet again. Therefore, I do not believe it is unparliamentary for him to use the general expression 'that is hypocritical', because it is clearly hypocritical. Frankly, if the government votes for this against my motion, that also is hypocritical of the government. I have used that expression in speeches in this house on numerous occasions and it has not been ruled as unparliamentary. I cannot reflect on an individual, but the member for Schubert was not reflecting on an individual: he was reflecting on the general stance taken by the government. Therefore, I have no hesitation, based on what I have seen the practice of this house to be, in saying that this house accepts the explanation of the member for Schubert.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Minister for Transport): The only unfortunate aspect of the comments of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition is that they are not actually accurate. In fact, I would say within the last month when sitting in this place I have used the term 'hypocrite' in general. I was asked to withdraw that and I replaced it with the term 'whited sepulchre' which, as those with a biblical bent would know, means something very similar but is not known to be unparliamentary.

The member for Schubert's misguided passion is regrettable. I point out that there is actually a government bill for consultation on this very subject so, far from being hypocritical, the government has a bill out for consultation on this, which we think is an intelligent thing to do. It would be regrettable that, because we chose a different path and decided to consult, we should suffer such inaccurate accusations. But the simple truth is this: were it to be found that the use of the term 'hypocrite' in reference to people here is unparliamentary, it would be a first. As a minister of the government, I have been required to withdraw the term. It is certainly not for the member for Schubert, because in his misguided little world he believes more passionately in the issue than anyone else, to change the rules, because he cannot. I have to say that, were it parliamentary, I would be

using it every day in question time because of my beliefs. But the truth is it would not be parliamentary and would unnecessarily inflame debate. If it is good enough for a minister of the government to withdraw the term, it is good enough for the member for Schubert to do so.

I think it is regrettable that he wants to grandstand and make a stunt of this and get himself thrown out. Perhaps he has somewhere he wants to go this evening: I do not know. But it is regrettable that he wants to make a stunt out of this and fly in the face of parliamentary precedent and refuse to withdraw a term that has been held to be plainly unparliamentary in this parliament and other parliaments for many years. On that basis, not only can we not accept the explanation, but to accept the explanation of the member for Schubert would also lower the standards of this parliament. I am not sure if the leader—

The Hon. Dean Brown: You are the worst offender!

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I am sorry, do you want to get on the record, Dean? Do you want to say something as well? No, I did not think so.

The Hon. Dean Brown: I am saying that in discussions in this house the word ‘hypocritical’ has been used.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Can I say that we are not assisted by the plain dissembling of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, because it is absolutely clear and it was admitted by the member for Schubert himself that he did not say ‘hypocritical’. He yelled the word ‘hypocrites’ at people, not ‘hypocritical’.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: So the choice for the house is very simple: we lower the standards that have been set and accept the explanation of the member for Schubert, or we do not accept it. I have nothing against him—he is usually a well-intended enough guy—but the fact is that we cannot have a vote of the house establish that it is parliamentary to call people hypocrites, or it will become the norm in the house, and that simply is unacceptable.

Mr BROKENSHIRE (Mawson): I ask the house not to name and throw out the honourable member for Schubert on the basis that he clearly was talking about the government as a group. We often refer to government. What he said, and implied in what he said, was that the government is full of hypocrisy and it is totally hypocritical on this very important matter. Members have to understand that many people such as the member for Schubert live in high traffic carnage areas. They live there and see it, and their community is very concerned.

Only a few weeks ago, after not supporting the member for Schubert for two years and continually blocking an opportunity to save lives on our roads, we then saw the Premier come in and, in my opinion, give the wrong message to the parliament when he started to talk about the importance of this particular bill—a bill drafted by parliamentary counsel. The member for Schubert is so annoyed because parliamentary counsel draft bills for private members and for the government, and it is the same legal team that does it. We could be saving lives today. We could have been saving them for the last two years. The Premier said that 28 per cent of the people killed and driving in 2004 had amphetamines or cannabis in their system. We have just seen an enormous amount of road carnage right across the state, and the hypocritical reference to the government is accurate because they are playing politics with people’s lives and they intend

not to bring this bill into the house until late in the spring session so that they can get it on the cameras just before the election that the police will be out there drug-driver testing. That is what it is about. The member for Schubert has a right, on behalf of his community and the broader South Australian community, to protect those lives, to stop the hypocrisy of this government, to stop this government playing politics and to ensure that this parliament can do something right now in a bipartisan way in the next 48 hours to get this bill passed through both houses of parliament and bring in the technology to save lives within a maximum of 40 days from now.

In defence of the member for Schubert, I also place on the public record that I spoke to Victorian police on Saturday and was told that it is working very well over there. They have the legislation and technology in place. My final plea is: please do not throw out a good member.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for Mawson is now debating the merits of the bill.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Minister for Families and Communities): I want to make a contribution to the house about the effect on the proceedings of the house in our acceding to the acceptance of the member for Schubert’s explanation. As Minister for Families and Communities, I am routinely asked questions by those opposite about matters of child protection, disability funding and affordable housing. In each of those areas, I have the very strong belief that the opposition, when it was in government, did much worse—

Ms CHAPMAN: I rise on a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker. The motion before the house is a very important one in that it moves that the house accepts the submission put to it. It has nothing to do with the subject matter. I suggest that the speaker is in breach of standing order 127, which prohibits digression from the subject matter under discussion, and I request that the Deputy Speaker rule accordingly.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: There is no point of order. However, I will listen to what the minister has to say.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: I only seek to refer to those matters, because what we saw over the previous 8½ years of the previous government was a systematic underfunding—

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I rise on a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker. Mr Deputy Speaker, I ask whether you are being consistent this afternoon. We have now raised for the second time a point of order in relation to the relevance of this matter. Mr Deputy Speaker, whereas you pulled up the member for Mawson when he was within a few words of going into a debate, it appears that you have allowed for the second time the minister to wander wherever—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I understand the—

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Under standing order 127, I ask that you, Mr Deputy Speaker, be consistent with your rulings.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I understand the deputy leader’s point of order. I draw the minister back to the matter of the acceptance of the apology.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Thank you, sir. It is very important, because the answer I would prefer to give to the house is I would be sorely tempted to name the member for Finnis as someone who used the phrase that has just been used by the member for Schubert. I would be moved to use that phrase in relation to almost every contribution in answers to questions in this house about our so-called deficiencies in these areas. Indeed, I am almost certain that on almost every occasion the Minister for Health, when being asked a further

question about the difficulties associated with the health care system would be sorely tempted to observe about the member for Finnis that, in fact, he was a person such as the term used by the member for Schubert. If members of the house think that is an edifying way in which we should be dealing with question time, I suppose they should be attracted to supporting the member for Schubert's motion. But it will tend to lead to uproar in every question time, which will not assist the proceedings of this house.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for Unley has the call.

Mr BRINDAL (Unley): Mr Deputy Speaker, I, along with my colleagues, support the acceptance of the member for Schubert's explanation, and I do so on the following grounds. This house has ancient customs, and it reserves to itself ancient privilege. I stand here and look opposite and see a group of the government who last week, for reasons known only to themselves, were prepared to sacrifice the most ancient and inviolable of privileges of this house. Yet, today, if the member for Schubert's words are to be accepted, perhaps it means that the word 'hypocrite' is no longer unparliamentary. This is 2005, and I in fact share the sentiments of the minister opposite. It is about time that some of these words can be used. If you read the meaning of the word 'hypocrite' in the dictionary, some people should be able to be called hypocrites and, similarly, some people should be able to be called liars. Just because they worked two or three hundred years ago does not mean that this parliament should move on.

In asking that this house accept the member for Schubert's explanation and perhaps change some of the rulings, I point out to this house that today I heard the member for West Torrens accuse someone of being a coward (it was not me; I did not raise it). I know that that is referred to in Erskine May as being unparliamentary, yet no-one chose to raise it. I am sure that the former speaker, Mr Lewis, would not mind me saying this, but the former speaker, Mr Lewis, often used to refer to us as geese and other farmyard animals, and that is parliamentary. Today, Mr Speaker Such referred to us as pots and kettles, and that is parliamentary. So, we can in this place, in 2005, be accepted to be an assortment of barn yard animals, pots, kettles and other kitchen utensils. However, we cannot use the accepted English meaning of the words 'hypocrite' and 'liar'.

I do not care whether the member for Schubert in fact directed it at the government in general or to one member in particular. It is time we brought this institution into the 21st century, or whatever century we are in—I get a bit lost because this place is so befuddled by time—and we accepted the member for Schubert's explanation. It is time this house moved on, and it is time we were able to call people for what they are, such as hypocrites and liars, if that is what they be.

Mr HANNA (Mitchell): One of the beauties of not being bound to either of the major parties is that one can approach a debate such as this with an open mind. I must say that I have changed my view of how I will vote on this matter a couple of times during the debate. When I first heard the member for Schubert in explanation, I thought it should be accepted, the reason being that the government has repeatedly said that it wants to crack down on motorists under the influence of drugs and, indeed, has supported the drug driving testing the member for Schubert puts forward, yet the

government rejects it when he brings a proposal to this house. To me, that is hypocrisy, so the charge is fair. But then when I hear the deputy leader of the opposition get up—disrespectfully—and insist upon getting a say in before the minister, although the minister has the call, I think, 'How seriously do the members of the opposition take this debate if they can be so disrespectful?' Then I hear the member for Mawson use this opportunity simply to debate the merits of the matter; again, disrespectfully. At that point I was going to vote not to accept the explanation, but then I heard the Minister for Families and Communities essentially detail an argument which describes the members of the opposition as hypocrites because of the way in which they use question time—all but using the word 'hypocrites'. If the minister can make out the charge of hypocrisy through argument, surely it can be said in a single word. So, ultimately I am going to move to support the explanation of the member for Schubert.

The SPEAKER: Order, the Minister for Infrastructure will resume his seat! The question is that the explanation be accepted.

The house divided on the motion:

AYES (20)

Brindal, M. K.	Brokenshire, R. L.
Brown, D. C.(teller)	Buckby, M. R.
Chapman, V. A.	Goldsworthy, R. M.
Gunn, G. M.	Hall, J. L.
Hamilton-Smith, M. L. J.	Hanna, K.
Kerin, R. G.	Lewis, I. P.
Matthew, W. A.	McFetridge, D.
Meier, E. J.	Penfold, E. M.
Redmond, I. M.	Scalzi, G.
Venning, I. H.	Williams, M. R.

NOES (22)

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

PAIR(S)

Evans, I. F.	Rann, M. D.
Kotz, D. C.	McEwen, R. J.

Majority of 2 for the noes.

Motion thus negatived.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Minister for Transport): I move:

That the member for Schubert be suspended from the service of the house for one day.

Motion carried.

The SPEAKER: The member is suspended for the remainder of the day's sitting.

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The deputy leader is very disrespectful to the house. He has been here long enough; he should not behave like that. I understand that for Order of the

Day No. 3 it was a question of adjourning the debate: that the adjourned debate be made an order of the day for—

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: On motion.

The SPEAKER: Is that seconded?

Mr BRINDAL: Yes, sir.

The SPEAKER: It has been moved that it be on motion. Those of that opinion say aye; against no. I believe the noes have it.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: Divide.

The SPEAKER: Division required; ring the bells.

The house divided on the motion:

While the division was being held:

The Hon. I.P. LEWIS: Mr Speaker, I take it that, in relation to your ruling that the motion moved by the member for Stuart that the adjourned debate be made an order of the day on motion, in your ruling that the noes have it means that the matter will now go off the *Notice Paper*, since it is adjourned indefinitely.

The SPEAKER: No. It will be up to the house to put up an alternative motion if this motion is not carried, which is to—

The Hon. I.P. LEWIS: Mr Speaker, with the greatest respect, no member rose to amend the proposition. If it were to be an alternative I suggest that, under standing orders, there would have to have been an amendment for an alternative date. There was none. You asked for a call, and called against it. That means that it is adjourned indefinitely and I ask you to determine how otherwise it can be.

The SPEAKER: An alternative was proposed.

AYES (19)

Brindal, M. K.	Brokenshire, R. L.
Brown, D. C.	Buckby, M. R.
Chapman, V. A.	Goldsworthy, R. M.
Gunn, G. M. (teller)	Hall, J. L.
Hamilton-Smith, M. L. J.	Hanna, K.
Kerin, R. G.	Lewis, I. P.
Matthew, W. A.	McFetridge, D.
Meier, E. J.	Penfold, E. M.
Redmond, I. M.	Scalzi, G.
Williams, M. R.	

NOES (22)

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

PAIR(S)

Evans, I. F.	Rann, M. D.
Kotz, D. C.	McEwen, R. J.

Majority of 3 for the noes.
Motion thus negatived.

The SPEAKER: It is now up to the house for someone to move a motion for the adjourned debate in respect of Order of the Day No. 3.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN (Stuart): I move:

That it be adjourned to 4 May.

Motion carried.

DIVISIONS, ATTENDANCE

Mr CAICA (Colton): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr CAICA: Regrettably and embarrassingly, I missed a division that was called earlier, the very first division. Whilst it did not make any difference, it makes a difference to me and my electors. By way of explanation, I was on the balcony with the door closed and could not hear the bells and did not see the light. From now on, when I am required to go and get some fresh air out of the house, I will go to the garden area where I can hear the bells and see the lights.

The SPEAKER: The matter of bells and buzzers is currently being looked at. We trust that we can improve the system in the future.

SHOP TRADING HOURS (CHRISTMAS TRADING PERIOD) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 27 October. Page 611.)

Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens): On behalf of the member for Fisher, I move:

That this Order of the Day be discharged.

The SPEAKER: Is that motion seconded?

Honourable members: Yes, sir.

Mr BRINDAL: I rise on a point of order, sir. The house is in the unusual situation that you, sir, have recently been elevated to the position of Speaker. A number of matters are standing in your name, and it has been explained to me that such matters put forward are the property of the house. While it is within your province to ask that they be discharged, could I suggest that all members have some notification of such matters as, if the house likes a matter, it might choose to proceed with it, and I think we should be given some notice.

The SPEAKER: For the benefit of the member for Unley, last week I indicated which matters remained active and those which were no longer appropriate. This matter was to be discharged because it related to a specific situation that applied only to 2004. However, it is up to the house, and it can decide to discharge it. The house has control of these matters, and it is not up to the chair.

Motion carried.

EDUCATION (COMPULSORY EDUCATION) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 27 October. Page 611.)

Ms THOMPSON (Reynell): This matter has been before the house for quite some time, and I rise to oppose it. When the member for Bragg introduced the bill in October, she referred simply to speeches she had made in February last year. That really indicates that the bill is no longer necessary, if it ever was, as it in no way takes account of all the initiatives introduced by the current government to encourage and support the attendance of children at school. One of the things that most disturbed me when I first became a member of parliament in 1997, and visited schools in our community during 1998, 1999, 2000 and 2001 (under the previous government), was the level of absenteeism. I was really

staggered that, in one particular primary school I attended for a special celebration of the achievements of the children, more than one-third of the children were missing. Among those missing were children who were to receive some form of recognition that day. I inquired whether there was a dreadful flu going around the school but was told that was not the case and that, unfortunately, that level of absenteeism was quite common.

There were no government policies or strategies to address the issue, not only for the children but for the teachers and families involved. I commissioned a parliamentary intern to look at the matter and was presented with a report entitled 'Can a primary school child's constant absence from school be an indication of the need for family support?' That is a somewhat convoluted title, but the message was clear, namely, that, in many instances of absenteeism in primary schools, the issue was the difficulties the family faced in supporting the education of their children. On coming to office, the current government addressed absenteeism very quickly. It also recognised that it was not a simple matter and that, while in primary school it might relate mainly to the family, in secondary school it related to family support, to a child's success in school, to their level of engagement and interest in the curriculum, as well as to the support the school was able to provide and the way it was able to work with the parents.

In 2002—that is, the year we came to office—this government established an absenteeism task force to address this issue so long neglected by the previous Liberal government. The task force comprised representatives from principal associations, DECS, DHS and SAPOL, and was established to provide advice on how school attendance could be improved. The work of the task force resulted in a number of initiatives, including the development of the attendance improvement package, revision of the attendance policy and updating of the DECS-SA Police memorandum of understanding. The attendance improvement package was distributed to all schools at the beginning of 2003, and it provided information to assist schools to analyse, develop, implement and review strategies to improve student attendance in partnership with their community.

An important phrase is 'in partnership with their community', because it is evident that there are different issues in different communities which require different solutions. Five attendance action zones were identified based on high absenteeism rates recorded in 2002, and \$2 million over four years was allocated to support initiatives in these action zones. District action zone committees have provided progress reports to the task force each term detailing strategies initiated, expenditure incurred, and data to demonstrate attendance and absence outcomes.

There have been a number of specific projects, and these include: SMS text messages to let parents know when their child is absent from school; extra school service officer time to make direct contact with parents of absent children; on-site child care to support young mothers to attend school; information for parents about the importance of regular school attendance and punctuality; employment of community liaison workers to build stronger school and family relationships and follow up student absences; and support for community provided breakfast club programs.

I recall some criticism from members opposite of the initiative of the Morphett Vale High School which involved developing a partnership with a number of businesses in the community to reward children who had succeeded in school

(both through their attendance and their accomplishments). It was suggested that children simply should not be rewarded for coming to school, which is what they are supposed to do. Those members opposite who made these statements had of course failed to investigate exactly what was involved in this, and the fact that students had to demonstrate why they were worthy of having some community advantage in the form of discount goods from various businesses. It was an enterprising project that involved children in not only achieving but demonstrating how they have achieved and making a case for themselves. This, of course, is a skill which will be very important when they are looking for jobs and positions in universities, etc. in the future.

Recent targeted working group initiatives include supporting education initiatives of Aboriginal communities. One example of projects in this area is the Para West Indigenous Sports Academy, which re-engages Aboriginal young people in schooling or training and employment pathways through a focus on sport. Students range in age from 16 to 23 and come from across the state. Since its inception in 2002, a total of 708 students have participated in the program. There is also a holiday mentoring program whereby Aboriginal young people at risk of not returning to school are mentored over the January school holiday break and in the first week of a new school year. Aboriginal mentors work with young people and their families to ensure that students have selected subjects for the new school year and/or that their learning or transition plans have been developed. These projects involve approximately 100 Aboriginal young people. In 2005, the program was run at the Ceduna Area School, the Port Lincoln High School, the Salisbury High School, the Kurna Plains High School, the Glossop High School and the Murray Bridge High School.

There are also ICT solutions to assist in the problem of dealing with absenteeism. The Education Department Schools Administration System (which we all fondly know as EDSAS) has been adapted to contain additional absence reports to enable sites to monitor absences more closely. There are additional absence codes which enable identification of the reasons for absence. Again, that helps in monitoring and managing the absence of students from schools. In some areas there has been the development of placing truancy notices in shopping areas. This is based on a system initiated in the Kalgoorlie district by community police, education, the Chamber of Commerce, and community development personnel. A similar project has been developed in the Murray Bridge area, and one is being developed in the Elizabeth area, but as I mentioned earlier it is necessary to ensure that there are community solutions to community problems, and different strategies are appropriate in different areas.

The memorandum of understanding that has been developed between DECS and the police force provides for student retention officers and police officers to work together to assist in returning students to school when their attendance at other places is inappropriate. This bill is not necessary and should be opposed.

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH (Minister for Education and Children's Services): I support the member for Reynell in her opposition to this bill. One of the problems inherent in its introduction is that the member for Bragg has extracted part of a bill that was consulted on in 1999 out of context and in the presence of a different government with different policy agendas. Quite clearly, this ad hoc extraction

of some documentation has caused the bill to be poorly constructed and repackaged in a way that does not allow it to do what the member thinks it is doing. For instance, clause 74(1)(b) of the proposed bill provides that a child is participating in education if a parent has been approved to provide home schooling. I understand that that is not the manner in which exemptions are obtained, and it is not part of the legislation to approve parents in this way.

This legislation has been introduced 8½ years after it was first contemplated and it does not take into account the very many measures that this government has implemented. Unlike the opposition, on coming to government we took up absenteeism as a major issue. We did this because we clearly understand (as the opposition did not when it was in government) that this is one of those risk factors that is related to low achievement. It increases the risk of poor retention and increases the opportunity for entanglement with the juvenile justice system. Because of this awareness, we introduced our \$28.4 million school retention plan.

We have established an absenteeism task force to identify ways of improving attendance and chronic truancy. Our first bill before the parliament proposed to raise the school leaving age from 15 to 16, and we have developed and provided all schools with an attendance improvement package to help them find ways in which to motivate teachers and improve attendance. We require every school to develop an attendance improvement plan outlining how the school will improve the attendance rates of students. We appointed an extra four attendance counsellors, bringing the total number to 14, to work with chronic non-attending students and their families. In addition, we have a memorandum of understanding with SAPOL to assist in bringing truants back to school as well as developing a training and development program called *Managing Truancy Together*.

We have developed an indigenous reporting program called *Absenteeism—What Works*, and we have introduced new codes for improved reporting of absence and tracking where our students are. We have researched the best ways of implementing leave passes, checking what has been done interstate, and we have trialled a program in one of every five high schools across the state in order to choose the most effective system. Having monitored that, by the end of the year we will introduce the program across all schools.

We have also provided \$1 million of a \$2 million initiative to five attendance action zones. Each of these action zones has received \$200 000 during the first two years, and we have invested in over 65 initiatives to improve student attendance. Our action zone initiatives empower local communities to act on school attendance, and many different approaches have been taken, depending on the nature of the students, the demographics, the socioeconomic background and the ethnic mix of the community. We also have found ways of employing and working with those communities with everything from breakfast programs to bilingual workers to increase home visits and calls to parents.

It has, in fact, been very rewarding to see how much improvement has occurred over the last three years. As a result of our efforts, there are now 1 300 fewer children absent from school each day, with the total absenteeism rate dropping from 8.9 per cent to 8.2 per cent. More specifically, we have been tackling the root problem of absenteeism by focusing on those students who are absent without a reason being provided. One element, which is not always appreciated by many adults who see young children or school-aged children on the street during school hours, is that the pattern

of schooling has changed significantly and it is, indeed, well recognised that flexible learning allows children to be out of school during part of the day but involved in legitimate activities, such as school-based new apprenticeships, part-time employment and part-time training.

Clearly, we cannot entirely reduce the number of children becoming ill or having other legitimate reasons for being away from school, but it is vital that parents understand the importance of absenteeism and, particularly, notify schools when there is a legitimate reason for a child's not being present. Indeed, one of the actions we have taken is to make it clear that parents need to report explainable absences. Clearly, there is a fluctuation over the course of a year, depending on illnesses and viruses, but there is a positive trend of improvement across the system. In 2004, 63 per cent of schools showed improvement in rates of unauthorised absences compared with 2002, some by as much as 10 per cent. Unexplained absences accounted for 32.7 per cent of student absences in 2004, down from 37.8 per cent in 2003. Rates of unauthorised absence have improved from 3.3 per cent in 2002 to 3 per cent in 2003 and 2.8 per cent in 2004, and all schools in the action zones decreased the number of unexplained absences.

This strategy means that we have targeted our resources more directly to those most in need, and the smaller number of students who have no authorisation or legitimate reason to be away from school—those chronic non-attenders or truants—are the ones on whom we focus our attention. Teachers and parents recognise that truancy is an early indicator of risk, and we are working together to bring about an improvement in outcomes for children.

There may also be a need for tougher approaches, which is where police may intervene to bring back truants and, as a last resort, when parents repeatedly refuse to encourage their children's school attendance, there may be prosecution, as is currently occurring with six families being investigated with a view to prosecution. But let me make it clear that, whatever action is taken, it must primarily be in the interests of the child, and our aim is always to get the child back into learning.

Our attendance push is part of our broader goal to have higher achievement and higher skills and retention to bring about employment, employability, training and opportunity. Those goals cannot be advanced by the sort of piecemeal move that the opposition is suggesting. This bill reflects a lack of awareness of the work that has been happening on the ground in our schools. The bill is presented as a way of removing important references to attendance by students at their local secondary school and it removes the authority of the minister to ensure that, if a student's needs can be best met at a particular school, this would be required to occur.

