HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 22 July 2010

The SPEAKER (Hon. L.R. Breuer) took the chair at 10:30 and read prayers.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (AUDITOR-GENERAL) AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher) (10:32): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Local Government Act 1999. Read a first time.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher) (10:32): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

Some members would recall that I have tried to bring about this legislative change previously, although the newer members would not. I think it is a very important part of what should be the government's approach, given that it has said it does not want an ICAC and it does not want ICAC house. It would be a very important element in an alternative arrangement. It allows the Auditor-General—who, currently, as we know, has oversight of the financial matters of government agencies—to have oversight of the financial affairs of councils.

It does not mean that the Auditor-General would directly audit the books of councils—that could still be done by private contractors: there is no reason why that could not be done by local audit companies or professional groups and, in fact, I think that would be a very sensible thing to do. What it would do is enable people to compare the financial performance of councils, which is very difficult at the moment; but, importantly, it would pick up early any sign or indication of inappropriate behaviour because this measure would apply to council businesses as well as the council activities themselves.

The Economic and Finance Committee has looked at this issue and I believe it has been supportive of a measure similar to this. I will quote from the Auditor-General's Report of 30 June 2006. He said:

> There is a need for the responsible minister and/or parliament to have, on an annual basis, a positive, comprehensive, independent audit assurance concerning not only matters relating to the financial statements but also the adequacy of the controls and general governance issues associated with local government administrative arrangements, i.e. propriety and lawfulness considerations.

He goes on to state:

> There are, in my opinion, sound reasons to suggest that this assurance should be comparable to that applicable to state government departments.

Further, he states:

> In short, the audit of local government should include, in my opinion, a provision similar to section 36(1)(a)(iii) of the Public Finance and Audit Act 1987.

Finally, he says:

> In my opinion, the auditor of local government should be provided with adequate powers to require accurate and timely information to be provided.

That was contained in the Auditor-General's Report for the year ended 30 June 2006.

In talking with the auditor-general who was in that position until recently, he said to me that he could not investigate local government, and that is reinforced in those comments. I am not suggesting local government is inherently bad, corrupt or evil—I am not suggesting that at all. Most of what happens in local government is excellent and done in the way it should be, and I say that as a former member of Mitcham council many years ago.

However, many councils run businesses, and I do know that in years gone by some of them have not done the right thing. I know, for example, that the Centennial Park Cemetery Trust (which is now run very efficiently and effectively by Bryan Elliott) many years ago (and it was hidden) did things that were quite inappropriate—for example, giving imported European cars to people and living a fairly extravagant lifestyle, with crayfish suppers being brought up on the catafalque. There were all sorts of things such as people tripping around the world looking at how you bury people in ice and snow which, as far as I know, rarely occurs here. That behaviour was never uncovered. It took about 10 years to get hold of the private audit report, but the Auditor-General could not look at that affair.

When I was on the Mitcham council, the outgoing town clerk was given a Holden Berlina as a going away present, and that was suppressed under staff matters. That is not the totality of what has gone on, but they are just minor examples, in a way, of what can go on if you do not have a proper oversight by someone such as the Auditor-General. When we talk about corruption that can occur, I do not believe South Australia is prone to it, but it is more likely to occur where you have developers dealing with council staff; it is probably more likely to happen there than anywhere else.

I think this is a reasonable, sensible, sound measure. I do not believe it will cost councils any more because they are already paying for a private audit. The Auditor-General could commission those people to do the same sort of work on a standardised reporting format. Even though the audit is meant to conform to the Australian auditing standard—and I am sure it does—I challenge anyone here to look at the various statements and financial reports of councils and compare one with the other, let alone try to ascertain whether there is anything happening that should not be happening.