The member for Bragg seems to believe that leading legislative change is about dusting off bits of an old piece of legislation and presenting it as new. But when it is out of context it does not always produce the required effects. I am particularly concerned that the bill has not given adequate attention to ramifications on other aspects of the act and will encourage inconsistency across the Education Act as a whole. One such example is the raising of penalties charged to parents of truants and those who employ school-aged children in contravention of the act. Some of the more substantive amendments need to be carefully considered and, in particular, the establishment of attendance panels. Our advice from our task force indicates that such panels will only duplicate existing processes.

I plan to continue and extend the program that the government has already put in place to improve attendance and enhance our education system. In doing this, broader legislative change across the spectrum of education covering the entire Education Act and relevant sections of the Children's Services Act will be pursued in the context of both the SACE and the Early Childhood Services reviews. But I think it would be ill-conceived to take this sort of bill, which is part of a broader bill, and tinker at the edges without producing a particular gain to the community. We will oppose this bill, which is more punitive than proactive, because it removes existing provisions that ensure that DECS officers are able to follow up with students. It is a bill that removes the essential power of the minister in regard to enrolment and proposes unwieldy procedures through the establishment of attendance panels. In short, this is a bill that is beyond its use-by date and will not be supported by the government.

Mr SCALZI (Hartley): I rise to speak on this bill briefly. The member for Bragg, in her second reading speech, clearly outlined the reasons for it. Extensive research was carried out, and I have been listening to the minister saying that things have changed, but I do not believe that in just a few years things have changed. If they have changed, they have not changed for the better. Indeed, I am informed by people in the education sector who know that this year has been the worst year for absenteeism. We know that there is an internal report in the minister's department and we know that each school was asked to do a survey on how to deal with absenteeism. The minister knows it is a serious problem. Things have not changed. I look forward to that report being tabled, because my teaching colleagues tell me that things have not changed for the better in the last three years: they have changed for the worse.

This bill clearly outlines a direction for compulsory education which will be to the benefit of young people and engage them in our education system. It is not about compulsory schooling: it is about compulsory engagement in our education system. It takes into account the measures to do with the compulsory age for employment of children and also the conflicts that might arise and how we can deal with young people who are clearly not at school when they should be at school. There are measures to increase penalties to ensure that young people under the compulsory age participate in our education system, and I do not believe that is a bad thing.

The minister says that this bill is out of date when, in reality, the government when in opposition agreed to many of the procedures in it. I quote from the member for Bragg's second reading speech when she said:

We know that students who are frequently absent from school are over-represented in the juvenile justice system. Research clearly shows that students who are often absent from school are likely to learn less as adults than their peers. Statistics for 2002 that have been provided to us tell us that nearly 37 per cent of absences are recorded as unexplained; 9.1 per cent of students are absent for more than one day a week; the average number of days absent for a student ranges from 3½ days a term in year 3 to six days in year 10; and, probably not surprising to anyone in the chamber, student absence is most frequent on Fridays.

Whilst absence rates vary significantly amongst individual students, there is an identified group of children and young people who can be described as chronic non-attenders. These include children involved with the child protection system and alternative care.

Like the member for Bragg, I am a member of the juvenile justice committee—and, indeed, madam chair is on that committee. One of the things that the committee has been

made aware of is the chronic problem of absenteeism and the close relationship between absenteeism numbers and those in the juvenile justice system. We must do something about it because, obviously, the system is not working.

The minister comes into the house and tells us that we should not proceed with this bill, that things have improved and that there are explained absences. We are all aware that many absences might be explained when parents write a note about why their child has not attended school, but it will not explain why they are still at risk and why they get involved in conflict with the law. You can attend in certain areas to see it, and it is not limited to the CBD. There are areas in the north and south—indeed, many areas in the metropolitan area—where young people congregate whilst they should be at school. The minister has not told us how many people have been prosecuted for not attending school.

The Hon. J.D. Lomax-Smith: You weren't listening.

Mr SCALZI: I was not listening! Not many people have been dealt with for absences. The newspaper this week reported on the case of a 14 year old girl, who is now 15 years, who has not attended school in the last 12 months. The parent who appeared before the committee was concerned that she would be charged for not having her daughter at school. Obviously, we have to have clear procedures to deal with this chronic problem. If this bill is not absolutely correct, let the government amend it. Let them vote for it during the second reading and move amendments that will provide procedures that reflect the changes the minister has said have taken place in the three years of enlightenment under this government.

I do not see members opposite coming in here to tell us in which direction we should go. The member for Bragg—as indeed did the previous minister—has a plan about how to deal with absenteeism. It is a pity that the government has not proceeded with that plan in a bipartisan way and ensured that we bring the solution to this problem up to date. New section 78—'Persistent contravention of compulsory education requirements' provides:

(1) The minister may convene a panel to review the circumstances of a case in which a child persistently fails to participate in the education system in contravention of this part.

We on this side of the house have the approach that education is about engagement and participation; it is not just about compulsory schooling. Members opposite believe that, if you increase the school leaving age to 16, you will save all these people and, if you increase the school leaving age to 17, you will save even more. The reality is that, unless you put procedures in place and the relevant programs which engage young people and which make them feel worthwhile, as well as having the subjects and programs in place they can relate to, you will not solve the problem of absenteeism. It is only a short-term measure which makes the statistics look good. We all know about how the government has twisted the statistics in relation to retention rates and that the government has decided to change the way in which it is reported. I urge members to support this bill.

Mr MEIER (Goyder): In light of the response from the government so that the shadow minister can give consideration to those comments, I move:

That the debate be adjourned.

Motion carried.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON A CODE OF CONDUCT FOR MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Rau:

That the report be noted.

(Continued from 27 October. Page 613.)

Mr SCALZI (Hartley): It is with pleasure that I note and indicate support for the committee's report. I commend the members of the committee—the Hon. J.M. Gazzola MLC, the Hon. R.D. Lawson MLC, the Hon. Nick Xenophon MLC, Ms Vickie Chapman MP, Mr J.D. Rau MP and the Hon. R. Such—and the two officers Mrs Jan Davis, the Clerk of the Legislative Council, and Mr Malcolm Lehman, the Deputy Clerk of the House of Assembly. One can see by the composition of the committee and the fact that the two presiding officers from the two chambers are represented the appropriateness of this committee to look at all 69 members of parliament and their different positions, which I have noted in the report, together with the various obligations of the members and the positions they hold and their rights and responsibilities.

When I look at the first principle in the statement of principles which the committee, in its wisdom, has recommended instead of the code of conduct, it states:

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

We must be grateful that the Assembly, in its wisdom, put pressure on the government to muffle this very principle because, if we had proceeded with the privileges bill last week, we would have thrown this very principle out the window. I am grateful for the wisdom of this chamber and for the support of the other place and, indeed, the minor parties. They sent a clear message to the government.

Professor Dean Jaensch from Flinders University clearly outlined why the very important principle of the privileges of parliament must be adhered to. It is a matter not only of history but also of a principle that has served us well. There are rights and responsibilities and whether a member of parliament is a backbencher, is a minister or is holding the position of chair, ultimately it is those who elect him or her who will decide on whether that individual has abused that privilege. So, I am pleased that we are adhering to the principles. I commend the report, because it clearly outlines the principles, and I would like to reiterate some of them. I have referred to the first one. The second states:

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

We know that, when there is a problem, the parliament itself has measures to deal with it. The report goes on with the principles regarding political parties: conflict of interest; reference to financial matters; members' pecuniary interests—all those things are dealt with. I commend the committee for the thoroughness of this report for the benefit of members.

We all know that the general public often does not have a clear understanding of the responsibilities of members of parliament with regard to how they work as legislators, how they work if they are members of the executive or presiding members in committees or in this chamber, and the responsi-

bilities that they have in their electorates. This report clearly outlines that, and it should be commended for doing so. The report refers also to parliamentary responsibilities and duty; electorate responsibility; party responsibilities and duties; the Speaker; the President of the Legislative Council; ministers of the Crown; the leader of a party; shadow ministers; and so on. It clearly states the appropriate code to adopt based on principles. Most other states have a code of conduct or principles. I note that New Zealand does not have a code of conduct for members of parliament—that is up to them—but I am pleased that the South Australian parliament has a code.

In the few minutes that I have left in this debate I will refer to the vacation of seats in the House of Assembly and, indeed, in the Legislative Council. Members would be aware that this has been a hobby of mine and that I wanted to introduce a citizenship constitution bill, which required—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr SCALZI: The member opposite says, 'Oh, no.' We should bring the South Australian parliament into line with the federal sphere, in which you cannot be a candidate or a member unless you renounce other citizenship. That is not the case in South Australia. I believe that we should bring South Australia into line with our national parliament. As long as I am in this place, I will point out this inconsistency, because members opposite will know that, when there was a Senate vacancy—as there was when Mr John Quirke resigned—we had to nominate a candidate. And what did we require of that candidate? We required only that that candidate hold Australian citizenship. But we do not require that of ourselves. We required that of the federal member but not of ourselves. In other words, we said, 'You must renounce all other citizenship but we do not want to.'

The Hon. J.D. Lomax-Smith: We didn't; it was their parliament.

Mr SCALZI: No, we did it in a joint sitting. I believe that it is hypocritical of this parliament to require federal members to renounce citizenship but not to require it of themselves. This is not going to be the end of the story because, as members might be aware, there are members in this chamber who hold more than one citizenship. If I was to apply, I would disqualify myself. I would not apply and disqualify myself.

Time expired.

Mr CAICA (Colton): I will be brief in my remarks. I would like to congratulate the committee on the work that it did in developing a set of principles for the parliament to consider subsequent to this debate. My understanding is that the committee was expertly presided over by the Hon. John Gazzola, and that his committee worked very well and collectively to develop this set of principles, taking into account other parliaments and other jurisdictions throughout not only Australia but also the world. My view is that we do not necessarily need a code of conduct, and I explain that by saying that each and every one of us with respect to our actions is responsible to our electors.

Certainly, it will be the electors in each of our electorates who, every four years, will determine whether or not we have conducted ourselves appropriately and whether or not we are, in their eyes, worthy of being re-elected to the positions that we hold. As a member of parliament, I am responsible for myself and I am responsible mostly to my electors, and I have to explain my actions and my conduct to them and myself when I look at myself in the mirror every morning. People argue that it is about—

Mr Brindal: You poor thing.

Mr CAICA: I can only be thankful that when I look in the mirror I am looking at my face and not the member for Unley's face. As I said, we are all accountable to ourselves. If there was, indeed, to be a signing off of the principles or, indeed, the future development of a code of conduct, it is not to say that I would not be happy enough to sign off on such a document if it were determined that it is what will be developed and agreed to. As I said, I am happy to be held accountable to that set of principles but, at the end of the day, I am accountable to myself and my electors. If we speak hypothetically, it would be interesting how we would indeed enforce any code of conduct or any principles if there was a breach of those particular principles. We only need look at the fanfare that greeted the development of the Howard government's code of conduct for his ministers. Indeed, the code of ministerial conduct, certainly in my humble view, has been broken on numerous occasions by those ministers.

Ms Chapman: What are you suggesting?

Mr CAICA: I am suggesting that, perhaps, unless there is the will of a parliament to enforce a code of conduct it is not worth the paper that it is written on—that is the very point. It is alright to sign off on documentation; but it is the willingness of those to enforce what it is that people have signed off on. I congratulate the committee. I look forward to the ongoing debate with respect to this particular matter, because for a long time I have believed that the majority of elected members whom I have met in the brief time that I have been here conduct themselves extremely well. They are dedicated to the task and they are a tribute to the electors who have elected them. I believe that that is the case with the majority of elected members in this particular parliament. As I said, I do not believe it is necessary; however, how this house determines where it goes, I will be happy to be a part of that and be brought under the guidelines, principles or the code that might ultimately be developed.

Mr BRINDAL (Unley): The member for Colton indeed raises what I believe is the crux of the dilemma that, in many ways, such a proposition as is before us sets forth. Most of this I agree with. I do not think that anyone can disagree with it. Most of this is like stating that we believe in motherhood; we believe in the family; we are proud Australians. It is like when the member for Hammond and probably, I think, the member for Flinders were kids at school we stood there every week at assembly and said, 'I am an Australian. I love my country. I honour her Queen and promise to obey her laws.' We said it firstly because we believed it and, secondly, because they were simple almost motherhood type principles. But we have the member for Colton saying that, of course, if we sign this we have to work out how to enforce them. I am reminded of a referendum that was put to the people of Australia some time ago now, but not so long ago in my memory, where they asked for freedom of religion to be put in the Constitution. That was roundly defeated on the proposition mainly led by the Christian churches that once you start to codify that which is generally understood by all of the community you start to run into legal impediments. If we want to look at an example of that we have only to look to the United States where, in seeking to codify freedom of religion, they have in many cases severely restricted the expression of religious belief. In many ways, what they sought not to achieve they have achieved by trying to quantify and codify. If we take the member for Colton's argument and look at this largely motherhood statement, then

there might be some real problems as to how, if this can be enforced, it might be interpreted in a parliament, especially a parliament strongly dominated by one party or another.

In the time available to me I want to draw in that context, if it were to be judiciable, objection to three clauses. First, clause 2 provides:

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

I am sure that the member for Hammond will not mind, because last week in this chamber we saw that. No matter what any of the rest of us think about what happened over the last few weeks, I do not think that the member for Hammond could not (and I am sure would) get up and put his hand on his heart and has, in fact, done so, and said, 'I was acting in the best interests of South Australia; I was acting with honesty, integrity and with accountability.' He could say from his perception that he believes he fulfilled all of those requirements. But if we have this as judiciable, does that mean this group, a subgroup of this group, or some other group, has to try and second-guess not the member for Hammond's actions but his motivations?

What sort of parliament would we have if we all mark one another on our ability to behave 'with fairness, honesty and integrity to advance the common good'? I know from debate that my idea of the common good in respect to prostitution law reform is at total variance with the member for Hammond, and we have fairly strongly disagreed about that over a number of decades. So, what is the common good of the people of South Australia? How is it judiciable? If we go on to clause 13 which, I think, is the bobby dazzler of them all, it provides:

Members of parliament should be mindful of their responsibility to accord due respect to the right of freedom of speech within the parliament and not to misuse this right conscientiously avoiding undeserved harm to any individual.

That is a fine motherhood statement but, again, by whom is this judiciable? What is 'undeserved harm to any individual'? What does that mean? Should we limit the rights of this place to freedom of speech? It was the subject of debate last week. It is a right we hold to be the most sacred and the most precious we are accorded.

Time expired.

ROAD TRAFFIC (VALIDITY OF REGULATIONS) AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. J.D. Lomax-Smith (Minister for Education and Children's Services), for the **Hon. P.F. CONLON (Minister for Transport),** obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Road Traffic Act 1961. Read a first time.

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH: I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

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

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Is leave granted? I heard a 'No.' Leave is not granted.

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH: This bill is to amend the Road Traffic Act 1961 ('the act') to clarify the Governor's regulation-making power as contained in section 80 of the act. Section 80 was intended to enable the making of regulations which are miscellaneous or ancillary to the

Australian road rules ('the rules'), in addition to regulations which, directly or indirectly, are inconsistent with the provision or provisions in the rules. It has recently been suggested that section 80 does not provide the Governor power to make regulations on this latter matter. This bill will put beyond doubt the Governor's power to make regulations that are inconsistent with the provision or provisions of the rules.

The rules were introduced into South Australia on 1 December 1999 as part of a program to provide a uniform set of road rules that apply in all Australian jurisdictions. They are amended by agreement with all other jurisdictions and then endorsed by the Australian Transport Council (ATC), which comprises all state, territory and commonwealth transport ministers. Once endorsed by the ATC, the amendments are introduced into the law of each jurisdiction in accordance with the usual legislative processes of the state or territory concerned. The ATC recognised that there may need to be variations to these rules within each jurisdiction to cater for the individual circumstances and requirements of each jurisdiction. Thus, the rules permit variation of a rule by introducing the concept of another law of the jurisdiction. Where there is provision in one of the rules for another law of this jurisdiction, a state or territory does not have to go through the agreed ATC process to vary the application of the rule in that jurisdiction. These variations are in accordance with the national agreement.

There was also a recognition that, even where there is no specific provision for another law of the jurisdiction, variations may be necessary, and a process for obtaining approval from the other jurisdictions, via the ATC, was established. Victoria, Western Australia, Tasmania, New South Wales and the ACT all applied at different times between 2000 and 2003 and were given approval to decrease the urban default speed limit. After gaining approval from the ATC to vary the application of the rules in South Australia, South Australia introduced a 50 km/h default urban speed limit on 1 March 2003 through regulation 9B of the Road Traffic (Road Rules—Ancillary and Miscellaneous Provisions) Regulations 1999. The rules continue to reflect the national position and state the default urban speed limit of 60 km/h, until 4 November 2004, when an ATC approved package of amendments to the rules, including a decrease in the default urban speed limit to 50 km/h, was introduced in South Australia.

The owner of a vehicle, which was allegedly detected by a speed camera to be travelling at about 67 km/h on a road where the 50 km/h default urban speed limit applied, has challenged the resulting expiation notice. The owner argues that the 50 km/h default urban speed limit was not validly created in March 2003. The owner argues that the regulation imposing the 50 km/h default speed limit exceeded the regulation-making power granted to the Governor by section 80 of the Road Traffic Act 1961. Legal advice obtained by the government suggests that the regulation was validly made and that the challenge is unlikely to succeed. However, the matter is of some significance and needs to be clarified. It was never intended by parliament that the powers of the Governor to make regulations be restricted in the manner suggested. The bill does not introduce any new offences or penalties, nor does it impinge on anybody's rights. Rather, it seeks to clarify the intent of section 80 of the Road Traffic Act 1961 and remove any doubt as to the validity of regulations made under the act and to avoid the uncertainty which would attend litigation. I ask parliament to pass this bill to

rectify the oversight in section 80 of the Road Traffic Act 1961 and prevent any arguments being made regarding the validity of any regulation made pursuant to this section which indirectly or directly is inconsistent with a provision or provisions of the rules. I commend the bill to members.

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH: I seek leave to insert the explanation of clauses into *Hansard* without my reading it.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Leave is not granted.

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH: The explanation of clauses is as follows:

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Amendment provisions

These clauses are formal.

Part 2—Amendment of Road Traffic Act 1961

3—Amendment of section 80—Australian Road Rules and related regulations

This clause amends section 80 of the Road Traffic Act 1961 to clarify the scope of the regulation making power under that section and, in particular, to make it clear that regulations may exclude the application of any provisions of the Australian Road Rules, provide for the grant of exemptions from any provisions of the Australian Road Rules or make a provision that differs from any provision in the Australian Road Rules. It is also specifically provided that regulations will prevail to the extent of any inconsistency with the Australian Road Rules.

Schedule 1—Validity of regulations

The schedule provides that, for the avoidance of doubt, a regulation under the Road Traffic Act 1961 made (or purportedly made) between 10 November 1999 and the commencement of the measure will be taken to have been validly made if it could be validly made under section 80 of the Road Traffic Act 1961 as amended by clause 3.

The Hon. I.P. LEWIS: I move:

That the debate be adjourned.

Motion carried.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: That the debate be made an order of the day for?

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH: The next day of sitting, sir.

The Hon. I.P. LEWIS: I move:

To amend that proposition to 23 May.

Amendment negatived; motion carried.

SUPPLY BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 12 April. Page 2338.)

Mrs PENFOLD (Flinders): I rise to support the Supply Bill to enable \$1.7 billion to be appropriated to use for the benefit of all the people of the state. However, I am concerned that the Labor government is proceeding to rewrite history and to do what it has always done: that is, to wreck private enterprise and to put taxpayers' money into paying people to be more dependent rather than facilitating their independence. Every question time, our former Liberal government is blamed by Labor members for not spending money on whatever program is under discussion when it was they (not us) who left the state technically bankrupt, unable to pay the interest on the state's debt from income, leaving

superannuation unfunded and WorkCover overcommitted, with rundown power, water, rail and road infrastructure. It is they (not us) who have been the government for the last three years and who have raised taxes breaking the promise that they gave before the election.

I think the Treasurer's response when challenged was that he had changed his mind. Recently, in answer to one of my questions, a minister stated that Labor governments never break promises. So, I suppose the fact that the Ceduna school has not been built, hospitals do not have acute care, the disabled have not received the money they were promised from the Moving On program, the desalination plant for Eyre Peninsula—which was 'written in blood' according to one minister—are all changes of mind. Perhaps the government needs mental health funding more than it realises.

This Labor government actually has significant money to spend, a whole \$5 billion more over four years than the \$33 billion that was estimated by our government before the last election. They should thank the former Liberal government for selling ETSA so that some of the debt could be paid out and making the power infrastructure requirements the responsibility of the new owners. They should thank the current federal government for replacing the very inequitable sales tax with the GST and a promise from the states to remove other taxes and for keeping the interest rates and inflation low enabling a property boom that has provided a land tax and stamp duty bonanza.

This money belongs to the taxpayer and should be used carefully to ensure that as many people as possible are independent and can look after themselves. People who are in control of their own destiny are happier people who use the health system and many other services less. However, instead of funds going into projects and programs that will provide jobs in the long-term, what do we see but promises of self-opening bridges that will totally disrupt traffic, tunnels and overpasses to help people save 11 minutes on trips to and from the city, and trams to replace existing ones—city projects costing multimillions of dollars that I would argue are not needed until development of the rest of the state has been facilitated.

We are called a citystate, and never more so than under this government. South Australia is currently disabled when it comes to development, progress, innovation and securing our future. The state can be compared with an able-bodied person sitting in a wheelchair and barely using their body, just letting their body waste away when all that is necessary for good health is to get up and move the right muscles to get back in shape. The state's muscles are roads, railways, power lines, pipelines, the air terminal and ports. The state's feet and hands are the bigger towns backed up by the smaller towns. I argue that the Eyre Peninsula could be the state's right arm, but this government has a tourniquet around it at the shoulder.

South Australia currently enjoys a strong income base greater than any that members of the house have experienced or can recall. The state should be vibrating with enthusiasm and action, but it is not. Instead, we are languishing under a Labor government that wipes off rural South Australia as just a milch cow to further Labor's agendas.

[Sitting suspended from 6 to 7.30 p.m.]

Mrs PENFOLD: A large proportion of state revenue comes from rural and regional South Australia. It is, therefore, fundamental that rural and regional South Australia be treated in a manner that encourages an increase in state

revenue. When the state's rural and regional sections are doing well, the whole of the state prospers. Nowhere is Labor's callous disregard for our non-metropolitan population more evident than its adoption of population-based funding. This takes no account of distance, scarcity of services or the cost of travel, just to mention a few of the problems with so-called population-based funding.

A child living in our remote country regions is accorded a similar level of funding as a child living in the city of Adelaide, where the member for Port Adelaide, state Treasurer the Hon. Kevin Foley, lives. One child has a major expense to access health facilities and medical treatment; has limited education opportunities; is virtually denied access to state museums, art galleries and libraries by reason of distance and cost; has little or no exposure to anything outside their own community; and is often restricted by a lack of access to technology that is a common part of life elsewhere. The other child has the best of health facilities and medical treatment on tap; has access to every possible educational and vocational opportunity; can visit all the state museums, libraries and art galleries that are located close by; is exposed to a variety of life situations and experiences, including international visitors; and has the latest technology options laid on.

According to Labor policy, funding is parcelled out to each child at a similar level. That is what population-based funding is all about. However, I understand that a country area school is provided with less funding than a city R to 12 (reception to year 12) school, but I have yet to work out what the difference is. Waiting lists for hospitals, shortages of beds for the frail aged and those who need care, reductions in health services in the country, including fewer visits by specialists and a winding down of acute care services are all symptomatic of the Rann government's lack of concern for rural and regional South Australia. This is in spite of record levels of revenue, especially from the goods and services tax, which Labor opposed.

Labor's disregard for country children and its arrogant disregard for social justice are nowhere more evident than in the case of Ceduna Area School. The Ceduna community worked together to plan the future of its school. The \$5 million first stage of the redevelopment, including \$1 million from the federal government, was budgeted for by the former Liberal state government. The tender process had begun, and the start date for the project was September 2002. When the Labor state government took office in April 2002 it demonstrated its partisanship by stopping the tender process, reducing the allocated amount to \$3.9 million (still including \$1 million of federal funding) and delaying the start to November 2003. It is now April 2005, and Ceduna is still waiting.

The latest news is that the tender process has again been abandoned and restarted. In the introduction of a previous speech I made on this subject in September 2003 I said:

I bring to the attention of the house a situation that displays this government's denial of education equality for those not living in Labor electorates, its contempt for social justice, its arrogant disregard for our indigenous people and its neglect of isolated communities.

The government is awash with funds, unlike the former Liberal state government, which had to carefully examine every cent that was spent while bringing the state back from Labor's bankruptcy.

Transport is another area where Labor policy of population-based funding is similar to the thinking of the Mad

Hatter in Alice in Wonderland. Funding to provide the so-called free bus transport for the people of the state to the recent Sky Show was not free, as the minister stated. It was paid for by taxpayers. And it was not for the people of the state, because most of the people of the state do not have access to this transport option to attend the 'free' partly taxpayer-funded Sky Show. However, funding for the legally blind to enable them to have subsidised taxis is refused by the same government. There is something very wrong with its priorities.

Rural South Australia accounts for billions of dollars of income to the state. The produce has to be transported over roads and rail, yet funding for both road and rail is diminishing. The Eyre Peninsula rail system urgently needs upgrading. Funding is—or should be—accessible through the money obtained from the sale of SA Railways, which is supposedly to be used for rail upgrades. Labor is keen to make political mileage regarding the need to cut greenhouse gases. However, Labor is extremely loath to undertake projects that do just that.

Rail is an important component of our transport system, one which, when used to advantage, makes a profit. The Eyre Peninsula division of the former SAR was one which turned a profit in a number of years. When road and rail are appropriately integrated, the energy savings—and, therefore, the lowering of greenhouse emissions—are enormous. While the government can find millions of dollars to extend the tramway from Victoria Square to North Terrace, it cannot find a similar amount to spend on the state's country rail network. Then there are the millions of dollars that prop up the metropolitan public transport system. Labor has no understanding of the necessity for a good road network outside urban areas. One of the Rann government's first acts was to cut the number of Outback road gangs maintaining the roads in the remote areas of the state. Corrugations on dirt roads can be lethal. However, adequate maintenance reduces or removes the danger.

The Eyre Peninsula Local Government Association comprises nine district councils and three city councils, making a total of 12 local government bodies. I quote excerpts from a letter from the EPLGA executive officer, Vance Thomas, supporting the federal government's Roads to Recovery Program, as follows:

Member councils have responsibility for close to 30 per cent of South Australia's incorporated land mass. The 12 councils maintain a network of local roads that would reach around Australia via Highway One and still leave a fair stretch of bumpy, dusty road left over.

Eyre Peninsula's local road network is 13 798 kilometres, 93 per cent unsealed. That represents 18.6 per cent of South Australia's roads being maintained by 4.6 per cent of the state's population.

Removing the three city councils (one of which is held by Labor) from the statistics makes the situation even worse. The letter further states:

The nine district councils maintain 12 956 kilometres of road (17.5 per cent of the state's total, 97 per cent unsealed) with a total population of 19 372 people or just 1.3 per cent of the state's total.

It does not take Einstein to figure out that the application of Labor's policy of population-based funding is a negative for rural and regional South Australia. Population-based funding is a cunning ploy to drain revenue from the productive areas of the state while denying constituents equality of justice and services. The Liberal government's program to seal all rural arterial roads would have been completed ahead of time and ahead of budget. The Liberals then began a

program to seal rural roads of economic significance. This program was emasculated under Labor, which does not understand the link between infrastructure, productivity and state income, nor the link with safety for those people who have to use the roads and have no taxi, bus or train options.

Despite the legacy of bankruptcy that the former Liberal government inherited from Labor due to Labor's mismanagement of the State Bank, the Liberal government was able to increase and diversify business in the state. Those gains have been steadily eroded under Labor. One only has to look at the list of businesses that have closed or downsized, moved interstate or overseas, or gone into some form of receivership to appreciate the negative effects that Labor decisions have on business. Business is the engine that drives the state's economy. It is business in all its varying circumstances—large and small, primary and secondary, value-adding and entrepreneurial—that provides the revenue or income for the state. Businesses must be profitable, competitive and serving their clientele well in order to prosper and, where appropriate, grow.

One would suppose that everyone knows that it is axiomatic that private business must be profitable or it ceases to exist. However, 'everyone' obviously does not include Labor politicians, who act on a preconceived notion without reference to fact and who ignore the effects their decisions are having on private enterprise.

Much has been said about land tax. The issue is one of many examples that highlight Labor's lack of business acumen. The substantial increases in land tax have been the reason for a number of people opting out of private enterprise. Simple remedies could have been implemented quickly and easily by the government which, instead, chose to ignore the issues. A quick look at the rental housing market amply illustrates the point. People owned rental properties to provide an income. When costs became so excessive that the income (that is, the profit) disappeared, people sold their rental properties and went out of the market. Those whom this affects most are the ones seeking rental accommodation. That important but basic fact seems to go unrecognised by the government. Labor ministers and members speak at length about housing, especially for the homeless and the needy, but have little or no idea about the variety of ways in which the necessary housing can and, indeed, must be provided.

Small businesses are particularly hard hit, and it is pertinent to remember that small business is the employment engine of the state and the nation. The land tax reforms announced by the government were too little and too late. As reported in an article in *The Advertiser* on 9 February 2004:

The government is returning nothing like the total additional land tax it has collected in the past three years, yet this year the government is giving back only \$20.6 million in financial relief and banking the remaining \$246.4 million. Meanwhile, land tax income swells the state coffers.

As has already been mentioned, the state is in receipt of unprecedented amounts of cash. However, Labor's lack of vision, coupled with inaction, is once again depriving the state of this exceptional opportunity. Our state should be vibrating with action and enthusiasm. It is not. More than anything else, that points to the inadequacy and failure of the current state government to drive the state forward, to give hope to the people and to develop the unique advantages that would make South Australia known across the world.

Mr MEIER (Goyder): I support the Supply Bill, and I appreciate the need for it, and that is to allow moneys to flow

for public servants and the running of this state. However, I want to take this opportunity to make a few comments. I think it is very interesting to note the revenue windfalls that have occurred since 2001-02 for this government. Before identifying them, I would like to identify what the previous government had been told were the estimates for the revenue windfalls from 2001-02 until 2004-05. The previous government was advised that its government sector total revenue would increase from \$8 141 million, or \$8.14 billion, in 2001-02 up to \$8.47 billion by 2004-05. That is what the previous government had been advised.

In fact, what has occurred as a result of a massive increase in tax take—not necessarily brought about by the current government but because of better land sales and the inflationary factor in land sales, house sales and business generally—is that it did not go from \$8.14 billion to \$8.4 billion: it has gone from \$8.5 billion to \$10.3 billion. In other words, there has been a total revenue growth of \$5.071 billion since 2001-02 until 2004-05. All we can say to this government is ‘Congratulations. You have inherited a \$5.071 billion total revenue growth.’ Of course, that immediately begs the question: what is the government going to do with it? One would think if their heart was in the state they would say, ‘We are going to put it into hospitals, education, law and order and infrastructure.’ In fact, we might even say spending on infrastructure should be slightly higher than spending in some of the other areas so that we can attract people from overseas and interstate. In fact, what has happened? I will start from the bottom up, Mr Acting Speaker. If I can use my own electorate as an example, what has happened is that the money spent on infrastructure has gone down. It is very disappointing that, at a time when an extra \$5 billion was available, almost nothing has been spent in an electorate such as Goyder.

If we look at the history of Goyder, we see a situation where we were somewhat deprived under the Bannon and Arnold governments. Thankfully, under the Brown and Olsen governments and, finally, the Kerin government, we received a lot more infrastructure projects. In fact, one of the two key infrastructure projects that needed to be done was the completion of the road from Port Wakefield to the Hummocks. For those who do not know where the Hummocks is located, it is at Kulpara. That is not a very great distance—I would say that it would be a distance of two or perhaps three kilometres. We have now had three long years of this Labor government and, guess what: that particular infrastructure project of reconstructing that road has not been done. Has the local member written and asked the various transport ministers when it will be done? Yes, he certainly has. Has he received appropriate replies? No, he has not. In fact, I reckon it is about six months since I last received a reply from the former minister for transport.

One thing I have to do, now that she has stepped aside, is to ask the new minister to please complete the project that was first implemented about five years ago by the Liberal government. It was almost three years ago, but nothing has occurred since. I can tell members that my constituents are extremely upset. I do not think the Labor vote will be very high in Goyder at the next election, because this government is not spending the money it should. Thankfully, two of the passing lanes on the coast road on Yorke Peninsula have been completed. So, at least that project has been completed. Then, completely out of the blue, something did occur of which I as the local member was not even aware, namely, a passing lane just outside Port Wakefield on the road to Yorke

Peninsula. There is no question that that is welcome, but it was not needed as much as the reconstruction of the last section of the road to Kulpara.

On three occasions now, the local member has nearly had an accident on that section, because it is so rough and difficult to control a vehicle when you come off the smooth road onto the rough road. It is a problem not only for the driver but also for approaching vehicles. I told the previous minister that I hoped she was prepared to take the rap if a serious accident occurred there, but still nothing has been done. The only hope I have is that at least the stockpile of aggregate is still there, and it is slowly increasing. So, with a little luck, we will have our new road within this coming financial year. But the government has repeatedly put off this project and, as the local member, I have obviously been put off. That is just one example.

The lack of proper water resources on Yorke Peninsula is such that some new developments are now having to pay an augmentation charge of up to \$13 000 per block. Imagine if you were buying a block of land for \$50 000 and suddenly you were told, ‘Oh, by the way, a water augmentation charge of \$13 000 also has to be paid, plus a \$2 500 charge to have the water supply connected.’ So, that is another \$15 000 to be paid, which is a massive impost on Yorke Peninsula.

Thankfully, a tiny bit of almost commonsense applied when I took a deputation to see minister Michael Wright. Whilst I had called for a \$1 000 water augmentation charge, the minister decided on a charge of \$4 000 increasing to \$6 000. The only positive is that it is better than a \$12 000 charge. It is a tragedy that the minister has absolutely no sympathy for the electorate, even though he taught at Kadina some years ago. I think the people on Yorke Peninsula have written him off once and for all. Certainly, I for one would love to see the Premier have a complete reshuffle of his ministry. I believe some members on the backbench should be promoted to the frontbench. They may be able to do a better job if they personally undertook to be ministers and did not say, ‘I’ve got the status, so I’ll let the public servants run the show,’ because that is what virtually all the ministers on the frontbench are doing—they are letting the public servants run the show—and that does not advance good government in this state. It is a great tragedy for this state, and it is something that needs to be addressed. I hope the people of South Australia will see through that.

It is interesting that the next election will be held on 18 March. I think we all know what occurs on 15 March, that is, the Ides of March. Because we are in opposition, we have everything to gain and nothing to lose. I say to the government: beware the Ides of March, because I believe it may finally be your undoing. I hope it will be the government’s undoing, because I want to see this state progress. I want to see new developments undertaken, and I want to see the government putting money into potential investments. I make no apology for that. Yes, the government may occasionally back a loser but, I tell you what, if you look at the record of the previous governments (that is, the Brown, Olsen and Kerin governments), you see a huge number of successes, which pushed this state forward, beyond all the expectations of the other states.

The Hon. W.A. Matthew: This government backs losers every day it sits on the front bench.

Mr MEIER: The member for Bright has said it perfectly. I am very disappointed that this government made a decision about 2½ years ago (which was announced by the Treasurer) that it would not put any money into any new infrastructure

projects, indicating that it believed that it was for the private sector to do that. Unfortunately, we are a small state and we are a disadvantaged state in so many ways. Whether we like it or not, the government has to put some finances into assisting new businesses to set up or assist existing businesses to expand. It is not difficult to do: in fact, we had a string of successes. We progressed this state forward. I think everyone in Australia marvelled at the way in which we took the state from a basket case to the leading state in Australia. I said to my branch meetings when we went into opposition and I continue to say that it was as clear as clear that, in its first four years of government, the Brown/Olsen government had inherited a basket case. We could not stop the decline straight away: it took us a good four years to stop that slide. We managed to do it in the first four years, and then in the next four years we started to go ahead—and did we what! Just look at Food for the Future, our export generation and the turnaround in economic confidence in this state, such that people were happy to come here.

It was clear that we had the cycle going in such a way that it would continue. It continues to go, and it is being aided very much by excellent federal government initiatives and the federal government's policy of promoting small business and development in Australia. The graph has continued to grow but the day is fast coming when that graph is going to level out. We are seeing in a variety of areas that the graph is levelling out.

I guess one of the classics is that virtually no attention has been paid to WorkCover. It a great worry that the unfunded liability now appears to be nearer \$1 billion—\$1 000 million. Do you remember the situation that we inherited? It was \$300 million. We took it down, from memory, to about \$20 million in unfunded liability, and it had gone up to about \$80 million in unfunded liability when we left office. That has now crept from \$80 million to about \$1 000 million. It is astronomical. It is another potential state bank disaster for this state, and what does the minister say? He says, 'I'll get a report.' In other words, he is not a hands-on minister: he simply relies on his public servants, and that is not good government under any circumstances. There is also the hypocrisy (and I have to use that term) of this government.

Mr Hanna: Be careful which word you use.

Mr MEIER: Yes. We remember when the now Premier indicated that Roxby Downs was a mirage in the desert. In fact, your father, Mr Acting Speaker, was one who reminded us on many occasions, when he was the member for Kavel, that Roxby Downs would be one of the greatest investments for this state. It became virtually the economic salvation of this state. And who was totally opposed to it at the stage? It was none other than the now Premier, the Hon. Mike Rann. He did everything to prevent Roxby Downs from going ahead. Now he does a complete about turn and says that he is promoting it. I regard it as total hypocrisy that someone can do an about turn like that. Thankfully, he is promoting it rather than denigrating it, as he did in opposition. He certainly was very effective in denigrating that and so many other projects when he was in opposition.

We have a situation where regional South Australia as a whole is being ignored, and that is one of my great worries as one of the regional members in this state. It is very disappointing to see how less and less money is being spent in infrastructure etc. than has been spent, and how our hospitals are suffering. I will highlight the Ardrossan Hospital. On 7 January, I took an urgent letter to the Minister

for Health, Lea Stevens, asking for assistance. I will quote extracts from my letter dated 7 January:

Dear Lea, I seek your urgent assistance for the Ardrossan Community Hospital.

In that letter I highlight what had been put to me by the Chairman of the Ardrossan Community Hospital, Mr Ray Johnson, who informed me of the plight of the hospital and indicated that the hospital was desperately in need of carryover funding and would be forced to stop trading in the very near future unless it had access to funds. I asked whether the state government could please help the Ardrossan Hospital. We should remember that, when the Hon. Dean Brown was minister for health, he provided a one-off grant of \$50 000 for the Ardrossan Hospital. It was a first, and it helped the hospital to continue. Basically, I was seeking an emergency package. What did I get back from the Minister for Health, the Hon. Lea Stevens? She said in her letter to me of 8 February:

I have noted the comprehensive approach taken by the Ardrossan Hospital in the preparation of its business plan enclosed with your letter. It is apparent that the business plan is largely dependent upon securing additional aged care places, or funding under the Commonwealth Rural Private Hospital program, and I commend the proactive nature of the plan in this regard. However, it is preferable for these issues to be resolved prior to considering this matter any further as this should allow a clearer view to be established for the future of the hospital. I have asked Mr Gary Stewart, Regional General Manager of Wakefield Health, to continue to liaise with the Ardrossan Hospital and to keep me informed of developments. Thank you for bringing this matter to my attention.

Yours, Hon. Lea Stevens

Did that do anything for the Ardrossan Hospital? Absolutely not. It needs urgent funding. I have since written to the minister on several occasions, particularly following a public meeting which was attended by some 500 people.

I was very disappointed to not be able to be present myself. I have asked for a deputation with the minister. In fact, I think that letter is in process right now, and I hope that the minister will attend to it urgently. But much, much more importantly is a request for some funding. What sort of funding? We are not talking \$50 000 any more; we are talking something like \$200 000 for their accident and emergency. They want a major highway—the coastal highway of Yorke Peninsula. Unfortunately, many accidents occur on that highway, and they need a hospital close by. Ardrossan is there and it can help them, but it is a private hospital. Surely, the government would be saving itself potentially millions of dollars by keeping Ardrossan Hospital open rather than seeing it closed. The government is going to have to then pick up the whole tab, and that is going to hurt it much, much more than if it refuses to give the money. Why can it not give the money? It can give the money.

As I highlighted at the very beginning, the government has a total revenue growth of something like \$5 billion more than was projected when we left office three years ago. Why are they so stingy? Why are they so stingy? I will tell you part of the reason, and I never believed this until went back into opposition again. There is such a thing as being in a safe Liberal seat. The negative is when you are in opposition. The Labor government says, 'Well, you're a safe Liberal seat; we are not going to win that, so why would we want to put any money into your electorate other than your normal day-to-day running operations through the public hospitals and schools?' It is extremely disappointing, and it is something that I hope the people of South Australia will see through and will judge this Rann Labor government.

Certainly, I will go on and say that, in the whole economic management of the state, it seems to be a matter of spin; it seems to be a matter of having committees of inquiry undertaken; it seems to be a matter of looking at things in the future; and, I guess, its transport plan. I welcome aspects of it. It is so far into the future. It is not going to help us now. It is after the next election. We do not even know which members will be here in that period of time. There will be a significant change. Some of us—

The Hon. W.A. Matthew interjecting:

Mr MEIER: No. As the honourable member for Bright said, he and I will not be here because we have announced that we will not continue. It grieves me that South Australia is not being looked after any more. People such as the member for Bright, my colleague, and myself may well decide that, perhaps, South Australia is not the state into which we should want to extend our experience, that the other states are going to be better placed. I never, ever thought that I would say that. In fact, I did say it once; I said to my children some years ago when Labor was in power. I said, 'There is no future here for you.' But, when we get into government, I reversed that and said, 'There is a great future in South Australia.' It worries me that I am having to rethink what I said to them in that respect, because I love South Australia; I love Yorke Peninsula.

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW (Bright): I too rise to support the Supply Bill and, in so doing, note that this bill is necessary, as is usual practice, to enable appropriation to be made for the first three months of the coming financial year during the period of budget deliberations, including budget estimates. I note that, on this occasion, we are examining the appropriation of \$1 700 million which is used to continue the process of government and, importantly, to pay hard-working, loyal public servants.

This is the 15th and last such address that I have the privilege of making to this house. As did my colleague, the member for Goyder, I have announced that I will not be contesting the next state election. At that time I will have served 16 years and three months in the parliament, and will have served across 17 frontbench portfolios—nine as a minister. I believe that now is the time to move on to other horizons. That will not detract me from the task that is at hand for the next 11 months and five days, between now and the next state election. The Labor Party can rest assured that during the remainder of that time, as at today, for 11 months and five days, I will continue to expose its weaknesses; I will continue to expose the problems that it creates for the people of the state; and I will continue to advocate on a daily basis for my constituents.

When I was first elected to this place in 1989, the Bannon Labor government was in power. I had the opportunity of being in this chamber during the last four years of that government to witness first-hand its demise and the reasons for it, and to participate in the questioning of ministers, as we saw a very sorry saga unroll for our state. There are actually a lot of parallels between the last four years of the Bannon Labor government and the government that we have before us today. Those parallels are not simply the fact that in the Bannon Labor government we had the member for Ramsay as a minister; today he is the Premier; and we had the member for Croydon—I think that his seat may have changed in the name, but today he is here as the Attorney-General.

The Premier, as he is today, was then the master of media spin, and the Attorney-General today has a greater opportuni-

ty to be what he was not then, and that is a very accident-prone minister. In fact, the Attorney-General is probably the most accident prone minister of this very sorry government. I do not need to put on the record today further details of his long litany of accidents and disasters because my colleague the member for Waite very capably did that today during question time.

That is not the only parallel. We also have a range of incompetent ministers who are being exposed in this place and outside in the media on a daily basis. We have a government that is incapable of formulating plans. It is incapable of planning and it is incapable of putting constructive ideas for comment before the South Australian community. I will come back to that in a minute. It is also a government that has again demonstrated its inability to manage the state's finances. Here today we continue to be exposed to the ongoing problems with WorkCover and public sector workers' compensation liability. We now have a government presiding over a debt of almost \$1 billion in workers' compensation between the public sector scheme and WorkCover.

To date, the exposure of that in this house has not received a significant amount of media publicity, but therein lies a parallel between the outgoing Labor government of the 1989 to 1993 era and today's Labor government. When the Liberal opposition raised details of the State Bank in the house, the media did not believe the extent of the problem. Indeed, in some areas, the media were critical of us for raising it. Our Premier was particularly critical, as he moved a motion in the house during private members' time chastising the dreadful Liberal Party for having the temerity to question the fine financial institution of the State Bank and lauding Tim Marcus Clark as a financial maestro who was capably managing the bank. Of course, the reality was that the State Bank of South Australia lost \$3.1 billion of taxpayers' money, and therein lies the problem.

Again, today we have problems with WorkCover and a blow-out in the public sector liability for workers' compensation now nearing \$1 billion. Through those schemes, the government has been losing hand over fist by increasing the debt by \$1 million every three days. That is what is occurring in this state under this incompetent government. I see a minister who stands up in question time and does not seem to understand the issues. That is exactly what happened with the State Bank, when we saw one bailout and then another, followed by the deserved and ultimate collapse of the government.

As I indicated before, similar parallels relate to lack of planning, and infrastructure is a classic example. The much promised infrastructure plan has finally been released—the very plan that was supposed to be released before December 2004. It was promised but never turned up. When I questioned the Minister for Infrastructure in this place on why it had not turned up, his rather glib response to the parliament was that there had been a fire on the West Coast and his chief of staff was very busy there undertaking activities associated with that. That was very commendable and I have given credit to the government for some of the management that occurred on the West Coast in the aftermath of the bushfires.

I give credit where it is due, but the fire was in January. The infrastructure plan was supposed to have been released in December 2004, but it was not. The minister promised that it would be released soon, but 'soon' has become this month—four months after the date it was supposed to be released. I had assumed that the reason for the delay was to ensure that a fabulous plan was released. What do we see?

We see an infrastructure plan that gives the state great vision—and I say that with tongue in cheek. The plan has, as its cornerstone for the period of the next 10 years, the delivery to the state of a one-kilometre extension of a tram line, a couple of tunnels under some roads and a railway station that was promised three years ago and shelved by this mob. That was the extent of their grand vision for the state.

It has been interesting in talking to loyal, hard-working, decent public servants who will continue to be paid through this Supply Bill. They are telling the opposition that the government was sitting on the infrastructure plan for the entire period of the delay and that the cabinet was agonising over the fact that the plan had no big hit announcement.

The Hon. J.D. Lomax-Smith: How do you know?

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: It is quite simple, minister: your Public Service is leaking like a sieve, and they are telling us.

The Hon. J.D. Lomax-Smith: You are psychic!

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: I do not have to be psychic: they tell us. We pick up the phone, give them a call and they tell us. That is what is happening.

The Hon. J.D. Lomax-Smith: You're psychic!