I commend this bill to the house. I think it is fairly obvious upon reading it what it is seeking to do. It is a reasonable, legitimate measure and I ask members to support it.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mrs Geraghty.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (ENTITLEMENTS OF MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT) BILL

The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher) (10:39): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Parliamentary Remuneration Act 1990; the Parliamentary Superannuation Act 1974; and the Remuneration Act 1990. Read a first time.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher) (10:39): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

What this bill does, in essence, is put members' pay, allowances, superannuation and other entitlements in the hands of an independent tribunal. I believe this should have happened a long time ago. As members would know, we have a funny arrangement where our pay is linked to federal MPs who are then linked to a band of public servants. What we also have is a mixture of superannuation entitlements for members of parliament.

Mr Pengilly: You've got a good one, Bob; you're in the best.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: I am in the good one. And I argue that the current arrangements are unfair because some members get a lot better deal than others for doing the same work. I would think it is a common standard principle that you get the same remuneration for doing the same work. Members who have been elected in recent times suffer from the political grandstanding of Mark Latham who, ironically, went out on his generous super, but the newer members in here have been short changed.

Rather than we in here getting involved in determining allowances and pay, and so on, I think it is appropriate that it be done by the independent tribunal. We have one so we do not have to create one. The remuneration tribunal already exists. I think it is appropriate that that body look at all these allowances, superannuation and pay to determine what is appropriate. Members would be aware that in the media today there is a report about a proposed pay rise for federal MPs that would then flow onto us.

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: Excuse me, member for Fisher, can I interrupt for one second? I inadvertently omitted to mention that in the gallery we have a group from CBC Year 9 and I think they are just about to leave. I hope you enjoyed your time here with us and I'm sorry I did not mention you before. I'm sorry, member for Fisher. I know that is completely out of order but I did not want them to go without being acknowledged.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (ENTITLEMENTS OF MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT) BILL

Second reading debate resumed.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher) (10:42): Thank you, Madam Speaker. I agree with you. I was the Speaker who introduced the policy of acknowledging schools—and I think it is a very important one. What we need is fairness and transparency. We do not want to go back to a situation where MPs determine their own pay and other benefits. As happened recently with local government councillors and mayors, we should put this in the hands of an independent body—the

same body that looks at the pay of judges; I do not anticipate we will get the same pay as judges—with access to the research capability to look at what MPs should be paid, what they should get for superannuation, look at their other benefits and remove some anomalies currently affecting serving members of parliament.

The proposed pay rise for federal MPs—hence for us—has been sidelined for a while—because of the election, I gather. My understanding of the proposal is that there has been a change so that, in order to increase the pay of MPs, some of the other benefits will be reduced or removed. That is a sensible approach. I am in the generous superannuation scheme where, ironically, I would get more money if I retired than I do by staying here. Some people ask, 'Well, why are you here?' Well, I am here because I love doing what I do.

There needs to be some changes but, historically, MPs got a higher super to make up for the fact that their pay was not always necessarily at the right level. That is a nonsense. Putting all these financial matters in the hands of an independent tribunal is the way to go. It would be make it clear and transparent. I do not believe the public would have a problem with that. They have a problem with MPs helping themselves directly to taxpayers' money. I commend the bill to the house. It is a fair, sensible measure, and I ask members to support it.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mrs Geraghty.

NEIGHBOURHOOD DISPUTE RESOLUTION BILL

The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher) (10:45): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to provide an alternative dispute resolution mechanism for residential neighbours. Read a first time.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher) (10:45): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

This is a measure I have canvassed before. I would be surprised if there is any member in here who has not had an issue where neighbours have been involved clashing with other neighbours, not necessarily their own but within their electorate. It is one of the most difficult issues to deal with. What I am proposing is that we have a person who can get involved in these issues and help resolve them; and, if they cannot resolve them, refer them to the appropriate authority.

We do have mediation (sadly, not meditation), but the problem is that you cannot compel people to be involved in mediation. Often I have found that people will not participate—one party may, the other will not. I have had some unusual neighbour disputes—some of it so petty that it is something you would expect at a kindergarten—between professional people accusing each other of looking into backyards, shifting wheelie bins, and things like that.