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: Because I have it right, minister, does not mean that I am psychic: they are telling us. I am not looking into a crystal ball to get those facts: they are telling us. I know that it is accurate, but it is not because I am psychic but because they are telling us. They are telling us that they had pressure applied on them to come up with innovative and imaginative projects that could be used as the centrepiece of announcements. When those announcements were made, the media outlets wanted to publish diagrams, the business cases and the plans—but there have not been any. There is a very simple reason: there aren't any.

Today, my colleague the member for Mawson asked the Minister for Transport whether he was prepared to release the business case for extending the tram line by a kilometre through the city. The question was not answered, because there is no business case: it has not been done, it is not there and it does not exist. Why? Again, the bureaucrats have given us the answer: it was cobbled together at the last minute, and the plans have not been done. There is one set of plans and, if the minister does not have them, I am happy to provide them to him. I alluded to them during question time today, namely, the work done in 2001. In fact, the concept was first started to be developed in 2000 and reached the drawing stage in 2001. I will give the minister a hint. In his own department, in the Passenger Transport Board, are concept drawings for a railway station and a transport hub adjacent to Westfield Marion. Surprise, surprise—that is what they announced last week. Those drawings exist, and I have copies if the minister wants them; I am happy to furnish them to him. They were done by the Passenger Transport Board, in conjunction with the City of Marion. How do I know? I chaired the cross-agency reference committee that worked on a number of projects.

As I detailed in the house today in the explanation to a question I asked the minister, a total plan was being developed for the Westfield Marion area that included the establishment of a State Swimming Centre and, as the member for Mitchell is well aware, a reconfiguration of the roads around Westfield Marion Shopping Centre. As he knows, you cannot leave those roads as they are, and you certainly cannot put a transport interchange in place (which was part of the 2001 proposal) without redeveloping those roads, because those roads will not cope in their present shape and form. It also

included the redevelopment of surrounding land owned by the Housing Trust, by TransAdelaide, or the Department of Transport, and by the City of Marion. It was to be a major redevelopment and reconfiguration of that area. All we have is an announcement of \$7 million for moving the railway station from Oaklands Park to Morphett Road and for the reconfiguration of bus movement through the Marion Shopping Centre. That is part (a very small part) of a much bigger, broader and worthwhile plan. Implementing only that part will cause chaos.

The minister indicated through his answer in the house today that he is clearly not on top of the portfolio. That is not the first time that he has indicated that he is not on top of the portfolio. Many members of this place would have heard the minister's interview on ABC 891 when he was very professionally questioned by the erstwhile David Bevan and Matthew Abraham about the movement of moneys from StateFleet into the capital project. The reason that came about is quite simple. Under our government, StateFleet was sold to the Commonwealth Bank. At that time it was a very good deal. The government argues today that, with today's interest rates and the AAA credit rating that has been brought about by good Liberal management, they can do better. They may well be able to do that now with the AAA credit rating, but we did not have that, thanks to the debacle of the Labor government at the time that fleet was sold.

When it was sold, that meant that, effectively, we were leasing those vehicles. So a payment was made out of recurrent each year. What has happened under this government is that that money, which is needed to continue to refresh the fleet, now comes out of the capital budget. This government is claiming a \$950 million capital works budget, but the fact is that that budget does not stand up to scrutiny, because included within that is the moneys that have actually been incorporated to pay for the fleet. On top of that, the \$950 million is a reduction from the last Liberal capital works budget of 2001-02. In reality, we now have a government that is spending about \$200 million—I repeat: \$200 million—less on capital works than the previous government.

They try to masquerade themselves as a visionary government with a capital works plan. As the member for Mitchell knows, if that \$200 million was available for development in the Westfield Marion area—because the Westfield Marion Shopping Centre is the busiest retail precinct in Adelaide, busier than Rundle Mall and Tea Tree Plaza—if a significant portion of those moneys—nowhere near that amount, but a proportion, much more than the \$7 million that has been put in—was made available, we would be able to have a state-of-the-art bus-train interchange at Westfield Marion. We would have a state aquatic centre, we would have the roads reconfigured in the area, and we would have seriously redressed some of our traffic problems. If that almost \$200 million had been available through the three years of incompetent management by this mob, we could have solved many other problems.

It is not just the fact that they are underspending on their capital budget, this government has a number of other things that are bringing money into its coffers. This is the highest taxing government in this state's history. This Premier and this Treasurer are the highest taxing in South Australia's history. What is more, they are effectively enjoying an extra \$5 billion a year. That is five thousand million dollars a year, more than was lost in revenue through the State Bank debacle over and above what was estimated since the last election for their term in government. You would expect from that to see

action, invigoration, planning, and projects delivered, but that has not happened.

That is the other parallel which I draw between this government and the previous Liberal government. When I was elected to this parliament in 1989 in my maiden speech I highlighted to the house that one of the things I would strive for was the delivery of what the Bannon Labor government called the third arterial road project—a new road to the south. They never delivered it. They put out material in my electorate and in the electorate of the member for Mitchell telling our constituents that they were going to build this road year after year after year, but they never did it. It took a Liberal government to clean up Labor's economic mess and build this road which we named the Southern Expressway. It took a Liberal government to build the freeway tunnel through the hills.

I know, Mr Acting Speaker, that this road is appreciated by your constituents and those of the member for Morialta. We have seen the economic benefits that this road has brought to the state and those regions, including Murray Bridge, as a consequence of having this faster road to that city. We have seen new industry go into Murray Bridge, and the prospects for Murray Bridge in the future are very exciting as a direct consequence of this particular road. Because of that example of leadership shown by the previous Liberal government you would think that we would see it followed by this government, but it has not been there.

I have asked the Minister for Infrastructure a very simple question on two occasions in this parliament. The essence of it was: can the minister name one single project that his government in three years has initiated, funded and commenced? The minister has not been able to name one, not one major project that his government has initiated, funded and commenced. I will help the minister out, because I have found one. The minister said that he would take the question on notice, because he could not come up with one. I asked the industry if they could assist, but they could not think of any. Well, sir, I have found one. It is appropriate that the relevant minister in her guise as the member for Adelaide is sitting here tonight, because that one project is the Sturt Street Primary School. I may be gilding the lily a bit because—

The Hon. J.D. Lomax-Smith interjecting:

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: I said a major project. The Sturt Street Primary School, which this mob reopened at the request of the member for Adelaide, was going to be a \$2 million project, and a \$2 million project does not really qualify as a major project, but it has had a major blow-out. The \$2 million is now a \$7 million project, which is another example—

Mr Hanna interjecting:

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: The member for Mitchell interjects, 'Perhaps it has now become a major project', because it has blown out by \$5 million. The member for Adelaide has the great honour of being the member who is in the electorate and who has requested the government's only project, which may qualify for major status if we discount the fact that it was a blow-out. It has been initiated by the government, funded by the government and completed—although I am not sure whether it is completed: there may be room for the \$7 million to blow out further. That is the great list of achievements of this incompetent government.

As I said, there are many parallels between this bunch of rogues and the bunch of rogues who maladministered this state up until 1993. We saw incompetent ministers, maladministration, financial incompetence, a lack of financial

understanding, a lack of prudent government, a lack of attention to detail and a lack of planning. All those characteristics are still there today but, of course, the government is, after all, led by the gentleman who was the most junior minister in the Bannon Labor government, and he is now our current Premier. It is not surprising that he took a leaf out of the book of the previous government. If the people of South Australia have not woken up to it yet—and many of them are doing that—ultimately, they will.

Mr HANNA (Mitchell): This is my opportunity to speak about economic matters in respect of this government. I did give it one very good recommendation about where to spend more money, and that is in respect of those who have mental illnesses and, in particular, those whose mental illnesses lead them to act out criminal behaviour, because our criminal justice system copes woefully inadequately with those who are mentally ill. There have been improvements over recent years, and it is good to see that a mental illness diversion program has been developed. But for the more serious matters where people are taken into custody, whether it be at a local police station, the remand centre or at one of our prisons, the treatment of such people is woefully inadequate.

The way that I usually come across these issues is through the parents of adult children who are going through the system. As any member can appreciate, if you have a child who is an adult but who has mental illness, you can be caused a lot of grief, particularly when there is a propensity to occasional violence and loss of control. A number of parents have come to me with problems of this nature. I have a couple of letters that I will read (excluding names) which concern these issues. The first letter states:

Dear Kris,

Thanks for your interest and support thus far with mental health issues. I have spent this morning speaking to the acting case manager at the remand centre and to the social worker at the remand centre. From these calls I have other issues which need to be raised—

1. Why is there no support at court for people who are released from there and then need to find their own way back (without money, transport, etc.) to the remand centre to pick up their property; do not have support re accommodation, Centrelink, etc. when released from court.

2. Where is appropriate and adequate housing after prison. Also where bail is denied due to no home address why is there not suitable accommodation for those people—thus freeing up the prison system. Also need support services for these!!

3. Why is there no information left at the visitors entrance clearly stating all the people in remand centre who can provide helpful information in all areas so that parents/wives etc. can easily ask questions and gather information they seek to assist the person who is in remand.

I skip to point No. 5:

Is there any way that the court system are requested to be easily heard when in court—so that interested parties can hear what is going on! Thanks again.

I have read that letter because it raises several very pertinent points that have not been addressed by this or the previous government. The last point that was raised refers to the lack of audibility of magistrates in the larger courtrooms. Quite often they will speak just loudly enough for those at the bar table, and perhaps the defendant, to hear. But those who care for the defendant, particularly adults who are mentally ill and, therefore, have a very keen and vital interest in the outcome of the proceedings, may be sitting at the back of the courtroom and denied the knowledge of what is transpiring. It is not always easy to understand or obtain an adequate briefing from a duty solicitor—if, indeed, one is provided by the Legal Services Commission on the day. I turn to another

letter, which is also worth bringing to the attention of this house. It states:

Dear Kris,

Well done—heard you on radio. Thank you for your efforts thus far re mental health and for taking the time to listen and act on suggestions e.g.—Remand Centre. Now there is a huge issue—Glenside. A few points below may be useful.

1. James Nash needs more beds and staff—thus burnout rate reduced.
2. Casualty at Glenside should be reopened.
3. Glenside should be upgraded and kept and added to for extra help and beds.
4. Mentally ill people need 'space' to exercise (walk etc.).
5. Units through state should be extra to Glenside.
6. Training should be increased in mental health area to obtain specialised staff needed to maintain staff levels.
7. A very strong lobby group is needed to prevent another mental health disaster as happened when Hillcrest was sold. Thank you.

Again, that letter brings some very pertinent issues to our attention.

The government has announced that it is going to close Glenside, and I am sure that, if the Labor government is re-elected in a year's time, that is what it will do. The critical issue, of course, is what is to replace those beds that are desperately needed at the current Glenside facility? Are we going to have facilities in various suburbs around Adelaide attached to hospitals, or whatever, because of inadequate numbers and inadequate time to replace Glenside? If mental health units are going to be built onto our state hospitals, will there be the same sort of recreational opportunities that are enjoyed by the residents at Glenside where they have beautiful grounds in which to walk? These are very powerful questions, and they have not been answered adequately at this point by the government.

I was prompted by some of these concerns to organise a tour of the Adelaide Remand Centre for interested members of parliament. There were, of course, a number of members who were interested but unavailable on the day, but nonetheless the tour did take place, and I appreciate the cooperation of remand centre management and also the Minister of Correctional Services and his staff to enable the tour to occur. The members who were willing and able to take up this opportunity included: the Hon. Robert Lawson, the Hon. Kate Reynolds, the Hon. Michelle Lensink and me; and staff from my office, Frances Bedford's office and Kate Reynolds' office. In addition, I am aware that the Hon. Angus Redford went by himself to inspect some of the facilities.

The remand centre opened about 15 years ago. It was only ever designed to accommodate men and there are no facilities for women to be remanded there. That generally means that they are sent to the women's prison, which is well publicised as a ghastly, antiquated institution with inadequate facilities—it is a scary place—and we do need a modern, humane women's prison.

In March, at the time the members of parliament toured the remand centre, there were upwards of 240 prisoners. One of the essential things to note is that these people are not necessarily criminals. They are not people who are necessarily going to be convicted of a criminal offence, but they are accused of a serious criminal offence or perhaps they have an offending history. There are prisoners who are kept there for over a year without regular access to psychological or psychiatric services, yet they are ultimately released back into the community after their time in the remand centre because either the case against them is not proceeded with or they are acquitted of the crime with which they are charged.

What is the implication of that for those people who are mentally ill? They have their medication and they have their behavioural problems in the community. Through some incident, they are carried into the criminal justice system and some of them are remanded in the Adelaide Remand Centre. Even if they are quite seriously mentally ill, they remain at the remand centre for lengthy periods of time. There is no rehabilitation offered at the remand centre and there is no ongoing psychiatric or psychological treatment of prisoners there. There is occasional treatment but nothing that would pass for minimum standards of therapeutic value.

So, you can have people there for six months, 12 months or longer, with a mental illness or some problem which predisposes them to criminal behaviour. They are left completely untreated—with no rehabilitation and no psychological help to deal with the problems they have—so they come out of the remand centre worse than when they went in. How short-sighted is that? If adequate funding was spent to care for people properly when they are on remand, let alone in prison, we would have people coming back into the community after their time at the remand centre better than they were when they went in—less likely to commit crime, therefore less likely to go back into the system and use up court time, use up police time and use up the resources at the remand centre again in the future. So, it is extremely short-sighted to be stingy when it comes to treatment of mental illnesses in the remand centre.

However, there is a considerable distribution of pharmaceutical items. Something like half the inmates at the remand centre are provided with some sort of mind-altering substance—and I am talking about through the dispensary, not through illicit means. Those substances may be something as mild as a common antidepressant or they may be something stronger such as an antipsychotic drug.

There is room for about half a dozen inmates in the infirmary at the remand centre, and sometimes this is where people with serious mental illness end up. One would ask the obvious question that, if they do have serious mental illness and they are being dealt with as prisoners in the criminal justice system, would they not be in James Nash House, which is our specialist facility for dealing with people with those particular problems? However, there is a waiting list for James Nash House. In other words, you can be psychotic and thrashing around violently at the remand centre and there will be no place for you at James Nash House, so you are left to mix with other prisoners and be treated in a place that does not have all the staff and facilities that should be available for the treatment of people in that situation.

I am aware of an example where one of my constituents was taken to the remand centre while awaiting trial, and his mental health seriously deteriorated there. That is not surprising if one bears in mind the recent notorious case of Cornelia Rau, a woman with a mental illness who was held first by the Queensland police and then handed over to DIMIA, which then held her for many months in the Baxter Detention Centre, where her mental state undoubtedly worsened. People were shocked to hear the circumstances of her detention. However, a number of people in the remand centre are in a similar state, yet we do not hear about them.

The person to whom I just referred, who was taken to the remand centre and whose condition deteriorated badly, was eventually taken to the Royal Adelaide Hospital for critical treatment. He was eventually moved onto James Nash House, when a vacancy became available. It is an inadequate system, and it does not cope with such people or treat them well. As

I have said, the whole community pays the price, not just the individual.

I will give another illustration of how primitive our system can be. Because of the number of people now on remand (well above the number for which the remand centre was designed), there has been a considerable amount of doubling up, which has meant that there are two prisoners to a cell. There is no doubt that in a number of cases people prefer the company, but certainly not in every case. It is true that, if prisoners are made to share a cell, they are assessed for their compatibility for doubling up.

Recently, a case was reported to me where a prisoner with a mental illness—an extremely vulnerable person—was placed in a cell with another much tougher, more experienced inmate. The tougher inmate gave a decree to his cell partner that he was not to urinate or defecate in the time they were in the cell together, which was most of the day and night. This mentally ill person became increasingly distressed and, out of severe anxiety, with the threat of violence, held on to their bladder and bowel functions to the point where they lost control completely and lost the use of their sphincters in respect of those functions. At that point, the person could be removed to the infirmary to get a break. If that is how we cope with people with a mental illness, we are not really treating people with dignity. Ultimately, the devastating consequences to that person's personality and health will again mean that in the long term there will a greater cost to the community.

In summary, if the government is looking where to spend some of the resources available to it, I could not recommend more highly, along with our schools, hospitals and many other worthy things, the provision of adequate psychological and rehabilitation treatment to prisoners in the remand centre and, indeed, in our prison system. I do not have the time to go into details about our prison system and its lack of rehabilitation and psychological services, so I have just focused on the Adelaide Remand Centre. It is a crying shame, and the government really needs to take some action on this issue.

Mrs HALL (Morialta): I am delighted to contribute to the supply debate, and I think I am the last speaker on our side. Listening to a number of the speeches over the last 24 hours or so, I have to say that a pretty consistent message has been coming through from this side of the chamber, and I will be pursuing that in my remarks. There should be absolutely no illusions that the Rann Labor government's focus on any priority in its budget, whether it be health, justice or infrastructure, is the result of eight years of hard work by successive Liberal administrations, which restored this state's finances after the near bankruptcy caused by the last Labor government.

Speaking of infrastructure, I ask whether it is unfair to add that it was a Labor government which ditched the transportation plan for the expansion of Adelaide and which sold off the transport corridors which had been purchased over decades to provide transport links and needs for the future development and growth of our state. As an aside, I thought I would mentioned that, as a relevant part of the budgetary process over the last two weeks, as the infrastructure minister has battled to defend his featureless infrastructure plan, he has thrown Liberal-initiated projects into the air as white elephants. I think that is a bit rough. His hubris is absolutely breathtaking, as he stands in front of decades of dud Labor projects, and I will name just a few. How about the miracle

of the new urban development of the MFP, which I have not heard mentioned by anyone on the Labor side, or that wonder of economic development, Jubilee Point—we all remember that—or, for that matter, the forestry industry program of Scrimber?

We could all have a lot of fun if we looked at some of the extraordinary pronouncements made in the Bannon years, during a time when our current Premier was a minister. I thought it would be appropriate if we went back to the early 1990s and made reference to the bizarre financial mismanagement of the State Bank by the last Labor government and its then leader, premier Bannon. For us, that was Labor in action—that marvellous team that lost us the AAA rating. Now the current government has the gall to boast that the AAA rating has been restored by its financial management. They never mention the near \$10 billion debt and lost opportunities that the Labor Party inflicted on our state some 15 years ago. There is no mention of the grief of the \$2 million a day in interest costs that the Labor Party inflicted on this state until a Liberal government had to come in and fix up the mess. Again, this bizarre logic returned yesterday in the Premier's letter to *The Advertiser*, in which he blamed everyone and anyone but the Labor Party, of course, for the sale of ETSA. The headline read, 'Why I am not going to apologise.' Why should any of us be surprised by that? There is no mention by Premier Rann of his 2002 pledge—and we all have copies of that marvellous document—'My pledge to you.' Under his signature, he asks South Australians to keep the pledge card as a check to ensure that he kept his pledges. You would have to say that that is a joke, and a pretty sick one at that.

The highlight for me was his pledge to fix our electricity system and give us cheaper power. However, we all know the result of that. But there are a few others that one could mention, such as his pledge for better hospitals and for more beds, only to announce that he is going to close Glenside. And we all know about the ever increasing hospital waiting lists. Of course, you would have to say that this is in direct contrast to the Liberal promise to develop Glenside into a centre of excellence and a specialised rehab centre for the mentally ill. His pledge continues: to cut advisory boards and committees and to slash Labor's definition of fat cats. This is a Premier who is leading a government into the history books as the highest taxing in the state's history. His treasury is awash with money, although the Treasurer likes to deny it, but the reality is that he knows it, the Treasurer knows it and I believe that the South Australian public knows it.

Debating a supply bill is always a very interesting exercise, because it enables MPs to reflect on pledges, on promises and on how they are dismissed and broken at will. Labor in office has a treasury laden with an additional whopping windfall of \$1.7 billion over the seven years to 2009-10—this from a GST that they fiercely fought and opposed, and they never acknowledge that it is the GST money in part that has done wonders for their balance sheets and their restored AAA rating. For three years, this government and this Treasurer have had unprecedented access to total windfall revenue of over \$5 billion above the forward estimates over the four years, inspired by a very active Australian and South Australian economy. That fact is rarely acknowledged by a Labor member. They rarely acknowledge that the nearly \$7 billion of debt, by today's value, was wiped out by successive Liberal treasurers. My view is that Labor deceives with talk of their \$360 million of business tax cuts. It never clarifies that the real figure is only a portion of that,

and that is approximately \$45 million per year over four years. Then there are the exorbitant stamp duties, land taxes and, in general, higher property taxes being forced on the people of this state, while a Labor government swims in cash and spins the line about its good financial management.

The people of our state are not blind to the comprehensive list of failings of Labor in office. They recognise the spin, and they recognise that headlines and promises are no substitute for reality and delivery of services. The government continues to fail in areas of exports and investment attraction while the rest of the country thrives, promoting the target while the graph lines rapidly take off in a downward fall. This government constantly boasts about its strategic plan—great on targets and destinations but particularly silent in a deafening way on how to get there.

The picture, in my view, is the same in the tourism industry. While the rest of Australia is enjoying very significant growth, our state is suffering from a lack of priority given to this most important generator of economic growth and huge employment opportunities across the metropolitan area and throughout our regions, plus the completely appropriate quantities of pride that this industry generates in our state as a most unique and important destination. The vital stats tell the story: our international visitor arrivals in Australia are increasing at a rate of 11 per cent while improvement in arrivals in our state languishes at 4 per cent; South Australia's share of Australia's international arrival market stands at 6.7 per cent, our lowest market share in a decade; backpacker arrivals are down 24 000 on the 2000 figures, while backpacker nights are down 354 000 on the figures that were achieved in 2001.

I have said in this chamber before that the Premier has a record that he should not be proud of, and I hope his two relevant ministers never attain his actual result—and that was the minister who achieved the highest unemployment figures and percentages ever achieved in South Australia's history, and the lowest visitor numbers ever achieved by a tourism minister.

Now it is time to move to some of the glaring inadequacies of the government's infrastructure plan—the much awaited infrastructure plan, the document that was promised for delivery last year but delivered just a few days ago. We were given a taste of its infrastructure credentials with a \$16 million blow-out of the Glenelg tram line project and a blow-out of up to \$178 million with the Port River Expressway thus far. Heaven help us with the underpasses and the overpasses that are currently being discussed because, whilst the government's performance on its minimal infrastructure contribution has been poor so far, it was with some optimism and hope that I read the infrastructure plan—page after page, platitudes, targets and priorities. I cannot believe that it is a serious document for the infrastructure needs of South Australia over the next decade, even though it talks about phase 1 and phase 2 projects but buries the responsibilities between governments in a general sense, and the private sector investment that is going to be required.

The fact that tunnels, trams, underpasses and overpasses, plus wind power projects constitute the main highlights of this government's major infrastructure announcement speaks volumes of its inability to progress the needs of the state. I would just love to read in its entirety the article in a column published by Geoff Roach in last Saturday's *Advertiser*. However, there are a couple of quotes that I thought I should go on the record. I can congratulate Geoff for being so concise in his views. He heads the article with the following:

Call that an infrastructure plan, Patrick? You've got to be kidding. What is it again that you are supposedly going to revitalise the state with?

An extra kilometre of tramline, a couple of traffic tunnels and a long overdue fancy transport station?

He then makes reference to the opening bridges, and rather cynically suggests that that is there so that a couple of traditional Labor seats will not be lost at the next election. He states:

Fair dinkum, is that really all there is for the next decade?

He talks about the infrastructure planning and operation in Melbourne, Sydney, Perth and Brisbane. He then rather frighteningly makes reference to the burgeoning provincial centres of Newcastle, Townsville, the Gold Coast and Geelong. He finishes off that section by saying:

All this while our present state masters continue, seemingly, to devote infinitely more energy to political spin and subterfuge than substance.

I thought that was a pretty good assessment of the plan released by the minister just last week.

As the shadow minister for tourism, I would have to say that the plan is a massive let-down, as I am sure it is for the tourism minister. To me, the plan is all about lost opportunities. The State Strategic Plan makes very bold promises about doubling the use of public transport, for example, to 10 per cent of weekday travel. Extending the tram to the Adelaide Railway Station is hardly going to put a dent in the conundrum that is our public transport system. It will not reduce the serious problem of traffic flow, and it will not solve environmental issues posed by a growing reliance on cars, and that is acknowledged in the plan itself. It is not going to make the city more accessible for tourists. These are all concerns that a highly developed and integrated public transport system has got to address. Committing to just a one kilometre tram extension, it has ignored electrification and it has overlooked the detail and coordination needed and enjoyed by other cities of approximately our size in our own country and overseas.

If you compare our public transport system to Sydney, Melbourne, Brisbane and Perth, it surely is a most disturbing picture. We all know and could talk about some of the experiences that we have had on their facilities, but I can just refer specifically to the difficulties tourists have when they arrive in our city. I must say how exciting it is for me to see that Adelaide Airport later this year—I understand that it is on budget and on time at present—is about to see us enter into an exciting new era. It was an initiative of and supported by the previous government and the federal government, but it is being driven by the professionalism and determination of Adelaide Airport Corporation. The redevelopment is at last going to put us on par with most airports in this country, and we will truly be in a position to welcome our guests in style.

However, it would be folly for anyone in this chamber, or elsewhere for that matter, to think that visitors these days choose a destination because it has a five-star airport. There needs to be very much more, and here in our state we certainly have it. Visitors are going to have every reason to be impressed with our new facilities, but as soon as they collect their luggage they are going to wonder how on earth they are going to get out of the place. Following the release of the government's infrastructure plan, Adelaide Airport is going to remain without access to public transport services. Every year 4.2 million passengers are processed at our airport. There is a 4 000 plus strong work force, and it has been ignored in this latest plan. Things like express services linking the city, Glenelg and Henley Beach, to name just a

few, would seriously complement the redevelopment greatly and would provide convenience for passengers and employees travelling to and from our new airport. I seriously hope that, at some point, the government starts to address that.

I have to say, though, that relying on this government to commit some of its bulging coffers of the Treasury to a simple project that might do some good, but might not necessarily earn a headline is, rather sadly, just wishful thinking. It demonstrates this government's aversion to matching words with dollars and actions of real substance. The words of the government's infrastructure plan are in keeping with its other documents of this nature, broad and relatively non-committal and at times, in my view, they are simply misleading. For members of the tourism industry I particularly urge them to approach the plan with great caution. That caution is particularly applicable to Kangaroo Island, a major international destination of this country. It is hugely important to our tourism industry, and is the subject of discussion in the plan, but in reality it stands to gain just about nothing. Members in this chamber would be well aware of my interest and passion for Kangaroo Island, and its importance in the industry. My frustration has not abated with the release of this plan. As usual, the commitment of the government fails to match the rhetoric, and KI is going to continue to miss out. The government talks about the Penneshaw harbour being designated as the primary freight and passenger ferry harbour, and it receives a priority 2 ranking. Are we missing something here? Is this a misprint? The plan then talks about Kingscote Airport, and that reference is just as misleading. It is expressed in the following terms: 'upgrade Kingscote airfield when justified by growth in demand for services.' That also receives a priority 2 ranking and will apparently occur sometime between now and 2015. Along with the people of Kangaroo Island, I am sure, I would appreciate some clarification on the logic of the argument presented by this statement.

The government is obviously unaware that the resealing of the tarmac and the upgrading of the terminal and facilities at Kingscote have long been recognised as vital to the ongoing success and growth of our industry in this state. Maybe it is the 'chicken and egg' argument, but the firm belief of those on KI is that growth in demand cannot come without the facilities, and that brings me to my next point. The plan also states that the lead for this project has to be taken by local government. So, it appears that the government is not prepared to invest even one cent in the upgrade, and that takes us directly back to square one.

It appears that the Kangaroo Island council will be burdened with fixing these facilities. It has a low rate base of only 4 300 residents and that, therefore, affects its ability to meet needs across the island. It really is an extraordinary reference to this international tourism icon of our state. There are so many issues and concerns of members of the opposition, and they have covered all portfolios. They are genuine concerns, and it is my view that, in a democracy, it is our job to continue to raise them. We believe that the government is failing the people of our state, and it is arrogant and an insult to the community that government members come here and ridicule our concerns, but it is typical of their determination to concentrate on a predetermined message and spin.

There are many other issues of vital importance I have not yet had the time to cover, such as aged care within multicultural communities; translation and access to services within the new, emerging and more established multicultural communities; the serious issue and increasing incidence of

domestic violence; the tragedy of our horrendous road toll and what is happening to our young people; the issue of mental health, so articulately outlined by the member for Mitchell, and its serious lack of assistance and funding; and emergency housing and the affordability of housing. I could go on, but time does not permit.

Time expired.

Mr MEIER: The debate on the Supply Bill is very important, and I draw your attention, Mr Acting Speaker, to the state of the house.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Goldsworthy): The Opposition Whip has drawn my attention to the state of the house. As a quorum is not present, ring the bells.

A quorum having been formed:

Bill read a second time.

The Hon. S.W. KEY (Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education): I move:

That the house note grievances.

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett): Yesterday in the house, the member for Enfield quoted the title of a song, *Fess Up When You Mess Up*. He should have looked a bit further, as the Uppity Blues Women had another song, *Weak Hips/Strong Lips*. That is what we get from this government: not much action but lots of lip service and lots of talk. There are no loose lips over there; they have strong lips and there is lots and lots of talk. I would like to use this time to talk about some of the local issues in my electorate of Morphett that involve spending serious money but, unfortunately, I do not think that my constituents should hold their breath.

In my contribution on the Supply Bill I mentioned the infrastructure projects I was quite happy about, and I will certainly talk about the potential for a real tram or light rail service around the metropolitan area later in my speech. However, this government has a huge opportunity to spend money on schools, but the only real infrastructure project it has been involved with was Sturt Street Primary School—a project that blew out from \$2 million to \$7 million. The Paringa Park Primary School has waited 50 years for redevelopment. The Bristol buildings at Paringa Park Primary School were second-hand in 1954, and it will cost \$2.5 million to redevelop it. I just hope that it blows out to about \$7 million. The kids at Paringa Park Primary School deserve to have \$7 million spent on them, because that school is overflowing. I forget the number of students at Sturt Street, but Paringa Park has well over 100—I think it is on the way to 150. Like most schools in my electorate, it is bursting at the seams, because so many people want to live in this fantastic area of this state, which is the electorate of Morphett.

The governing council, the students, the staff and I are over the moon about this \$2.5 million redevelopment in last year's budget, but the disappointing part is that it has taken so long to get it up and running. Now, the government says that they are going to do this redevelopment but that they should build us a proper school hall. The problem is that the school hall will cost another \$800 000. They say, 'We're the good guys; we will put in \$600 000', but the school, which has about 125 students and is a small school compared with some, has to find a further \$200 000, otherwise they will not get their hall. If Sturt Street can blow out from \$2 million to \$7 million—I forget what the lift cost in Sturt Street—

Ms Chapman: It was \$140 000.

Dr McFETRIDGE: I am advised by the member for Bragg that it was \$140 000 for the lift in Sturt Street. I am sure that the government could find in those buckets of money that they have an extra \$200 000 for a school hall when the Paringa Park Primary School has waited 50 years for this redevelopment. Unfortunately, this is not the only school in my electorate that is having problems. Brighton Secondary School is a fantastic top-quality school—it won the Rock Eisteddfod. I had the pleasure of taking some of the students from the Rock Eisteddfod around the V8 races. I took them down into the pits, and I am pleased to say that on the front of this month's Brighton Secondary School newsletter there is a photo of me with the kids in front of the HSV Holden team. That is a great indictment of the calibre of their reputation, but self-praise is no recommendation.

We finally got the approval for the state volleyball centre at Brighton Secondary School, but unfortunately the cost has blown out because of delays by this government. If it had been implemented with the money that was available under the former Liberal government, we would have been home and hosed, but now the cost of \$1.4 million has blown out to \$1.8 million. We can still build it for \$1.4 million, but the state volleyball centre will have only a 2 metre runoff around the volleyball courts. This is far too dangerous for elite athletes to try to stop, twist and turn without hurting themselves by slamming into the walls, and it has only a 7 metre roof. My understanding is that any volleyball centre that is worth its salt has to have at least a 9 metre roof and at least a 4 metre runoff. Unfortunately, the cost to do that is another \$400 000. This government has the money. This is a state facility, not just a facility for the Brighton Secondary School. The government should put this money up and give the people of South Australia (not just the people of Morphett or the Brighton Secondary School) what they deserve, and that is first-class sporting facilities.

The most common complaint that comes into my office is about the antisocial behaviour of hoon drivers in the electorate of Morphett. I have spoken many times in this place of the need for a greater police presence in my electorate, particularly around Jetty Road, Glenelg. The Sturt LSA officers do an absolutely sterling job. They try to be where the hotspots are but, unfortunately, like all police officers in South Australia, there are just not enough of them. What did we see on the TV news tonight? Some of the British police who have come over here are leaving. They are not happy with some of the conditions under which our South Australian officers are working, so they are leaving. That is an indictment on the squeeze that this government has put on the South Australian police force. We have to give the police 110 per cent financial support, not just our moral support. It is great to stand up in this place and say how much we love our police officers, and we do, but we need to put our money where our mouth is. The Jetty Road Main Street Board is working with the police, the council and the residents association. I am on their committee as well, and we are looking at the problems and trying to work through the issues, but unless money is put up by the state government to provide extra police, what do we have? Not much at all.

The other big infrastructure project at the Bay is the Patawalonga. We have the Barcoo Outlet, which is an award-winning infrastructure project that was built under the former government. We have the seawater recirculation system, and that is working exceptionally well under most circumstances. The only circumstances when it does not work well is when people fiddle with the computer program. It is coming up to

two years since we had the disastrous floods in that area. Since then, we have had a number of little minor fixes. We had the launch of PatWatch earlier this year. The minister came down to the Pat. Unfortunately, he had a little bit of bronchitis on that day, but I invited him to come for a swim in the Pat with me. I went for a swim in the Pat, and the Pat is now a fantastic place to have a swim: it is clear and clean. It is certainly very salty because of the fantastic design of the seawater recirculation system.

I tried to have a look on the web site tonight to see how PatWatch is going, because we were promised that there was going to be a real time web site where we could look at the levels in the Pat, the Barcoo Outlet, and the tides and see what was happening. I did a Google search and up came the Hon. John Hill. The web site is dwr.sa.gov.au/file/patwatch. I could not get into that page. I tried another heading: Patawalonga Seawater and Stormwater Management. I cannot remember the web page for that, but I tried to click on there and I could not get on. So, I did a search of the Department of Water, Land and Biodiversity Conservation site and I got a registration form so that I could go along to the PatWatch meeting next Monday night at Partridge House, if I was so inclined, but I could not find anything else.

I will go to that meeting as I am keen to organise the PatWatch down there, because who do they call? They call the member for Morphett whenever there are issues down there, because they know I will help them. I was up at 4 a.m. with the Salvos (thank God for the Salvos) when we had the floods last time. Let us hope that the Patawalonga Catchment Management Board (and God bless it, because it is trying hard under the present circumstances) can get something out of this government; let us hope that we can get that web page up. I learnt how to be a gutter guardian, but I could not find out how to be more than a member of PatWatch or what PatWatch did. That will be become more of an ever present issue as the rain comes, and I just hope that it is as this government has promised.

Regarding the new trams, I am delighted that there will be some improvement, but I am very disappointed in what we are getting. I will be watching the ballast contamination issues on the tram track and what they are doing with the sleepers. Something like 20 000 sleepers are coming over from Victoria. Why we had to get them from Victoria I do not know. We are not getting new track laid: we are getting it ground off. Let us hope that this government spends some money on the people who deserve it.

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY (Light): I rise to speak about my electorate in this grievance, but I would like to add a little to the member for Morphett's contribution about trams. I think it is very disappointing that the—

The Hon. S.W. Key: Are you a gutter guardian?

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY: No, I am not a gutter guardian, but I am very concerned that the model of tram that has been chosen by this government is not the optimum. When you replace a tram system, you should be looking for one that will deliver the best outcome for South Australia, and these are very narrow trams. The member for Morphett and I discussed matters with the companies that were going to supply these trams some 12 or 18 months ago and we talked about the models that were available. I think the government has made a mistake in this area, because the capacity and comfort—

Dr McFetridge interjecting:

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY: Yes. As the member for Morphet said, they are 30 centimetres narrower than the ones we already have, which does not seem to me to be a very sensible move. However, let me move on to discuss the electorate of Light and some of the issues which are particularly pertinent and which require government attention. When I talk to people in the electorate, the subject of roads and the lack of money that is being spent by this government on our roads comes up every time. There are a number of local roads with respect to which funding would normally come from the local government roads fund. This government has reduced that funding and, as a result, the waiting list for those roads that are on the priority list just gets longer and longer.

Roads that are within my electorate include the Wasleys to Mallala road, which now carries a lot of the traffic to the Dublin stock market—traffic which was not there before. That road is a major link between the coast—for instance, Port Parham—through to the Barossa Valley and further east, and for years we have been waiting for it to be sealed. It urgently requires work. The Roseworthy Road, which is a link road between the Sturt Highway and the Gawler to Kapunda road, is another road that carries a lot of traffic in terms of vehicles that go across to link up to Gomersal Road and through to the Barossa Valley. That road also is unsealed and desperately requires funding out of the local government road fund. A road that has had everything done to it apart from the sealing—the final top coat—is a road that links Wasleys with Hamley Bridge, and that road also carries a lot of traffic from north to south. The foundation for the road has been laid for years, and all that was required was the final top coat, basically, of tar and chippings for it to be finished, but funding did not come through (and I am going back now probably to the early 1980s). That road also requires funding. But there is a range of sealed roads which also need addressing, because governments are not spending money on roads, which require either top dressing or, in some cases, levelling, to improve their capacity. This government's answer to all of that is: reduce the speed limits on those roads and then we do not have to put money into them and we do not have to pay attention to them.

Another very important project in my electorate is the North Para retention dam. This dam is planned to alleviate the flooding of the Gawler River and, in particular, the lower reaches of the Gawler River. The dam has been in the planning stage now for about four years. That project was originally estimated to cost between \$7 million and \$8 million, but it has now been found that, with the engineering requirements, the purchase of land and a number of other issues, the cost has blown out to some \$17 million, which is a very high cost. The last time the Gawler River flooded was in 1991. It cost the government of the day (the Arnold Labor government) \$10 million in damages. Our advice is that, because a report was produced that identified the problems, should another flood occur (they usually occur about once every 10 years, so we are past the due date for a flood of the Gawler River), the government would be held liable, because it comes under the responsibility of the government. While this is a large amount of money—some \$17 million—it is something which desperately needs doing and which must be done.

The agreement with respect to the \$8 million price tag was one-third from local government, one-third from the state government and one-third from the commonwealth government. Now that the cost of the project has blown out, local government has said that it cannot afford the extra money.

The federal government has asked the state government to kick in half of the extra money and the federal government will contribute dollar for dollar to the money that the state government puts in. I call on the Premier—and, in particular, the Minister for Environment and Conservation, because it comes under his portfolio—to seriously look at this matter in the upcoming budget. It is something that is desperately required. If the project does not go ahead and the river floods, I can assure the government that it will be liable, through lawsuits, for damage to property in Gawler and the lower reaches of the Gawler River.

Another particularly important area, which I raised in my supply speech and which I will reiterate, is the Peachey belt area and the desperate need for the revitalisation of Housing Trust accommodation in that area. As I mentioned in my supply speech, I know that the government has released a housing plan but, quite honestly, the amount of money that is set aside in there is laughable, because it will not go very far at all. It is about \$15 million. There are three regions that that \$15 million addresses and, over the life of that plan, it works out to be about \$1.5 million per year in each of the regions, so it will not go very far at all. It requires a lot more than that. I know the Playford council is very supportive and, in our time in government, the Playford council put aside \$800 000 towards that refurbishment, and I am sure it would be equally supportive of this government.

The member for Morphet raised the issue of police and hoons in the area. We have a problem in Gawler with young people on Friday and Saturday nights in particular in the main street of Gawler. I was driving home only last Saturday night at around midnight and there would have been around 30 to 40 young people in a group in the main street who were just wandering across the street without worrying about cars. These young people come out of two of the local hotels that have live entertainment. As a result of some serious drinking, in most cases, they cause problems within Murray Street and there are not enough police to cater adequately. I know that a target force group comes from Elizabeth, but the fact is that, if an arrest has to be made, those officers are taken off the street and there is no back-up, so the street can have no police presence. I am talking about between midnight and 3 o'clock in the morning, because the closing hours for the two hotels is 3 a.m. As I said, in many cases young people come out who, unfortunately, have had too much to drink and fights occur in the street, and more police are required in Gawler to cater for these situations. This government claims that it is putting on more police. I would say it needs to address those areas where there are problems and recognise that what is needed in Gawler is an extra shift of police—another car, so that there are two cars within the town and not just one—to cater for this problem.

One of the other issues I will mention briefly in the time that I have left is land tax. I have lost count of the number of people coming into my office about this, even after the government's measures to try to improve the land tax debacle. A number of those people own multiple properties, and they are people who have invested in property rather than in superannuation funds for their retirement. They are now paying thousands of dollars in land tax. The government's platform and changes that it put forward have basically made no difference to these people, because they have properties valued at over half a million dollars; but, as I have said, instead of putting their money into superannuation funds, they invested in property and are now being disadvantaged because of that.

Time expired.

Mr BRINDAL (Unley): The member for Flinders nearly spoke before me, and I was tempted to give way to her because it is always difficult to follow such an erudite speaker as the member for Light. We all feel somewhat inadequate. He is a very good member, whom I hope the electorate of Light sees fit to return at the next election, because he would truly be a loss to this place. His thoughtful contributions to this place certainly set a standard, not only for our party but also for those opposite. It is apposite that I follow the contribution of the member for Light, because I, too—

Ms Ciccarello interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: Vini, they are giving him more questions now. Don't complain. I have set that up. That was a factional deal I did with the Labor Party on your behalf, Vini, so just don't question.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Unley.

Mr BRINDAL: I am sorry, sir. I should let you into a secret. The member for Norwood and I have a personal faction of two. We meet in a phone box and it is a cross-party faction, and we do not intend to form a government anywhere in the near future, although we are ever hopeful.

The member for Light raises a very interesting issue that is not confined to the Gawler River but, indeed, is a problem for most of metropolitan Adelaide—that is, the so-called rivers of Adelaide, which are barely little more than creeks. In the case of the Light River, it floods onto the plain and its channel was never designed to be big enough to take its peak flows to the sea. It is a watercourse designed to spread over an area that was market garden—as you would know, Mr Speaker—and is now residential housing.

Similarly, in Unley and through the western suburbs—through the member for Bragg's suburbs, down into the minister's seat of Ashford and certainly into the seat of Torrens and beyond—these creeks meander and, in many cases, meandered and flooded through swamp-like areas on their way to the sea. Indeed, when Europeans settled in this state, it is recorded that a drop of rain falling on Mount Lofty would reach the sea a year later. The drop of rain that now falls on Mount Lofty reaches the sea, in many cases, something like 17 minutes later, and that is a problem. It rushes down concrete drains and pours through the creeks and the watercourses, and those creeks and watercourses in many cases never sustained the flows that now go down them. In the time before we settled this state, and certainly before we cleared this state of much of its native vegetation, that water in many cases went underground and came out in springs, and in other cases percolated its way to the watercourses. Now, when once there were—

The Hon. S.W. Key: Black forest. It ended up in the black forest.

Mr BRINDAL: The member for Ashford raises the black forest. I used to represent the black forest and the member for Ashford now does so. It was called the black forest because of all the black native trees that were there. It was not called the black forest in Adelaide conspiracy terms because there were witches there, either—although they will rewrite history to say that is where we used to traditionally hide the witches or hide the gays, or do something else ne'er-do-well down there—

The Hon. S.W. Key: It is where the bushrangers were.

Mr BRINDAL: The member for Ashford is getting Australian and creative: it is where the bushrangers were. We can tell that to our children and grandchildren.

Ms Breuer: You should write a novel.

Mr BRINDAL: Yes, I will. I promise the member for Giles that she will feature prominently in it. The problem we now have—and it is a problem I lay not at the doorstep of this government but rather at the doorstep of a succession of governments—is that we came along and thought urban infill was a good idea. When I was growing up and when a lot of members in this place were growing up, traditionally about one-third of the suburban block was covered with built form.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: I'm good at teaching ancient history. You would classically have the cricket pitch for the boys down the back, fruit trees, a rotary clothes line and a lawn out the front. About one-third of the block had an impervious surface.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: No, that was in the member for Ashford's time, not in mine. I do not remember horses and carts. The member for Giles can remember camel trains at Marree, I am reliably informed. However, I do not go back that far.

Ms Breuer interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, the member for Giles!

Mr BRINDAL: To take away what the member for Giles now spreads in this house in liberal quantities. The fact is that about one-third of the block was covered in built form. Because of urban infill, we are now encouraging better utilisation of our infrastructure—our roads, power services and sewerage. Where there was one-third of the block covered, often the houses have been expanded to take about half the block, the back has been taken off and a courtyard home has been put on the back. Because the yards are now so small, the whole yard is often covered with paving stones so that the entire surface of the block is now impervious. So, when an inch of rain falls on that block, an inch of rain runs off the block into the street and into the creek and down the creek, searching its way into the sea.

That is not a big problem in relation to any individual block but, when you times that by hundreds and thousands of blocks in metropolitan Adelaide, we have a severe and increasing flood problem, or risk of flooding, in Unley, Ashford, West Torrens and many of the other areas. If we doubt the emergence of the problem, I hark back to the Dunstan era, I think, where they realised a real problem was emerging with the development of the Torrens Valley. Mr Speaker, you would be able to vouch for the fact that that Torrens linear park, of which we are all so rightfully proud, was not developed because we thought a linear park was a great idea: it was developed because they realised the real potential for flooding along the Torrens. It is a brilliant flood mitigation scheme, because it gives us recreation and the capacity to bicycle, and it is now the path of an O-Bahn expressway. However, it is still clear enough that, in the event of a major rain storm, the sections around St Peters and many parts of metropolitan Adelaide will not now flood, because a flood mitigation scheme is in place—but not so for Dry Creek and the creeks in Unley and Burnside, and not so for the creeks out north.

The problem is that what we have done as a succession of governments—and, again, I do not blame this government—is to allow planning approval to take place in areas where quite legitimately it should never have been allowed. The law is quite clear: you cannot sell land for the purpose of residential development that is subject to inundation more frequently than one in 100 years. I can show members block after block in Unley where a house has been built but where a house should technically never have been built.

When Hickinbotham wanted to build Andrew's Farm, in fact, bits were taken away, because Hickinbotham was told by the Land Management Corporation, 'We can't sell you that land, because it is subject to flooding. It would be unlawful, and we would be subject to a law suit.' Yet, a succession of governments have done that to people in Unley, Ashford, West Torrens and all over metropolitan Adelaide. The minister tried to fix it and, when there was a public outcry, withdrew because of the outcry. The problem now is not that the minister withdrew the plan but that it has been left to the very councils which failed to fix it in the beginning and which are, in fact, part of the problem. I can tell the minister, although I think she knows, that I tried to negotiate with the councils about this problem when I was the water resources minister, and I got nowhere. She has tried in her own way and equally failed. We are now right back where we were, with the councils being charged to do it, and they will not do it.

It is not a problem just for the councils. It is a problem for the people of South Australia, in Unley, in Ashford, in West Torrens, in the member for Light's electorate, and in most of our electorates. It is a problem that needs fixing and it is a problem that will be expensive. In the brief time that remains to me it is worth stating that councils do not even know where the stormwater drains run. They know where most of them come out, but there is no complete mapping of where stormwater drains in Adelaide run. Indeed, some people think that some of the drains might well run directly under people's front passage, and run in all sorts of odd shapes and sizes over the drains. Does that matter? It does matter, because—

Ms Breuer interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: The front passage; I am not to get muddled up with that! Why it matters is that if one of those drains collapses—

Members interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: I think I need an extension of time.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member's time has expired.