I had a case once where people were complaining that their neighbour had a bright light shining into their house and that they could not eat any meal without pulling down the blind. I thought that I would go down and try to sort this one out. It got very nasty between the neighbours—tyres were let down and all sorts of things. I went down to the house that had the big spotlight, and I said, 'Look, do you realise that someone coming around the corner could get blinded by that light, and they could have an accident and you might be sued?' They replied, 'Oh, we'd better change it.'

They would not change it for the neighbour, but they did on my highly professional legal information, which was really a bluff. Often these disputes drag on and on and we need a mechanism. Sometimes, as I suggest, it can be trees, it can be animal issues, car parking, noise, alleged voyeurism, car access, and so on. I do not believe that politicians should be spending time trying to sort out these issues: you need a person who can intervene.

New South Wales has a very effective commissioner dealing with tree issues. The commissioner there goes out and checks on the issue, makes a ruling and says, 'Look, that tree is intruding into your neighbour. Cut it off, cut it down, whatever,' and it works brilliantly. I have met the commissioner over there, Judy Fakes, and it works brilliantly. What I am proposing here is simply not about tree issues on boundaries. As I said, it could be involving animals, noise, and so on. I think that the bill is fairly self-explanatory and I ask members to support it.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mrs Geraghty.

GRAFFITI CONTROL (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher) (10:48): Obtained leave to introduce a bill to amend the Graffiti Control Act 2001; and to make a related amendment to the Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher) (10:48): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

Members would know that this has been an issue I have been interested in and involved in for a long time—not doing the graffiti but trying to deal with it. Graffiti is still a significant issue in our community, costing millions of dollars in the metropolitan area. I have tried over the years several times to bring about some change in the way the law is administered; In fact, it stretches back almost 10 years where I have tried to introduce various bills.

The LGA supports the objects of the bill. The bill has been based on input from the Police Association in New South Wales, which provided considerable input, as have other groups and agencies. In essence, the bill seeks to prohibit the onselling or gifting of spray cans to minors (which, I believe, is a deficiency in the current law), it makes it compulsory for offenders to pay compensation and it requires offenders to participate in graffiti removal programs.

The government has got some programs, but I am basically beefing that up to require offenders to participate. Also, through this bill, I am seeking a register of offenders and purchasers of graffiti-type materials to provide ID and to allow for expiation fines for carrying graffiti implements without reasonable excuse in a prescribed area between 10pm and 6am, which would be areas such as schools and which gives another avenue for police to enforce this. It also allows for courts to disqualify offenders from holding or obtaining a driver's licence for a period of one to six months if the court deemed that appropriate. It gives greater power to the police to search suspects and their vehicles if they are in a prescribed area at a prescribed time, for example, in or around schools between 10pm and 6am, on railway tracks or transport corridors, areas like that.

I am particularly keen for this parliament to get serious about graffiti. Some people say it is not as bad as robbing a bank. That is a silly argument; you can apply that to a whole lot of behaviours. There is no justification for ignoring the vandalism that occurs through graffiti. I think generally our parliament and governments have been too lenient in terms of dealing with vandals, whether they be graffiti vandals or other vandals, and I think it is time we took tougher action against those who offend. Previously, governments have said that I am too tough, it is too difficult, or whatever. If the government wants to amend this, I welcome that. If it has an alternative proposal, I would like to see that, but we cannot keep turning a blind eye, because graffiti vandalism is just as costly as someone stealing something.

If it is harmless, then I suggest that those who do it, do it on their own property, if it is such a good thing. I do not have a problem with aerosol art if it is done in a legal place and it is done with permission, but I do have a problem with the ongoing vandalism which is costing my local council and therefore the ratepayers of the City of Onkaparinga over half a million dollars a year just in that one council area. What does that money achieve? All it does is return the buildings back to the status quo. It does not provide any new facilities or anything for young people or anyone else in the area. I think this is a reasonable bill. If anyone in here has a better proposal, or can amend it, or has any ideas about amending it, then I would urge them to do so. I commend this bill to the house.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mrs Geraghty.

ELECTORAL (CONTENTS OF WRIT) AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher) (10:55): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Electoral Act 1985. Read a first time.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher) (10:55): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

This is a very simple measure. The intention of the bill is to bring forward the closing date for the nomination of candidates to one week after the writ is issued by the Governor. Members would recall that, in the March election of this year, many people missed out on being able to cast a vote and it was not the fault of the Electoral Commission, which, under Kay Mousley, did a fantastic job. I believe that the current time allowed for registering as a candidate (14 days) is unnecessarily long. If you do not know as a potential candidate that there is an election coming up under our fixed

term arrangement, then you would probably have to question whether that person was suitable to be a candidate, anyway.

Under the current arrangement, in effect, you are allowed only nine business days for ballot papers to be printed and sent out. We are seeing an increase in the number of people using the postal vote system—and probably not for the reasons originally intended, but I do not have a problem if that is convenient to people. The main thing is that they exercise their democratic right.

This amendment to the Electoral Act brings forward the date on which candidates need to register by seven days. As I say, if you do not know when the election is and you are a last minute candidate, then I think you have a problem, anyway. This measure is fairly straightforward. I think it is a logical, commonsense approach and would help ensure that the Electoral Commission could do its job and would also reduce the likelihood that citizens would miss out on their democratic right to vote because of technical reasons related to the challenge in getting out postal votes, etc., to them within the limited time frame. I commend this bill to the house.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mrs Geraghty.

FACIAL IDENTIFICATION BILL

The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher) (10:58): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to provide for facial identification in certain circumstances. Read a first time.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher) (10:58): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

This is a very simple measure and I thank parliamentary counsel for their expertise and prompt drafting on this matter. This bill does not mention the burqa which some people seem to be obsessed with. This bill allows the owner or occupier of prescribed listed premises (which I will indicate in a minute) to display a sign indicating that a person must not enter the premises with his or her face obscured and the obscuring of the face could result in the person being refused entry, being refused service or being removed from the premises using reasonable force. The definition of 'obscured face' is 'if it is covered to such an extent that insufficient facial features are visible to enable the person to be identified'.

As to the premises which are prescribed or designated, the first one is an authorised deposit institution (ADI), which is a bank or similar. The second one is a state or federal government agency, and the third one is any other business or activity where, for reasons of security or for the purposes of compliance with any act or law, it is necessary or desirable to establish the identity of persons in the premises so used.

Mr Pengilly: What about hoodies?

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: The member for Finniss asks about hoodies, and this covers anyone. Last week, I saw a photograph of someone in and around the courts in Melbourne. A guy was wearing a hoodie and you could not tell.

Mr Pengilly interjecting:

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: I think it was a bloke, but it was hard to tell. This applies to anyone obscuring their face and includes a helmet or any other facial covering. I do not know whether members read *The Independent Weekly*, where there was a letter from one of our most esteemed former professors, Peter Schwerdtfeger. In his letter last weekend, he indicated that, when he was professor of meteorology at Flinders University, he had students doing exams and he did not know who they were. That is bizarre, and the reason the university does not do anything about it is that for political correctness it does not want to upset potential student numbers and therefore its finances.

I was contacted by people who have close links with the Registrar of Motor Vehicles area, and they told me that people were coming in, getting a licence issued or renewed or a photograph or whatever, without necessarily uncovering their face. As a result of, I guess, of this issue being raised, the Registrar of Motor Vehicles issued a directive on, I think, Tuesday of last week that any person seeking a licence, ID or photograph has to uncover their face. I would have thought that was happening anyway. If it was not, why did the Registrar of Motor Vehicles have to issue a directive?

I have spoken to people in banks and I have spoken to tellers and people who belong to the finance union, who have expressed great concern. It does not matter what the facial covering

is; they are terrified if someone steps into that bank with their face covered. They do not know who it is. I know that the minister has said that they could ask them to uncover their face at the counter or when they want to do a transaction, but you have the person in the premises with their face covered prior to that.