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg): Tonight I would like to pay a tribute to three people in particular—Kate Castine, John Darley and Nigel Smart. On 1 April this year the Premier visited the state seat of Bragg. That is to be applauded. In the three years that I have been a member it is the first time that I know of that he has actually visited the state seat of Bragg; it will probably be the last. Nevertheless, he came out to welcome and conduct the opening of The Forge, which is a brand-new performing arts centre which has been established at the Marryatville High School, in my electorate of Bragg. Marryatville High School is a fantastic school, and I would have to say that as a local member—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The members for Kavel and Unley should leave the chamber if they want to have a talk.

Mr Brindal interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for Unley has been quite unsettled tonight. He should sit down and take a couple of deep breaths.

Ms Breuer interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, member for Giles! I do not know what has got some of the members excited, but the member for Bragg has the call.

Ms CHAPMAN: The Marryatville High School is one of those exceptional public schools of which people move house to move into the district to be able to go to this school. It provides an outstanding level of education and is, not surprisingly, highly sought after by parents to have their children educated there. Until recently, Kate Castine was the

principal of that school, and she oversaw in her years as principal the planning of a \$2.4 million building, which ultimately had funding of \$1.4 million from the state government, and \$1 million raised from the Marryatville High School community from direct donation. I particularly recognise the member for Light, who was the then minister for education who approved this development; of which, notwithstanding a bit of follow up in the 2002 budget in keeping this government to the attention of the importance of this particular development, after it mysteriously slipped off the budget capital works payments along with many others that had been established under the previous state government. Nevertheless, it was restored after significant protest, and we now have today this magnificent performing arts centre.

On the day, Mark Leahy, the new principal of the school, welcomed those in attendance. I also recognise that not only was Kate Castine present—who worked tirelessly with an absolute passion for the development of this project—but also Jan Horsnell, the Chair of the Governing Council of the school who addressed the gathering, and I pay tribute to the hard work of herself and the governing council for their work over the years. I also recognise the many donors who made up the \$1 million contribution from the Marryatville High School community. On the day there was an opening performance, which was an absolutely brilliant kaleidoscope of dance and theatre of many forms, and students from all levels of the school participated not only as cast but also as musicians and crew. I thank them for that performance and it is fair to say that the entire gathering was delighted with the same.

There are too many to mention directly but I want to particularly mention someone who was very much responsible for the music—Aldis Sils—who is on the staff of the Marryatville High School. I pay tribute to him particularly today without reflection on the many other people who made a contribution, because I also see him out in the community within the Burnside and Bragg area with members of the musical teams from Marryatville, providing pleasure to the audiences on those occasions. He is frequently there, and makes a great contribution in this area of music which, of course, is a leading light in the school. Also, of course, as you would expect in such a school of high standard, even the delicious refreshments were provided by students, and the whole occasion was a tremendous event. I sincerely thank the Premier for coming out to open this magnificent performing arts centre because it will serve the community in the eastern suburbs and the school community for decades to come.

I also recognise Mr John Darley. Mr Darley has been a driving force behind the land tax reform in this state. During the lifetime of this government we saw a massive increase in the land tax take, which is a state tax that has helped to fill the very healthy coffers of the state government treasury during the lifetime of this government. Mr Darley has been, and continues to be, absolutely committed to the cause of seeking relief for the many people who pay the extraordinarily high level of land tax. But, most importantly, he has recognised the very significant group of people in the community who indirectly will be severely affected by a continued level of take of this tax. Those people include, and I think that it is important that the government remembers this, the very people who are least able to afford this sort of tax. Undoubtedly when you impose a tax on property, even though a direct payment cannot be recovered from a tenant, whether that is commercial or residential, ultimately that becomes a

base upon which the landowner will determine what the revenue income and rental will be. I think that it is a sad day when a government refuses to recognise those who cannot afford to own their own properties and are living in rental accommodation. The severe affect of this type of tax is that it reduces the pool of available accommodation and makes it less accessible and less affordable for the very people—that is, the tenanted community in the residential area particularly—on whom this tax, I think, falls at an offending level. There is also a large category of small businesses that carry that weight. Even in the face of the threat by the Treasurer that there will be consequences to Mr Darley by his taking up this cause, he has continued undeterred in his resolve on this matter, and I pay tribute to him because it is people like Mr Darley who come forward and expose the inequity and injustice of this type of activity of a state government who are both necessary and of whom, so many in the community can appreciate his efforts. Nigel Smart is the endorsed Liberal candidate for Norwood. Nigel Smart is 35 years of age, he has two children, and his wife, Sarah, is expecting a third child in June. I want to thank Mr Smart for standing up—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, the members for Giles and Colton!

Ms CHAPMAN:—and indicating his intent to offer his services to this parliament if the people of Norwood accept him ultimately on 18 March 2004. Here is someone who, after a 17 year football career, 10 years of which have been at the elite level of the sport as a representative of the Adelaide Crows, who is now a life member of the AFL and who, at the conclusion of that playing career, had a number of other options available to him, has made a decision to put his name forward for consideration of the voters ultimately to serve this community. I have no doubt about his commitment to the people of South Australia and the people of Norwood.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Colton is cautioned.

Ms CHAPMAN: I thank him for coming forward on important issues such as the Britannia roundabout. Nigel Smart is one of the people in this state who understands the principle that anything is possible and that the impossible just takes a little bit longer. I applaud him for nominating to stand for this parliament, and I will proudly sit with him in this chamber when he becomes the member.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the members for Giles and Colton. They should be careful. The member for Giles has been warned. The member for Bragg has the right to be heard without interruption.

Ms CHAPMAN: I will proudly sit with him in this chamber if the people of Norwood recognise that and understand the benefit that he can bring to this parliament.

The Hon. S.W. KEY (Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education): I move:

That the time for moving the adjournment of the house be extended beyond 10 p.m.

Motion carried.

Mrs REDMOND (Heysen): It is my pleasure to get up and have another 10 minutes to talk about things. The members of the government will be pleased to know that I am going to start out with compliments to the government on a

particular issue in my electorate, so I am sure they will all be happy to sit quietly and listen to that. In particular, I want to compliment and thank the government for supporting the introduction into Heathfield High School—which is the only local public high school in my electorate—of a commercial kitchen, which is to be used partly by the students of the school for their cookery and hospitality work, and also to provide TAFE certificates 1, 2, 3 and 4, ultimately, to qualify people as chefs.

Until now there has been nowhere in the Hills for young people to do that, so I compliment and thank the government for having the good sense to recognise that there was a need for that in the Hills and for agreeing to place it at Heathfield High School. It will be opened in a little while. I think that the feds put in some money as well, and I understand that the Hon. Alexander Downer, Foreign Minister and member for Mayo, is doing the official opening. It is a very worthwhile exercise being a commercial kitchen which, I believe, will be really well utilised. I had the pleasure of inspecting it when I attended a recent school council meeting, and it is rumoured to be even better than the kitchens at Regency TAFE. It is well worthwhile. I think it was the member for Taylor who was the relevant minister at the time when I wrote to her about it, so I am pleased to be able to say that I am starting my speech with something positive about the government. However, things may deteriorate from here on in.

There are a few other issues in the electorate about which I think the government could have done much better. I refer first to its spending money to downgrade the road that used to be the main road down from the Hills, past Eagle on the Hill. Sadly, that hotel was closed a week or so ago. It still makes no sense to me whatsoever to spend money to take away the two lane aspect of that road. That road was the main route out of the Hills. Now we have the Heysen tunnels, and they are fabulous. The traffic flows pretty well, because we have three lanes each way. However, we still had a very good dual carriageway for most of the length of that old road, basically from Devil's Elbow up to just beyond Measdays Crossing at Crafers, where the old and new roads join. Of course, the problem that the government sought to address was essentially the hoon drivers who would get onto that road, and that was perfectly true. There was a problem with hoon drivers but, in my view, the way to address that problem is to actually catch them and even confiscate their cars (some have suggested). We should be doing something about the drivers rather than spending money to downgrade the road so that, for its length, it is now one lane each way.

That creates a real problem, in my mind, because, for a start, it is our alternative route out of the Hills. In the event that we have another Ash Wednesday fire, we may well need more than the road that we have at the moment. Furthermore, there is the potential for a breakdown in the tunnels, or some event in the tunnels, that means that they is no longer useable and we actually have to go via the old alternative route. Cutting it down to one lane makes absolutely no sense to me.

Another local issue that made no sense to me was the difficulty that the government seems to have had in relocating the Aldgate Kindergarten to the site of the Aldgate Primary School. I have met with the councils of the kindergarten and the school, and they are both very happy with the idea. The school had more than sufficient room to accommodate the kindergarten on the school grounds. It could set aside a classroom within the grounds for use as a kindergarten. It recognised that there would have to be special provisions in terms of appropriate fencing and play equipment, and so on.

Yet, for some time now—for at least a couple of years, if not three or more—there has been a hold-up in terms of moving that kindergarten to the Aldgate Primary School.

For the life of me, I cannot understand why. It is quite a small kindergarten (and one of my children actually attended it), which is located at the back of the shops in Aldgate, in fact in a commercial zone. Of course, as we are all aware, the price of land has gone up quite steeply in the Hills as much as anywhere else, and that land is now probably quite valuable. It seemed to the people on the kindergarten and the school councils that there could be a win-win situation for everybody, because the kindergarten site could be vacated and sold as a commercial site in the township of Aldgate, where there is not a lot of extra room to expand; the money from the sale would surely be more than sufficient to enable the kindergarten to be relocated; and, if necessary, work could be done at the site of the primary school. For some reason, that has taken an inordinate amount of time to achieve. Another thing that the government has not done—and I come back to my favourite theme of the need for generational change—

Ms Chapman: You will need more than five minutes.

Mrs REDMOND: Yes, I know. It relates to the disability sector in the state and elsewhere. In particular, I would like to see the government doing more than it has done thus far to support groups such as one in my electorate known as the Hills Fleurieu Accommodation Action Group, which is a group of parents with disabled young adults in their family. As I have mentioned before in this house, the key issue for these people, as their children grow up and become young and middle-aged adults, is: what will happen to their child once they are no longer able to care for them? The Hills Fleurieu Accommodation Action Group is an incorporated body that was set up a few years ago to address this issue. As a group of parents, it hopes to find some land, with the help of government of any persuasion and at any level—be it state or federal—on which to establish a ‘core cluster’ accommodation model. At its heart—

Mr Goldsworthy interjecting:

Mrs REDMOND: The member for Kavel is also involved with this group, because it contains members from both his electorate and mine. The group wants to establish a village, if one can call it that, comprising maybe 20 accommodation places, but the core four places will accommodate the most highly disabled people, who really need 24-hour, live-in care to support them in living independently away from their family home. Beyond that group will be another who will be somewhat more independent than the high dependency group but who, nevertheless, still require a fair amount of support. Beyond this group will be yet another who may, indeed, be able enough to travel by bus to sheltered workshops, for example.

The benefits of living in this way are that it enables these disabled adults to have a group of peers and a community around them with whom they can socialise, which is a large part of maintaining the abilities they have managed to achieve through their training and education, and to maximise their potential while, at the same time, living with as much independence as possible. I am aware that a number of the parents of those in this group would happily put in their own money to try to help achieve this outcome. As I have said many times previously, the key issue for these parents is: what will happen to their child when they cannot look after them any more? We need to address this issue, and it seems

to me that this sort of model is worth while, and it has been tried and tested in other countries, particularly in the UK.

We have to start somewhere and, because the Hills Fleurieu group has been going for a few years now and has sorted out much of what is needed and what the model should be like, it would make an ideal candidate for whom the government could take up the running and do something positive. The government has not been negative, but neither, at this stage, has it been positive. It has said that there is no reason why this model could not be adopted, but it has not come forward and provided the sort of assistance that such a group needs to achieve an outcome. At the end of the day, that outcome will save the government money because, if these young and middle-aged adults do not go into this sort of accommodation, they will need to be institutionalised.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite): I intend to spend the next 10 minutes talking about issues in my electorate of Waite, and I will touch on economic development issues that I think will affect all my constituents in the future. I start by reminding the house of the burnt-out Mitcham Shopping Centre catastrophe last year. I now advise members that this has been successfully resolved, with the decision of the Mitcham council last week to approve what Access Economics has reported to the nation is a \$60 million redevelopment at the site. Thankfully, the Taplin group has moved swiftly to get plans into council. The process of public consultation was carried out quite effectively, and the decision has been made to let it go ahead—not only with an improved and rebuilt shopping precinct but also with a number of cinemas that I think will provide—

Ms Bedford: Cinemas!

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: Yes, cinemas—valued community assets in the south-eastern part of the city. It will service not only the Mitcham precinct but also the Blackwood and Belair region quite effectively. Nowadays, families want these sorts of mixed facilities and, certainly, many have told me that they would rather their teenage children saw a movie at Mitcham Shopping Centre than their going to Glenelg, Norwood or into the city. I intend no offence to my colleagues who are the members for those areas, but the parents said they would rather have their teenage children closer to home. I am delighted it will proceed, and I commend Mitcham council and the shop traders for all their hard work following a period of great pain and suffering. I think it augurs well for the future.

I have renewed my call for the state government to contribute towards the rebuilding and refurbishment of roads surrounding the shopping centre. Mitcham council has a main street precinct and multimillion-dollar proposal to upgrade Belair Road, which is the extension of Unley Road, and to undertake work on the junction of Princes Road and Belair Road, which surround the now burnt-out centre. I ask the government to consider this \$2.8 million contribution to that multimillion-dollar development. The council is putting in more than that, but it needs a lift. Apart from servicing the Mitcham community, and the precinct around the shops, it also carries thousands of cars every morning and afternoon to and from the city as the burgeoning precincts of Blackwood, Belair and beyond continue to grow. It needs some attention. I repeat my call for the government to chip in in that respect.

There are other issues that are vitally important to my electorate. This budget that we are discussing regrettably does not focus much attention at all on the precincts of Mitcham

or Waite. There is not much in the infrastructure plan or the budget that will help my electorate, and I lament that fact. With regard to the environment, the Brownhill Creek Recreation Park needs considerable attention from the government. It would be nice to see resources made available to clean up the creek and remove the woody weeds. I have called on the government to consider purchasing a small portion of the Garrett land, which is now in the hands of the receiver, so that we could link the Brownhill Creek precinct with the Waite precinct and, if you like, continue that hills face park effect across that region. Despite the spin that the government has attempted to put on it, I have not for one moment requested that the Garrett residence or the prime and principal portion of the Garrett land be purchased, simply the hills face portion, the most westerly portion which the whole of Adelaide can see. This is a rare opportunity. I think there is a risk of further development of that area, and it is something to which the government should give attention.

We have the ongoing issue of feral olives on the hills face which needs attention. We have the Colonel Light Gardens heritage precinct, which has preserved that suburb superbly, the Mitcham Village PAR, and a desperate need for measures to protect old homes from being pulled down so that we do not destroy the landscape. I am sure the member for Adelaide and the member for Bragg would agree with me that we need to preserve what we have because it is so precious.

Regarding law and order, as some of my colleagues have mentioned, we also have a problem in Mitcham with hoon driving. That is why I supported the hoon driving legislation. We have to stop these irresponsible people from screaming around our suburbs at all hours of the day and night. There are particular problems with this at Windy Point and McElligott's Quarry, and there are also problems generally in the back streets of Mitcham with both motorbikes and vehicles. I look forward to the first confiscations of hoon drivers' vehicles in my electorate with glee.

More police on the beat is a recurring theme. The public perception is that crime is on the upswing. The Torrens Arms Hotel was held up by an armed gang, and the Big W shopping centre was broken into just this week. There is, seemingly, an ever-increasing number of home break-ins, violent crimes and other serious offences being committed in my electorate. We need more police out there. Of course, cutting local crime prevention funds was a big mistake.

The government has created a problem in my electorate with its approach to speed zones. Before, we had 60 km/h and 40 km/h speed zones, and that presented enough problems. Now we have 50 km/h speed zones thrown into the mix. So, my constituents struggle through 60, 50 and 40 km/h zones as well as other restrictions if they are passing a school as they go to and from work or about their business. I think it would have been brave and appropriate for the government to bite the bullet on this and decide whether it wants 40 or 50 km/h speed zones, so that at least we had 60 and 50, or 60 and 40, but it did not want to take that issue to the councils, so now we have three zones. Of course, with the ever-increasing ratio of speed camera offences, which simply rip money off people, many of whom are law-abiding and well-intentioned drivers, this is simply yet another burden to bear.

I have mentioned roads. Old Belair Road needs an upgrade—that was cut short by this government when it came to office—and Belair Road, as I have mentioned, needs work. The government's plan to have the History Trust swallow Carrick Hill seems to have been shelved, but this is of

concern to Carrick Hill and the Friends of Carrick Hill, and I hope the government does not proceed with it.

My electorate is fascinating. It has some amazing people and some fantastic schools. We rely heavily on the Flinders Medical Centre, the Repat Hospital and the Women's and Children's Hospital and other hospitals close by to service our community. I am of the view that health and education and law and order are our priorities. The government keeps going around with this mantra, this absolute no-brainer. This is everybody's priority, and it is crazy for the government to claim that somehow they have some special priority on this. It is my priority, it is the Liberal Party's priority, and it will remain so in the years ahead.

Of course, the real challenge for this government is to do something, because nothing much has changed in the last three years. I mentioned earlier that we have the lowest take home wages in the nation. Certainly, we have enjoyed some economic benefits as a consequence of national economic growth, but we are not seeing the benefits here that have been seen in other states. My constituents are not feeling those benefits. In almost every category, whether it be export, wages, any one of a range of economic indicators, we are lagging behind the other states. It is propped up by the housing boom, low interest rates, and retail credit. When this national boom ends I fear that, as a consequence of having done nothing, this government will have left South Australians (certainly in my electorate) no better off than they were three years ago when it came to office. I think this has been a period of missed opportunity.

The Hon. I.P. LEWIS (Hammond): Having missed the opportunity and good fortune of being able to comment widely on the Supply Bill, there are some remarks that deserve to be made which I want to put on the record to reinforce what other honourable members have said or failed to say. The first of those things to which I draw attention, for which the government has sought to appropriate money to advance the cause, is the question of bridges, particularly the proposed bridge across the Port River, which will open. It is just crazy to expend the money on opening bridges when it would be far cheaper to fit telescopic masts to those vessels in the marina upstream from the proposed site of the bridge—indeed, to buy a whole new damn fleet of yachts or build a new marina downstream rather than build a bridge which will open, the end consequence of which will be that it will stop trains carrying grain that are two kilometres long when some yachtie wants to go through the bridge, and is entitled to do so under maritime law, taking precedence over the traffic on the road on the bridge. To do that is an enormous and immoral waste of energy—not only to open and close the bridge but, worse, to start and stop the traffic, particularly the trains, which will have to be stopped whenever a vessel wants to go through the bridge and cause it to open.

There is the problem of the trams, or any other form of public transport, for that matter. Mr Speaker, you would know that it is possible to calculate how many kilograms, if you like, of atmospheric carbon would be produced per kilometre for each passenger who has travelled on such a vehicle, whether it is a bus, a train or a tram, or any other kind of transport. When people see a tram running on electricity they say, 'It is clean; there is no exhaust gas or anything else,' but they forget the fact that the flue gases coming out of the powerhouse that generate the electricity are still exhaust gases and that there is an enormous loss of efficiency between the powerhouse and the powerline from

which the tram gets its energy to drive its electric motors. Sadly, no-one has bothered to calculate that figure. Equally, no-one has bothered to do an annualised cost, that is, work out the capital cost of the equipment, what the life of the equipment will be and what its annual cost per year would be across that life by shifting cash in time to a net present value and, having done that, add to it in the annualised cost the recurrent operating expenses of trams compared to buses compared to trains and then divide that by the number of passengers who travel, and one gets a cost per kilometre per passenger travelling on that mode of transport.

No-one has bothered to do that. They have just stuck up their hand and said, out of nostalgia—not out of logic or reason or consideration for the environment, just pure nostalgia and political expedience—‘We should have more trams, and we ought to extend the tramline.’ They have not carried out a traffic impact study. To my mind, on the back of the envelope it is very obvious that, instead of having a tramline from the city of Adelaide to Glenelg down the route presently carrying that tram, we should put in a paved carriageway of concrete in both directions—it does not need to be a channel like the O-Bahn; you would simply drive the bus without interference from any other traffic, the same as the tram traverses that distance now across the intersections with boom gates and the like—drive the bus down the concrete carriageway and, at convenient points along the way, allow the bus to exit, the same as it does at the bus interchange stations on the O-Bahn.

You not need the expense of an O-Bahn channel, and you can certainly allow a bus to travel on a well-paved concrete surface (if not concrete, then some other suitable surface) with good gradients, curves, radiuses and camber on those curves wherever the line needs to bend to make it entirely safe and far more efficient than using trams and far more flexible in the process. A greater volume of traffic can travel along that carriageway than would otherwise be possible. The millions of dollars we are to spend on it have not been sensibly assessed.

There is a big problem with respect to the Lower Murray swamps. The previous government and this government failed to look at what I was telling them was the disaster confronting us if we did not do the necessary research. The former minister for water resources and his predecessor and her predecessor and the predecessor before that over the last 20 years have failed to listen to the sound science upon which policy had to be based and do any research on it whatever. It continued to be inefficient and, suddenly, we are now confronted with the impact of deregulating another aspect of the dairy industry, that is, milk prices. Under the impact of doing that, farmers walk off. They are quite happy to sell their water, pay out the debt on their land with the proceeds, get rid of their mortgage and retire on the residual amount. The water is a far more valuable asset now, in a free market, for which I have been a staunch advocate (as those who were members of the River Murray select committee would know). It is a valuable asset. It needs to be traded, and this government and the previous government should have done more, could have done more and must do more to extend free trade in water in the Murray-Darling Basin system so that it can be transferred to those crops and in those locations and upon those soils that are best suited to use the water, where it will do least damage to the environment and where it is, therefore, more sustainable and will generate greater total revenue for the gross domestic product, the bottom line of the national accounts and, indeed, for this state’s account.

The other problem that I draw attention to is the idiocy and incompetence of the department in advising the minister about what will happen when one over-exploits underground water resources, such as is now occurring at Peake. It is not just taking water away from householders immediately adjacent to the extensive irrigation that has been permitted to occur there by draining the water to a lower level in the aquifer; it is not just doing that for 10 or 15 farmers around Peake, and the whole township of Peake, which has no other alternative water supply for its domestic and stock purposes: because of the depression in the middle where it has been pumped from, it is also drawing in the more saline water around the edges, and that is affecting 150 to 250-odd farms and homes. In one instance, a farmer only recently lost 36 prime lambs, because over a few days the water in his bore went from acceptable levels of salinity to more than double and killed the sheep.

That is going to be permanent damage, not just damage that will be there for this year. That is forever. It will be a million years before that water will again freshen up if we stop pumping now. The salt water has moved in. It does not pay you to pump salt water out, so no-one is going to pump it out to allow the fresh water to come back if the level was allowed to recover to a height sufficient near the upwelling of the fresh water to push the salt back. No, it will stay there and move at a very slow rate and clean up in that fashion.

There are things that I want to commend, and one is the excellent improvements that have been made and are continuing to be made at the Murray Bridge hospital. I am proud to have been part of that, and I commend the minister for what she has done there—equally, with the Strathalbyn aged care facilities and other aged care facilities throughout the electorate. I mention also the disability services that have been supported and expanded, and must continue to be expanded to enable those people who have, by some measure, disabled people living in their homes with them—their kith and kin—to find facilities and accommodation. Some of those people are now aged 40 and 50 years and they may be intellectually disabled, and they have parents who are in their 70s and 80s and can no longer look after them, yet they have nowhere to go. That is very sad.