You have people, as I said, doing exams and you do not know who they are. You will have a situation that is sure to arise in regard to people appearing in a court setting. One of the reasons for getting in early on this, before the problem amplifies, is to set clear ground rules, and I cannot imagine a magistrate or judge being happy dealing with a defendant or a witness who cannot be identified.

The feedback I have had from sections of the Muslim community is that they do not have a problem with what I am seeking to do. Banks, if they want to be considerate—and they should be—of a woman who is not comfortable showing her face to a male—and there are a lot of people who come from a particular background in that category—then a bank could and, in my view, should make provision for that.

I noticed that in France the parliament has voted to ban the burqa. I do not support that. I do not believe that what clothing people wear down the street, at the park or at the beach should be controlled. I do not care if people get around naked. It does not worry me; it is not going to upset me. I do not care what they wear. People do not like what I wear. I know some people think I am an overgrown Wiggle, but that is not the issue.

If we do not deal with this facial aspect sensibly and in a reasonable way, what we will have is a move in the community for a more drastic approach, which has been advocated by Senator Bernardi and Fred Nile, member of parliament in New South Wales. I do not support that restriction. I think that is unnecessary, because it is not related to the key points I am making, which are based on security considerations and identity where those issues are critical. If you are walking down the street and you have your face covered, I do not see that as a problem in itself.

It does not matter what the covering is on your face; some people have tattoos, some people have other things. Contrary to the writer in *The Independent Weekly* a fortnight ago, my measure does not relate to what is covering a person's hair. We know that the Sikhs—a great cultural and religious group for whom I have a lot of respect—wear a turban. Exclusive Brethren wear a head covering. I do not have a problem with that whatsoever. This is purely about the recognition of facial features, and I think it is a reasonable measure.

I noticed that the Spanish parliament had a vote on the burqa and, although the ban on the burqa was opposed by the Socialist party, what they are looking at is a measure very similar to what I am proposing here, which I think is a reasonable, sensible measure. I do not care whether it is a hoodie, whether it is a balaclava, whether it is a bike helmet or part of a burqa; it does not make any difference to me. The key issue is: can you identify that person, and do they meet the security requirements where that is an issue? I think if we can adopt a sensible, pragmatic approach, then we will avoid going down what I think is the extreme path of those who want to ban the burqa.

In introducing this, I am well aware that our community has some people who I would regard as bigots and xenophobes. I am not in that category. I do not care what racial, religious or cultural background someone comes from, but I am concerned about the potential over time for problems to emerge if we do not have sensible ground rules implemented soon for the visual aspect of the face to be identified.

I am sure that no-one would argue that Professor Peter Schwerdtfeger is a racist or a xenophobe. I am not and neither is he. What we are concerned about is having sensible measures in place to deal with a situation which the Muslim community, I believe, can see the sense in, because it does not interfere with people wearing, for example, a burka to a mosque or anywhere else in the public arena

I think the final point is that not all people of the Muslim faith wear a burqa. It is not ordained in the Koran, from what I can see, that women must cover their face. They must be modest in their dress but there are a lot of people in the Christian faith who would argue the same, in regard to women in particular. I do not know why we pick on women, why women have to be modest in their dress. I think the same rules should apply to men.

I conclude by asking members to support the bill. It is a reasonable proposition. I think it is common sense and if the public opinion is any guide, then I think about 98 per cent of the population support what I am trying to do. I commend the bill to the house.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mrs Geraghty.

ELECTRICITY (WIND POWER) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 1 July 2010.)

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (11:11): I rise to support this bill. I note that the Hon. Acting Speaker currently in the chair brought this matter to the house and I think it is very sensible legislation. The objectives of the Electricity Act 1996 are to promote efficiency and competition in the electricity supply industry; promote establishment and maintenance of a safe and efficient system of electricity generation, transmission, distribution and supply; establish and enforce proper standards of safety, reliability and quality in the electricity supply industry; establish and enforce proper safety and technical standards for electrical installations; and protect the interests of consumers of electricity.