The other problem to which I wish to draw attention in the course of these remarks is the wine industry. I seek your leave and that of the house, Madam Acting Speaker, to incorporate in *Hansard* tables 20 and 21 from the 2004 Australian and New Zealand Wine Industry Directory and table 22 from the same directory, which will illustrate the point I wish to make. I assure the house that they are purely statistical, Madam Acting Speaker. Do I have your leave and that of the house to do so? Thank you: I will continue.

It is evident to me that unless we have sensory appellation of those wines produced by a plethora of wineries—

The ACTING SPEAKER (Ms Thompson): Order, the member for Hammond!

The Hon. I.P. LEWIS: —we will not be able to sell them, and there will be an incredible glut of wine. The small wineries producing very small amounts of wine will not be able to sell them unless they go for regional appellation—

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order, the member for Hammond!

The Hon. I.P. LEWIS: —with independent judges determining quality.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Hammond, your time has expired. I understand you sought leave to insert a statistical table into *Hansard*?

The Hon. I.P. LEWIS: Yes, it is purely statistical, and I thought you nodded in compliance.
Leave granted.

Table 20. Number of wine producers by tonnes crushed

	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
Less than 20 tonnes	293	323	337	371	418	485	582
20 to 49 tonnes	211	235	259	296	331	381	414
50 to 99 tonnes	145	171	180	199	212	230	254
100 to 249 tonnes	142	140	157	169	189	199	211
250 to 499 tonnes	50	69	78	75	88	103	106
500 to 999 tonnes	31	36	40	49	61	57	72
1 000 to 2 499 tonnes	44	48	45	49	54	56	45
2 500 to 4 999 tonnes	19	23	29	27	36	36	40
5 000 to 9 999 tonnes	16	14	20	29	23	27	24
10 000 or more	34	38	41	42	41	43	43
Unknown or unspecified	13	7	11	12	12	8	7
Total	998	1 104	1 197	1 318	1 465	1 625	1 798

Source: The Australian & New Zealand Wine Industry Directory

Table 21. Number of wine producers by tonnes crushed, by state

	NSW/ACT	Vic.	Qld	SA	WA	Tas.	Total
Less than 20 tonnes	101	204	46	112	66	53	582
20-99 tonnes	157	195	42	143	114	21	667
100-499 tonnes	79	76	11	88	57	6	317
500-999 tonnes	17	11	0	29	14	1	72
1 000-2 499 tonnes	9	9	1	12	12	2	42
2 500-4 999 tonnes	10	12	0	14	4	0	40
5 000-9 999 tonnes	5	5	0	14	0	0	22
10 000 or more	14	9	0	19	1	0	43
Unknown	4	0	1	1	1	0	7
Total	392	521	101	432	269	83	1 798

Source: The Australian & New Zealand Wine Industry Directory

Table 22. Establishment dates of wine companies

	No. companies	Per cent total
Established 2000 or after	191	10.6
Between 1990 and 1999	799	44.4
Between 1980 and 1989	399	22.2
Between 1970 and 1979	209	11.6
Between 1950 and 1969	67	3.7
Between 1920 and 1949	29	1.6
Between 1900 and 1919	6	0.3
Between 1860 and 1899	41	2.3
Before 1860	18	1.0

Mrs PENFOLD (Flinders): This week I had the pleasure of welcoming SA Great board members to Eyre Peninsula with a letter that I want to put on the record for the benefit of others. It states:

SA Great board members. Welcome to Eyre Peninsula Great, land of opportunities!

I regret that I will be unlikely to be able to join you for your visit as parliament is sitting. However, I am taking the opportunity to update you on developments on Eyre Peninsula since I last briefed you when you visited in March 2003.

Next time you visit Eyre Peninsula, I am hopeful that you will be able to use the ferry (that is currently running between Stradbroke Island and the mainland in Queensland) which is being planned to run between Wallaroo and Lucky Bay located just north of Cowell. This trip should take you about one hour and 40 minutes and you will be able to relax in comfort instead of driving for an additional three hours to get here. This ferry will be a big boost for our tourism, our businesses and our people with the possibility of driving over for appointments in the morning and coming back in the evening.

... The wind farms mentioned in my last report are now becoming a reality, with two wind farms under construction—one at Mount Millar near Cowell and the other south of Port Lincoln at Cathedral Rocks. The planning of a third wind farm for the central west coast is continuing with the company already having spent \$1.45 million. However, it is restricted by the lack of a power line to connect it to the grid.

Eyre Peninsula is potentially one of the best wind power generation sites in the world. A second power line along the West Coast would ensure that an additional 1 000 MW... would be able to be connected to the grid. This power line could be connected to the Port Lincoln substation giving the triangulation that is needed for the city to have reliable power.

Currently Port Lincoln is serviced by a single 132 KV line from Port Augusta that is over 30 years old and the Electricity Industry Planning Council... has it on their program to replace but have been

making excuses to delay. The Australian Competition and Consumer Commission... advise that these are not valid excuses. I have been trying to get a regulated line component used on the west coast in conjunction with the wind development companies and the government to 'kill two birds with one stone' for everyone's benefit!

... The proponents of an exciting new technology using graphite blocks to store wind energy as heat have visited our region on several occasions recently to look at a number of projects. This 'stored' energy can be used to take out energy fluctuations, for example, when the wind doesn't blow, to meet expensive peak demand or for the desalination of water using off peak power at a greatly reduced price and could be a major breakthrough of world class. The technology was developed by a [New South Wales] university and the first trial plant is at Cooma.

Water restrictions and poor water quality continue throughout Eyre Peninsula and are still hampering development. A desalination trial on the Tod Reservoir was completed but the promised desalination plant has not materialised and I don't expect that it will ever will in that particular location. I am currently working on the possibility of a desalination plant for Ceduna that would

- use the existing pipe system,
- reduce the use of chlorination
- and the requirement for pumping that put the real cost of their foul water at about \$3.60 per kilolitre.

This cost requires the use of community service obligation funding, one of the few sources of funding for SA Water, as most of their profits (some \$261 million in the last financial year) go back into general revenue for the government.

Private interest in desalination is being thwarted by SA Water's reluctance to facilitate the use of the existing pipelines and their unwillingness to assist in the provision of water to small communities currently not connected to pipelines such as Port Kenny. (Water for this small community I hope will mean the saving of their school which currently has only 11 students, as water will allow more people to come and live permanently in the area.)

The Elliston Council has only about 800 full ratepayers and urgently needs development that water would bring if it is to survive. SA Water is failing to fulfil its charter to provide water for the people of this state. Instead, they are getting into the plumbing business where they have no right or responsibility to be. The shortage of water on Eyre Peninsula is limiting building, horticulture, agriculture and the expansion of the population across the region, and all this could be easily rectified with the use of desalination of the seawater that surrounds us.

Recently, this region has hosted a great variety of exciting people from all over the world interested in utilising our massive mining potential. In particular, India and China are interested in mining projects that are currently being researched and costed for development on Eyre Peninsula. These include coal, gold, copper, uranium, tungsten, graphite, haematite, world-class magnetite iron, gypsum, salt, kaolin clay, jade, granite, marble, porphyry and mineral sands. The most recent interest has been for mineral sands, graphite and iron ore. Exploration for offshore oil and gas is periodical.

However, a question of great concern for the future remains—how we are going to ship some of these minerals out of the region? Presently the magnificent deep water harbour in Port Lincoln happens to require everything to be transported through the middle of the city! But there are some future solutions! There is the possibility of using the former BHP wharf which would require connecting the railway to bypass the town. Port Neil is another option. Connecting Port Neil to the rail could end up being the most cost effective way of getting the ore to the port.

As these mines are coming closer to production, planning needs to be undertaken now to coincide with work currently being undertaken to upgrade the railway for grain transport.

The waters surrounding Eyre Peninsula are the habitat for about 80 per cent of temperate marine species. The region produces about 65 per cent of the state's fishing and seafood income. The Marine Science Centre at Kirton Point is going from strength to strength and will expand even further to become a world-class centre of excellence in research, education, training and business development.

In-sea aquaculture is booming. Tuna, kingfish, mulloway, oyster and mussel in sea farms are all producing well now. The tuna industry is a major employer, although prices fluctuate and can threaten the viability of the industry.

The onshore abalone farms are evolving as 'what works and what doesn't' is sorted out. Abalone farms across Australia are getting organised with a new marketing group and a new research group

being formed to help the industry become more organised and professional.

The wild caught crayfish, prawns, abalone, pilchards and other finfish are still the major seafood commodities produced on Eyre Peninsula. Australia's only remaining tuna cannery is in Port Lincoln and it continues to thrive particularly with the new American free-trade agreement. Staff developed the popular Tuna Tempters line marketed by John West which has been copied by other companies.

Agriculture—including huge potential for viticulture and horticulture: Eyre Peninsula produces 40 per cent of the state's grain, worth about \$350 million however with water from desalination and water recovery we could do so much more.

Four vineyards are now located near Port Lincoln. Since my last report to you we have added the Turvey Family's vineyard 'Lincoln Estate' and Anna Stehr's 'Anna's Vineyard' to Fletcher's 'Delacolline' and the well-known Ford Family's 'Boston Bay' wines.

There are also a number of olive plantations coming on stream with a commercial pressing plant available and another small one located at the Tumbly Bay school. Olive groves at Tumbly Bay, Elliston and Port Lincoln are now in production. Unfortunately, the recent fire burnt a part of some groves and has set the industry back substantially.

More than 10 per cent of South Australia's national parks are on Eyre Peninsula, which covers some of the most magnificent coastal scenery in Australia. The Coffin Bay ponies are a significant attraction for people who have never seen horses running free in the wild. Visitors can also see dolphins, sea lions, whales and colourful native birds, including the distinctive Port Lincoln parrot. At Baird Bay, visitors can do more than just watch the wildlife—they can swim with dolphins and sea lions. Eyre Peninsula's Seafood and Aquaculture Trail has been very successful and the Outback and Nature Trail has been well received by visitors and the first official feedback will soon be available.

Port Lincoln is surrounded by water and islands which provide some of the best recreational diving in Australia, reputedly more diverse than the Barrier Reef. This region has the only mainland seahorse farm in Australia and it is a significant tourist attraction for Port Lincoln.

There is a shortage of accommodation in Port Lincoln and it is often completely booked out at popular times of the year. We are hopeful, a proposal to build a multi-story hotel on the foreshore will go ahead and provide much needed four-star accommodation and function facilities.

I trust this overview of just some of Eyre Peninsula's assets and future challenges will be of interest to you as you visit this wonderful region of South Australia. I am sure that you will be amazed at just how diverse and appealing this area of the state is and hope that you can come back again soon with your families and friends. Yours sincerely...

Mrs HALL (Morialta): I want to raise tonight the issue that I have described as an ongoing farce; that is, the government's handling of the Magill Youth Training Centre and the apparent reluctance to commit the necessary funding for a new facility. This issue has been, and continues to be, one of my great concerns. It is a top priority of not just me but a number of residents in the electorate of Morialta. Members would recall, I am sure, that I have asked numerous questions of the government on this topic. I have spoken many times, not just during debate but during estimates, and it continues to prove to be a frustrating exercise, to say the least.

The past three years have seen the issue receive no priority from this government, apart from promises from relevant ministers to keep me updated in due course. There has been absolutely no progress made over three years and, despite what I describe as weasel words, I guess I could not be blamed for assuming that the matter was on the bottom of the pile as far as this government's priorities are concerned.

Certainly, I want to recognise the good work that has been done by the PSA in actively pursuing this issue, and I certainly encourage it to keep at that. There was one instance last week, however, when I almost thought for a second that the government had a conscience and would finally accept its responsibility. After three years of running into a brick wall,

imagine my surprise when I came across the words 'Magill Youth Training Centre' in the State Infrastructure Plan. I wondered whether the day had finally arrived: could the government be about to spend some of its buckets of money on a facility that desperately meets none of the modern day requirements and could it be about to rectify it?

I read on with some trepidation, because, after all, my constituents and I had been let down a few times before. But, alas, the plan as set out on pages 121 and 123 promises that 'options for the replacement of the Magill Youth Training Centre will be investigated'. Well, really? That is nothing but a new way to stay 'tough luck'—recycling the government's old line for the past three years. Constituents within my electorate and the various stakeholders involved will again see for themselves that words and rhetoric just do not translate into action and delivery of much-needed services and facilities.

Just to give an indication to the house of this saga, allow me to give a chronology of events. In addition to several unsuccessful requests for briefings on the centre's future, in question time since May 2002 I have asked the government two basic questions: first, when will the government relocate the centre; and, secondly, what is the status of the land at Cavan purchased by the former Liberal government for the purposes of a new centre? The answers from this government are as follows: on 8 March this year the Minister for Families and Communities advised that a decision is yet to be made, and that he was unaware as to the status of the land at Cavan.

On 31 May last year the Minister for Families and Communities advised that the matter is being evaluated. On 19 November 2002, the Treasurer advised that the government was working through the process of deciding whether the relocation to a new centre would be part of a PPP project. In July that same year, the Treasurer undertook to check whether money had been set aside in the budget for the relocation of the centre. In May that year the then minister for social justice advised that the government would consider the future of the Magill centre through the budget process.

Since 2002 we have looked seriously at the PPP option and then, through successive budgets in 2003-04, the government has promised nothing more than to commit funds for 'sustainment of the facility pending its replacement'. Now we have the latest on offer in the infrastructure plan, which is to 'investigate'. Three years of evaluating, assessing, reviewing and checking and the Magill Youth Training Centre still barely rates a mention in the government's so-called blueprint of the state's infrastructure. How much longer does it need to make a decision and turn it into action?

The Liberal government had its plans in place. The land had been purchased, and the council of the area was being most cooperative. The land purchased was for \$750 000; \$22 million had been set aside in the forward estimates for the relocation. Meanwhile, the government plays around and ignores the clients housed in the centre, and the staff working there continue to be subjected to a second-rate building and working conditions. Under dreadful circumstances they do a great job, and they deserve better. It is only by government allocating some patch-up money to this Magill Youth Training Centre for maintenance that it possibly stays within occupational health and safety boundaries.

I urge the government to stop dithering on this, to take some immediate action and to get on with it. We know that the Treasurer is absolutely loaded with buckets of money. He ought to use the land at Cavan and get on with the relocation. Every member of this chamber on both sides who has visited

the facility is ashamed of it. From the Magill Youth Training Centre, I move to my disappointment about the public transport system, particularly that which has been outlined in the recent infrastructure plan.

I want to expand on the points I made earlier, and to register my serious concern about the impact of this negligence on my constituents. I have regular contact with a significant group who happen to live in the Teringie area, which is a very beautiful part of the electorate of Morialta. They have been to talk to me on a number of occasions about the difficulties they are experiencing in accessing public transport. In fact, this difficulty is pretty basic. The fact is that there is no public transport at all that will drop residents even close to their homes. The route 106 bus begins and stops at the top of Magill Road, leaving Teringie residents at a rather loose end.

There is no provision of a service for the rest of the trip to Norton Summit. While this is highly inconvenient for those who work in the city, for those who have children who attend school below the foot of the hills, or for those who are of a mind not to use the car unless it is absolutely necessary, it is particularly troublesome for our older residents who just cannot drive at all. Two elderly residents (and I will not use their names) specifically came to see me. They expressed their concern that they were spending a significant amount of their pension on taxis to go about their daily activities because there were no other services.

These constituent concerns have been raised with the government time and again. I have to say that, on each occasion, negative responses have been received. It is pretty obvious that the infrastructure plan is not going to give any hope to the constituents either, because trams are pretty unsuitable for the Adelaide Hills. It is high time that this government started giving greater consideration to the needs of those who live in these areas rather than dismissing them as has been the wont of previous ministers.

Should some miracle occur and the pending transport plan contain any ideas that might improve our public transport system, I trust that the government will commit the necessary funding to implement much-needed access to the hills areas of Morialta. Teringie and the hills' residents of Montacute and Norton Summit would support such a bus service; and I have no doubt that operators, such as Torrens Transit, would make such a service work. The residents of the electorate of Morialta face a diverse range of issues of some significance, and many have been mentioned tonight, including mental health.

I would add to that the bushfire issues, and particularly the problems of native vegetation, but I know that is for another time; issues of multicultural affairs; the horrors of land tax; and, in particular, the hoon driving issues and the shocking difficulties and toll of Gorge Road. I know that, as the debates progress over the coming weeks, a number of these issues will be addressed, and I look forward to participating in the debate.

Time expired.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): I have pleasure in speaking in this grievance debate. I want to highlight issues of real concern in my electorate of Kavel. First, I want to cover some issues in relation to education requirements. I refer to a number of specific issues relating to a number of schools in my electorate, the first of which is the Mount Barker Primary School. As members would be aware, the climate in the Hills during winter is particularly wet and cold,

and schoolchildren, particularly those in primary school, need enclosed areas where they can participate in a whole range of activities and also a place where they can enjoy their play time activities in undercover areas. Over a number of years, what is referred to as multi-purpose halls have progressively been built at specific sites. Unfortunately, the Mount Barker school does not qualify under the education department's current loan criteria, and it does not have the capacity itself to raise the funds required to meet the quota (which, from memory and from correspondence I have received, is a third of the cost of the project) to come anywhere near meeting the approval requirements to build a multi-purpose hall on its site.

The school is in a real quandary. It cannot qualify for funding, because it does not qualify under the education department's loan criteria, and it does not have the capacity to raise the funds: the school would need to raise tens of thousands of dollars. The school has done an outstanding job thus far raising funds, but it is very unlikely that the school will raise the required amount of money it needs to contribute. So, where does a school such as the Mount Barker school go for assistance?

The school community put a proposal to me, which I forwarded to the education minister. I suggested that perhaps there is an alternative way around the quandary in which some schools find themselves and that a relatively small amount of funding be set aside to cater for the school's specific needs. However, the standard response that came back from the minister, which I half anticipated, was, 'No, we don't have the funds available.' It is a pity that the education minister is not here at the moment, but I ask the government: how does a school like the Mount Barker Primary School, an education facility in a town which has experienced significant population growth, meet the demands of its community without the education department having some flexibility in its funding criteria? The government has been unable to answer that question to date, and it is a growing concern for that school community that a satisfactory response has not been received.

I refer to other education requirements, such as those in relation to the Birdwood High School. Unfortunately, as a consequence of the redistribution of the electoral boundaries, the township of Birdwood is moving out of the electorate of Kavel and into the electorate of Schubert. However, over the last three years, I have had a considerable amount to do with the Birdwood High School community. A significant redevelopment is to be carried out on the school site. The feasibility study under the member for Taylor's stewardship of the education portfolio was approved, and they have worked through that progress. Plans have been drawn up, covering a number of options for the redevelopment of the site. I, along with other members of the school community (and I understand the member for Schubert has also written to the minister) have written to the Minister for Education imploring her office and her department to satisfactorily fund the redevelopment of that site out of her budget resources. I want to talk about that issue tonight as well.

That leads me onto other areas of need, and I refer to an issue I have raised previously in the house, that is, the Nairne Primary School crossing. I do not need to go into the details, because I have raised this matter at least half a dozen times on previous occasions. The issue is not going to go away, and the government cannot continue to ignore it. It is a problem that will only increase in urgency. The township of Nairne is also experiencing significant residential development. You

only have to drive down Woodside Road to see that further land is being opened up, roads are being pushed in and the infrastructure, such as roads, sewerage, water, electricity, telephone—all those necessary services for a housing development—are going in on a daily basis. You can see the roads and the land being cleared across the hills and down over into the established township of Nairne. The problems with the Nairne Primary School crossing and the junction immediately adjacent to it, the Woodside Road/Princes Highway T-junction, are only going to increase.

I wrote on a number of occasions to the two previous ministers for transport to no avail. I have two letters on file to the previous minister for transport who failed to respond. From memory, I wrote in May last year and in September last year—that is, seven months ago—and still no response. I spoke personally to the current Minister for Transport, and he has undertaken to investigate it if I send in the relevant information. I have to give credit where credit is due to some of the ministers on the government side. We have our argy bargy and our disagreements in this place, but there are three or four ministers that I think I relate to reasonably well on a one to one basis; and the Treasurer puts his hand up. I will give the Treasurer some credit. He is a very hard man in this place but in the three and a bit years that I have been here, when I have had a problem and I have gone to the Treasurer—the Deputy Premier—with the issue face to face, he has given me some decent advice on how I can go about—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: Actually he has given me some money, and I could elaborate on it but I only have one minute left. There is the Deputy Premier; the new Minister for Transport—he is another hard man in the parliament; and the Minister for Environment—I have just taken a principal from another primary school to see the Minister for Environment this afternoon on an environmental issue. As I said, I will give credit where credit is due. In this place we communicate in a particular way, but outside this place I am able to deal with a number—not all of them, but three or four—of the ministers on a reasonable one to one basis.

Time expired.

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop): I would like to take the opportunity tonight in this grievance debate to do what a lot of my colleagues have done, that is, to talk about some of the issues in my electorate; I would dearly like to do that. I would dearly like to talk about the events that happened in the house today with the member for Schubert and his intention to save young people from road trauma by introducing a bill and have it pass through the parliament. I would like to lament the government's willingness to trade the lives of, more than likely, the young people whose lives would be lost over the next six months so it can get some political kudos in the run up to the next election, and look like it is doing something about road trauma.

I would like to talk about those and a host of other matters. I have chosen to speak about something else which has occupied this parliament for the last month or two; that is, the matter which involved the previous speaker and his demise. I particularly want to talk about the role of our daily newspaper, *The Advertiser*, and some concerns that I have had about the impact and the affect that *The Advertiser* and its coverage of that particular story have had on the workings of this parliament. I have some serious concerns about the way in which this story broke, the way it was handled, and the way that the people of South Australia, particularly the

media, hopped on board and became involved in a roller coaster—and that may or may not have been by design. I do not know, and I am not going to make judgement on that or other matters which were raised during the course of events which have occurred since, probably, 2 March.

On 2 March, *The Advertiser* first broke the story on page one, and I quote:

In the first clear link between the recent deaths of two homosexual men, it has emerged that both gave evidence to Speaker, Peter Lewis, in the investigation which helped force an inquiry into the abuse of state wards.

The story goes on, and I quote:

Mr Lewis confirmed to *The Advertiser*.

Later in the story it says:

Police found the body of Mr Moore, a heavy intravenous drug user, in a bedroom in his Kilburn home last Friday, ten days after he was reported as a missing person.

Listening to the radio on that particular story, there was a question about the police being at that residence prior to finding that body. I still do not know why the body was not found on that prior occasion. That is something that is going on in the back of my mind. I do not know whether that was an accurate report or not but it was reported on Adelaide radio. That was on Wednesday 2 March. On Saturday 5 March, *The Advertiser* ran two stories. On page one, amongst other parts of the story, (and this is the relevant part to what I want to say on this matter) *The Advertiser*, talking about Mr Lewis, said, and I quote:

Mr Lewis—under siege from his parliamentary colleagues, since raising the allegation in *The Advertiser* on Wednesday.

That was on page one of *The Advertiser* on Saturday 5 March. On page 10 of *The Advertiser*, in the same issue on the same date, *The Advertiser* waxed lyrical about how this story evolved and where it came from and, amongst other things, said:

The cyclone was formed when several serious matters—namely the alleged paedophile MP investigation, current police investigations of a murder, and a suspicious death, and the Mullighan child abuse inquiry—inadvertently collided in spectacular style.

It then goes on later in the article to state:

The Advertiser became aware of the apparent links between the three matters on Monday—

—and remember that this story was on Saturday and it broke on the Wednesday—

when it was learnt the two victims in the current major crime investigations both had made allegations about the MP to Speaker Peter Lewis and his staff when they were pushing for the Mullighan inquiry to be established.

All it took was the maverick Mr Lewis—a prime mover behind the Mullighan inquiry—to confirm this to *The Advertiser* and the cyclone was moving.

Although reluctant—

and this is still quoting from *The Advertiser*—

to discuss it when first approached, Mr Lewis confirmed that both murder victim Robert Woodland, 36, and Shaine Moore, 33, found dead in suspicious circumstances, last year had told him about the alleged activities of the serving MP whom they knew only as ‘Terry’.

On Saturday 5 March, *The Advertiser* clearly said that it was aware of the story; it was aware of the connection; and it was aware of the three issues, as it said, ‘colliding’, and it received confirmation from the Speaker. Over the ensuing days the story ran rampantly in all the media outlets in Adelaide and, at various times, various people and various other side issues were brought in—

The Hon. K.O. Foley: What’s your point Mitch?

Mr WILLIAMS: Just listen to the speech.

Members interjecting:

Mr WILLIAMS: No, I am not.

The Hon. K.O. Foley: You are defending Lewis.

Mr WILLIAMS: No; I am not. I am questioning the way this place works.

The Hon. K.O. Foley: An idiot like Lewis?

Mr WILLIAMS: If you do not want to hear the story, you can leave.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. I.P. LEWIS: Sir, I object to that term used by the Deputy Premier out of his place in referring to me in the fashion in which he did. It takes one to find one, but I object, and I ask that it be withdrawn.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Yes; I heard the member for Hammond. The member for MacKillop will take his seat. I ask the Deputy Premier to withdraw.

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

Mr WILLIAMS: On Thursday 10 March, *The Advertiser* wrote the story that one of the witnesses—and the Speaker alleged that there were at least eight—was a convicted paedophile. This became the story of the day by *The Advertiser*. It struck me that, on a daily basis, our criminal justice system relies on the evidence of persons who have previously been convicted of criminal activity. If it was not for that, many of those criminals whom the Premier continues to talk about would not be in our jails. It fascinated me that *The Advertiser* would want to discredit the witness because he had a previous conviction. That just rang a bell in the back of my mind.

Whilst these stories were going on, back on 4 March—this was the first week when the story broke on Wednesday 2 March, and I have talked about *The Advertiser* admitting on Saturday 5 March that it knew the story, but it was confirmed by the Speaker—the day before it confirmed that it knew the story and only had it confirmed, *The Advertiser* editorial states:

Extraordinary allegations made by the Speaker of the House of Assembly.

Yet, on the very next day, *The Advertiser* admitted on page 10 that it got the story and went to the Speaker to confirm it. A week later, on 10 March, *The Advertiser* called for the Speaker’s head. It stated:

The State Government must act immediately. Parliament resumes today to remove Peter Lewis as Speaker of the House of Assembly.

The Hon. K.O. Foley interjecting:

Mr WILLIAMS: If the Deputy Premier had any manners, he would listen. I am not defending anyone. I am just questioning what the role of our daily paper is and has been in this issue. I find the events of Friday 1 April reprehensible and repugnant, and I think that everybody involved wishes that they had never happened.

In no way am I defending anyone: I am just raising the issue that this parliament, I believe, has been railroaded by the media. I know that some members, probably the Deputy Premier included, would be happy that this issue has probably gone away. It has not gone away; it will not go away. It has been bubbling along beneath the surface in this state for 30 odd years.

At some stage, there will be a full, open and accountable investigation, and maybe we will bury it. You can go anywhere in Australia and find that South Australia has an unenviable reputation in this area. I am not proud of it; I do not think anybody in this place is proud of it; but I am

certainly not proud of what has happened in the past six weeks in South Australia.

Time expired.

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW (Bright): Tonight I rise to talk in part about the issue of honesty and accountability in government. This current government has made much of the issue of honesty and accountability: it did so before the last election and has continued to do so on coming into government. I believe that, in talking about honesty and accountability, the government would expect that to apply to the coming election and, indeed, to its candidates. It is there that I would like to pause for just a minute and refer, by example, to a Liberal candidate, the candidate for Norwood, Mr Nigel Smart. He is well known throughout the state. He has a very high profile and is a very good candidate for the seat of Norwood. If elected, Mr Smart will certainly bring to the parliament intelligence, visibility and honesty. As an indication of that level of honesty, there has been no pretence about Nigel Smart. When he made his announcement that he intended to be a candidate, he was quite open about the fact that he did not live in the seat of Norwood. He told the people of Norwood that he was not living there or intending to live there but that he wanted to represent the people of Norwood. The people of Norwood know where their candidate stands.

I want to contrast that with some of the activities that are occurring amongst Labor Party candidates for the next election. I want to start by referring to a very interesting letter circulated in a number of electorates. It is headed:

The Premier of South Australia, the Hon. Mike Rann MP: an important message from the Premier of South Australia.

Dear Resident—

Mr Scalzi: I've seen it.

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: The member for Hartley indicates that he has seen it, as I am sure have many of my colleagues. It is a letter in which you fill in the blanks, and these letters have a number of similar sentences, most of which start off by saying:

Dear Resident

It is my pleasure to introduce you to candidate X—

with the candidate's name—

as my candidate for your area at the next state election to be held in March 2006.

The letter contains sentences such as, 'Candidate X has listened to the community concerns about increases in property values, and that's why he/she supports our \$245 million cut to land tax. Candidate X has fought for our hospitals and welcomes the tens of millions of extra dollars we have been putting into elective surgery, hospital equipment and dental care.' It continues:

Like me, candidate X has a tough attitude to crime, and he/she supports my crackdown on criminals, including murderers, outlaw motorcycle gangs and paedophiles.

This is a common theme in all these letters. It is interesting that these candidate Xs all portray themselves as locals, and one of them is the Labor candidate for Bright, who moved into rental accommodation very recently.

Mr Caica interjecting:

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: It is not appropriate for me to reveal exactly where the candidate came from, but I can say that the candidate for Bright was the failed federal candidate for Boothby at the last election. The candidate for Boothby, as the Labor candidate for Bright was then, released a brochure in the Boothby electorate that portrayed them as

a Hills local who went to Blackwood Primary School and Blackwood High School. It even contained a photograph of the Labor Party candidate in the uniforms of Blackwood Primary School and high school. It went further and stated that, as a student, they used the Belair train line into the city. Why was the candidate for Boothby running for the Labor Party? Because they wanted to represent the Hills.

In a different guise, the failed candidate for Boothby now emerges as the new Labor candidate for Bright—as a local living at Brighton—who moved into a rented home unit there only a short time ago. No sooner was the candidate there when they spun around a piece of literature saying, 'My priorities are your priorities. I'm a local, so the same things that affect your life affect mine.' That begs the question: when is a local really a local? When you issue such a brochure, I put it to you that you are portraying yourself as someone who has lived in and is familiar with the area. This candidate has not. Contrast that with Nigel Smart, the candidate for Norwood, who displays honesty, integrity, intelligence and decency. He has been open and honest about the fact that he does not yet live in Norwood but intends to move there. He is not running around pretending that he lives there. This comes back to the very essence of honesty and accountability in government, and any candidate who is prepared to masquerade in that way is being untruthful and, in my view, is not deserving of a seat in this place. I am sure that, when the local people find out about this masquerade—

Mr Caica: They won't be sucked in.

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW:—they will not be sucked in and will respond accordingly: they will show their contempt.

The Hon. K.O. Foley: Where does Angus live?

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: The Deputy Premier asks about a potential candidate for Bright. I can tell him that it is highly likely that whoever becomes a candidate for Bright will have had a very long association with the electorate. In fact, one of my colleagues in the upper house has had a 15-year association with the electorate of Bright.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: The interjection was: what has the Hon. Angus Redford got to do with the electorate of Bright? I met him when he was an elder of the Seacliff Presbyterian Church. I did not know that he was a member of the Liberal Party. He was living at Brighton at the time. This is the same Angus Redford who was the deputy chair of the Save Brighton Council campaign, at a time when the City of Marion wanted to amalgamate with the City of Brighton. This is the same gentleman who regularly attends a local church and who has been actively involved in local campaigns in the electorate for a long time, including assisting locals with legal advice undertaking campaigns to stop undesirable development from occurring in different parts of the area. The honourable member wants to know the credentials of one of my upper house colleagues: he has plenty of local credentials, as, indeed, do many others.

The Hon. K.O. Foley: Are you backing him? Are you voting for him?

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: I am a very strong supporter of the Hon. Angus Redford, and I am very happy to put that on the record whenever anyone asks me. That is the difference between Liberal and Labor candidates, and even aspiring Liberal candidates: they are prepared to put all their credentials on the record, openly and honestly, to let people in the community know where they come from, and I call on the Labor Party to be as honourable. If a candidate

is moving into an area, let the community know. That is all you have to do—let them know. A while ago, the member for Colton interjected and asked where I live. I do not now live in the electorate of Bright; I moved out before the last state election, and I made no secret of that fact. It is not a secret amongst my constituents, and I never tried to hide it. There is a very simple reason: I had an association with my electorate for more than 20 years by living there. The boundaries have changed many times. The suburb of O'Sullivan Beach has been lost and come back to the electorate. The suburbs of Sheidow Park and Trott Park have been lost to the electorate, as have North Brighton, Seaview Downs, Darlington and Seacombe Heights.

Suburbs come; suburbs go—the boundaries have changed a lot over the years. If I had lived in any of those suburbs, I would now be outside the electorate. I live 10 minutes from my electorate office. My constituents have been comfortable with that. I have been open, honest and frank with them, and it is important that they have a future member of parliament who will be equally so. I believe that the Labor Party needs to look very long and hard at the integrity of its government policy and ensure that its candidates are made aware of it and that they adhere to it. It disappoints me that this nonsense has been peddled by the Premier himself, the very person who is touting openness, honesty and accountability in government. There he is putting out letters and peddling nonsense, including trying to make it appear as though there are land tax cuts for people, but when they get their next land tax bill they will be able to demonstrate to the government that they have not received any cuts.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): The Productivity Commission has highlighted in recent days the significant problems that will confront us over the next 40 years as our population ages and as the number of aged people within the Australian population increases from a proportion of about 12.5 per cent to about 26 or 27 per cent. In other words, over the next 40 years the number of Australians aged over 65 will more than double. The proportion of Australians aged under 65 will actually drop, and in particular the proportion of Australians who are wage earners will also significantly drop. This poses significant problems, particularly in the area of health care. The average health care cost for someone of 65 years of age is four times greater than the average health care cost of someone around the age of 40. The average health care cost of someone about 75 years of age is about six times greater than that of someone about 40 years of age.

So, as we grow older, particularly from the age of about 60 on, our health care costs grow exponentially. There is a serious imbalance as we go through life between what we earn and the actual cost of our health care on an annual basis. That is one of the problems confronting Australia as the number of people aged over 65 more than doubles. There will be not only a greater proportion over 65 years of age but also those people will live longer. For instance, in the last 50 years, our life expectancy has increased by about 20 years, and in the last 30 years our life expectancy has increased quite dramatically compared to even the 1970s. The impact of this is that people will live longer and they will live more active lives, but they will expect medical procedures and health care at the higher cost level for a much longer period.

The forecast is that the impact of this on the cost of health care will increase significantly indeed. In Australia, about 9.5 per cent of our gross national product goes to health care.

That has increased by about 1.5 or 2 per cent in the last seven or eight years, but the forecast is that that is likely to increase to about 14.5 per cent of gross national product, which is the current figure in the United States of America. All the developed countries around the world with their ageing populations are finding that the proportion of the total national economic cake that goes to health care is increasing at quite a dramatic rate.

To tackle this problem we will either see a significant increase in the tax burden imposed on the smaller proportion of taxpayers within our community as we approach that period over the next 40 years or we can look at other solutions. I propose that one of the solutions that Australia should be looking at is a voluntary health superannuation scheme. Under this scheme—and I stress it would be voluntary—participants would contribute to a health superannuation scheme whilst they are working and can afford to do so. If they cannot afford to do so because they have very high costs or are on a low income, then clearly, as it is a voluntary scheme, they will not be required to contribute. Those who do contribute should receive a tax concession for their contribution to superannuation and, at the same time, the health superannuation scheme would be taxed similarly to other superannuation schemes at a rate of about 15 per cent only. There would therefore be a much lower level of federal government corporate taxation in relation to that superannuation scheme.

In this way, a significant amount of money could be saved during the period when the person was working and where they had income that allowed them to put something aside for future health care costs. Once they retire, the benefits in that superannuation scheme could go to one of two purposes. It could go towards paying the private health insurance premiums of that person or their family or it could go towards paying the direct medical costs of that person or family, their partner or spouse. In this way we would find that a higher proportion of people would be able to afford to stay in private health insurance after retirement.

One of the major problems with private health insurance at present is that people take it out whilst they are earning. Many people have said to me, 'I have had private health insurance for my entire working life. However, I have now retired and I can no longer afford private health insurance.' That is the very moment at which the health costs for that person are likely to increase very dramatically, indeed. So, the superannuation scheme benefits could go to either or both those purposes. If the person should decease at any stage, the value of the funds within the superannuation scheme would then go to the deceased estate and, therefore, would be retained by the person's beneficiaries under that proposal.

I believe that this is the only way, through a savings scheme for health care after people retire, in which we will be able to maintain and continue the very high standards of health care that we have enjoyed in Australia for many years. In fact, it can be argued that Australia probably has one of the highest standards of health care anywhere in the world. My concern is that, unless this is done, the pressure that will build up, particularly for public hospital services, will continue to escalate to the point where it is no longer sustainable into the future in terms of maintaining the standards and the high quality of health care that we have enjoyed in the past.

I believe that the scheme will become a very beneficial way for Australians to increase their saving effort, which is somewhat alarming, because Australians are not good at saving for the future. When we are put on an international

scale, the saving effort of Australians falls well below those of many other countries. In this way we not only save, but we save for the purposes of maintaining the high standards of health care that we have enjoyed within Australia, and ensure that we overcome the imbalance between health costs and the income of the person during their life.

It can be argued, quite rightly, that by encouraging more people to save for their future health costs when they retire through a superannuation scheme or by continuing with their private health insurance it will have the effect of taking the pressure off the public hospital system. Therefore, those who cannot afford to contribute to a voluntary health superannuation scheme will receive the benefit, because the existing growing pressure on the public health system, particularly through public hospitals, will start to abate and diminish and that way they will receive the services, such as elective surgery, when they need them.

I believe that the scheme has a great deal of merit. Indeed, I have discussed it with a considerable number of health professionals, including people involved in superannuation and private health insurance, and they have applauded the scheme. I noticed this morning that the federal President of the AMA, Dr Glasson, has supported the scheme very strongly indeed. I hope that the federal government will seriously look at this proposal to see how it may be of long-term benefit to all Australians.

Time expired.

Mr SCALZI (Hartley): I would like to spend the time available to me in this grievance in a little bit of reflection. Members would be aware that, in February 2002, the member for Hammond gave his support to the Rann Labor Party to form government, and we know about the compact. We knew that, without 50 per cent of the two-party preferred vote, we as Liberals could not govern in our own right, and the Labor Party could not govern in its own right: it had to get the support of the Independents on the floor of the house. The key seat at the time was that of the member for Hammond, who gave his support to the Labor Party. I do not wish to reflect on the former speaker—or, indeed, the present Speaker—or any other member who has given their support to the government and has not given their support to the opposition. Indeed, if we reflect on it, in the 1997 election, the Olsen Liberal government was also a minority government. So, we have had two minority governments, but it is important to note the difference.

After the 2002 election, when members on this side of the house talked about the two-party preferred vote and the fact that the Labor Party did not receive 50 per cent, we were told, 'Take a reality check. You are not in government. The Labor Party is in government. Accept the reality.' With the announcement of the Drugs Summit and the business council, some people believed that things were going well. However, we know now that things have not gone well. It saddens me that, when things have not gone well and relationships have been strained, all of a sudden it is all the fault of the member for Hammond. Again, we saw it about 15 or 20 minutes ago when the Deputy Premier was asked to withdraw after, unfortunately, calling the member for Hammond an idiot.

Mrs Geraghty: Come on, Joe, get back on track.

Mr SCALZI: I am on track. The member for Torrens—an honourable person and a member I respect—I know, has had nothing to do with these unfortunate circumstances in which we find ourselves. When we think about it, the Olsen Liberal government was a minority government. It needed the

support of the member for Mount Gambier, who used to be the member for Gordon. He got in on Labor Party preferences by a narrow margin in 1997. The member for MacKillop was also an Independent member who later saw the light and rejoined the Liberal Party. Of course, we have the member for Chaffey, the National Party member who remains a National Party member and independent. Under the Liberal Olsen government, a minority government, we took some tough decisions, but the Independents were not speakers or ministers. But they did support the Olsen Liberal government and we could not have governed without their support.

Since 2002 we have still had Independent members. The member for Chaffey, a National Party member, is now a minister. The member for Mount Gambier is a minister. The member for Hammond, who gave his support on the floor of the house, made a decision, took on the Rann government on the understanding it would be bring stability, but they agreed to a Constitutional Convention and a compact, and we were going to have stable government; they were going to deliver a stable government.

Mrs Geraghty interjecting:

Mr SCALZI: Well, the member for Torrens interjects and it reminds me that we are going to Mount Gambier. The lake in Mount Gambier will never more blue than when the House of Assembly meets there. One asks why?

The Hon. S.W. Key: Why?

Mr SCALZI: Because the government has had a blue with the member for Hammond and a blue with the rest of the compact.

Mrs Geraghty interjecting:

Mr SCALZI: Oh, it is corny! I think the sad thing is that this parliament has been discredited, and it is not just the fault of the member for Hammond. It is because it was doomed from the start. As I said, I do not want to reflect on any member, but people talk about an independent speaker, as in the case in the House of Commons, but we must remember that in the House of Commons there are almost 500 members so you can have an independent speaker. He or she can resign from the party and does not have an opponent at the next election. But when you have only 47 members in a chamber, I believe that the offices of speaker and deputy speaker should never be used to form government. A member should be able to support whatever party they believe should form government in the best interests of the state, but the position of speaker should not be the negotiating factor and the position of Deputy Speaker should not be the negotiating factor, whether it be with a Liberal government or a Labor government. Because when you negotiate with the office of speaker, it is doomed from the start and, when things go wrong, this is the result.

I am really pleased that we did not pass the privileges bill that would have taken away privileges because things went wrong. At least the government listened to what the commentators were saying: they listened to the opinions of the Democrats, Family First and wiser counsel that you cannot throw away four hundred years of tradition and the ability of members of this place to act in the best interests of the public because the Labor government no longer needed the member for Hammond. They knew that things were going to go wrong. We saw the tension between the speaker and the Deputy Premier: it was evident long ago. And what did they do when they no longer needed him? They started courting the member for Chaffey. They first courted the member for Mount Gambier and then the member for Chaffey.

This is a government that has been based on less than 50 per cent of the votes, and deals, and compromised the office of speaker. Then, when they no longer needed him, they discarded him. As I said, I do not want to reflect on any individual member, but we must remember that this place is bigger than all of us. The parliament is an institution that has taken a long time to get to the point that it is at today. Sadly, in the last two years, we have seen what has happened.

What has happened to the Constitutional Convention which the government agreed to? I might not agree with all the proposals of the member for Hammond, but he made those proposals in good faith.

Time expired.

Mr MEIER (Goyder): On Monday of this week at the beginning of the session it seems the Premier at long last realised he had made a mistake in shifting the Adelaide Cup long weekend to March. He virtually admitted as much in his events statement when he indicated there were too many events now in March. In fact, he indicated that it would be unconscionable for him as arts minister not to seek to have the Clipsal 500 a little bit later and to ensure that there were not too many clashes.

Well, hello, hello? I have tried to tell the Premier that on several occasions and I have certainly said it through my local media. I can tell members that people in my area were extremely upset from the word 'go' when the Premier announced that the May long weekend would disappear and go to March. Why were they upset? Because we hold the largest Cornish festival in the world, we believe (certainly in Australia), on the May long weekend.

It is now coming into its 17th festival, and that is over a period of 32 years. It is held every second year. It brings an enormous number of people into South Australia. Certainly, it brings even a greater number of people into regional South Australia. It will be very difficult for that festival to continue in the same format—in fact, it will be impossible for it to continue in the same format. We have been considering for sometime now how to arrange it and still keep it in May. We have considered other options. Obviously, March was one, but we discounted that immediately because everything else is on in March.

It would be silly to try to attract people from the city to the country area. We have considered October but, again, we feel that that month would be too warm, because one of the characteristics of the cornish festival are the pasties. It is an ideal time in May. I noticed yesterday that the Minister for Tourism (Hon. Jane Lomax-Smith) said that some of the regional events should look at the June long weekend. We have had enough problems from time to time with inclement weather in May. Most times we have been lucky. It has been either very good or reasonable weather. At the end of the last festival (almost two years ago) by Monday mid-afternoon the storm came in and, certainly, the tents started to go in the wrong directions. It was rather catastrophic.

Thankfully, most of the festival was almost over. We are always taking that risk in May. In June we are taking a greater risk. It is that much colder, and there is more chance of rain. We do not want to go to June. It was interesting that the member for Morialta highlighted yesterday the many regional events that will be affected by a shift from the May long weekend, namely, the Mount Barker Jazz and Heritage Festival, Kerneweck Lowender, the Southern Flinders Live Music Festival, the Penola/Coonawarra Festival, the Melrose Fat Tyre Festival, the Clare Gourmet weekend, the Wild Boar

weekend at Stone Hut and the Riverland Balloon Fiesta and Country Fair.

The best thing the Premier could have done was to say, 'I've got it wrong', and shift the long weekend in March back to May. That would have been the honourable thing to do. It would not surprise me if the Premier still did it. In fact, I have heard that the Minister for Tourism is furious about it. She almost indicated that yesterday in her answer when she referred to the fact that the Kerneweck Lowender occurs only every two years. She said, 'Well, there are two years during which to reassess the dates of that event.'

She is almost saying that, maybe, something can be done. I would hope that, if there is a change of government, we can shift the long weekend back to May. Another alternative, I suppose, is to bring the Queen's Birthday holiday from June to May when it has been a particularly good time to hold so many regional events. The trouble is that most states have the Queen's Birthday holiday on that June long weekend. I think that definitely one—

Ms Breuer: Let us get a republic and forget the Queen's Birthday. We could celebrate an Australia President's birthday.

Mr MEIER: I will not sidetrack into the debate on a republic versus the monarchy, but I suppose that, down the track, that is another option if we should become a republic; perhaps May would be the ideal opportunity. Whatever the case, I am calling on the Premier to follow Premier Beattie's example. I give credence to Premier Beattie who, on many occasions, has admitted that he has got something wrong and he has had to change what he has done. Why not eat humble pie and admit that the long weekend should remain in May. It is a complete shemozzle now to have all these activities, events and festivities in Adelaide in February, March and April. Bang, it is full on and then there is virtually nothing for the rest of the year.

I do not know how the accommodation industry will survive in terms of keeping full-time employees, because the people will be told, 'Look, we want you for two, probably three months but, after that, I am sorry, you will not have a job until next year, in nine months, and we will hire you again.' Obviously, they will not do that. There is that problem to overcome. The Premier should have thought of that. He should not have done it at the stroke of a pen. In fact, I made the point when I asked a question—I think at the end of last year, it may have been the beginning of this year—as to when the Premier would sign off. He said, 'We are looking at that, and where the legislation would come in.' In fact, it had been signed off by him a week or two previously. He did not even know that he had signed off for the long weekend to move from May to March. In fact, again, it was a broken promise from the point of view that he had said the parliament would have the opportunity to change the long weekend. The parliament did not get the opportunity. It was the stroke of a pen and we read about it in the *Government Gazette*. Once again, I call on the Premier to reverse the decision to change the long weekend from May to March.

Motion carried.

Bill taken through its remaining stages.

MOTOR VEHICLES (LICENCES AND LEARNER'S PERMITS) AMENDMENT BILL

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill without any amendment.

**PRIMARY PRODUCE (FOOD SAFETY SCHEMES)
(MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL**

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill without any amendment.

ADJOURNMENT

At 11.37 p.m. the house adjourned until Thursday 14 April at 10.30 a.m.