The bill seeks to amend Division 3AB—Feed-in mechanisms of the Electricity Act 1996. Section 36AC—Interpretation will be amended in relation to the definition of a 'qualifying generator'. Currently the definition is associated with a small photovoltaic generator. However, the amendment would add a second definition to therefore include the small wind turbine generator.

The wind turbine generator will be operated by a 'qualifying customer' and will comply with any standard prescribed by the regulations for the purposes of this definition. It will also be connected to a distribution network in a manner that allows electricity generated by the wind turbine generator to be fed into a network. As I said earlier, I commend the member for Finniss in bringing this bill to the house. It does seem odd that we can have solar power and get the benefit of having feed-in tariffs for that and not for another great renewable energy source—wind power—as an addition to photovoltaic cells.

We have a government that keeps telling us how great they are at dealing with renewable energy sources in this state. The sad thing is that so many of these renewable energy sources are so far from being developed. We on this side of the house certainly do back geothermal power as baseload power and we certainly understand the economics of providing baseload power which is being developed under solar, with different technologies moving forward there (that is a good word; moving ahead I should say. I will have to get Hansard to fix that up) with the option of new solar power being able to be run over 24 hours where the power is stored when it is captured during the day and then can be utilised obviously at night.

Certainly we have heard a lot from this government about how much wind power there is in this state, but you have to remember that wind power is capable of operating for only a small percentage of time. Sometimes there is no wind and sometimes there is too much wind, but it certainly is not a baseload power. Certainly, for individual operators, whether they be in outback areas or too far away to connect to the grid, people for a long time have been used to using things such as free light towers and wind power to provide power in their situation, and a lot of these people tie that in with solar power. Obviously, if you are disconnected from the system, you cannot get the benefit of getting any feed-in tariff. However, it certainly shows the initiatives individuals can take on an individual basis, because of the effort involved in shifting power lines or even to shift a power pole.

A bit of work was done on a road entrance into the T&R meatworks. I stand to be corrected, but there was a major pole on the corner of the road and to shift it was going to cost $240,000, which is just absolutely ridiculous. In the end, T&R and the people involved in adjusting the road managed to put the road up as hard as they could, within reason and legalities, to this pole. Returning to wind power, as I have said before, we have many wind farms in this state. People have different views about wind farms, but there is certainly a lot of production going on, which is good. Let's not ever shy away from the fact that we are a long way from having sustainable green energy of a baseload nature in this state.

In relation to geothermal energy, I have been on the site at Innamincka, where they have been trying to tackle the great pressures and heat of geothermal energy. The rig is sited about 15 kilometres out of Innamincka. They have brought in bigger rigs to dig deeper holes. It is all

about managing to control the water flow and controlling it as water that comes up to the surface and where it comes out.

I hope they harness it in the future but, in the shorter term, there should be the opportunity for people who live wherever there is wind, and in most places there is. South Australia is well known for wind power—the Mid North, the West Coast, Yorke Peninsula, Cape Jervis and even through quite a bit of Adelaide, especially in the Adelaide Hills. There are plenty of spots where people, with the right amount of incentive, could generate green power for themselves, which would certainly ease the load on the coal-fired power stations in this state.

Let's never shy away from the fact that, while it seems to be taboo to debate nuclear power in this state, we will have to rely on coal-based generation for our main baseload generation needs for a long time yet. There are many factors involved in that: it is so cheap and it is easily accessible. In fact, I noted the other day that, as far as our coal exports out of this country are concerned, there is a port near Mackay that at times has 51 empty coal ships waiting to load at any one time to export the product.

This is where the federal government, under former prime minister Rudd, did not seem to understand, when it brought in its 40 per cent mining tax, the impact it could have on the Australian economy in regard to regional people and regional employment and also the gross wealth of the nation. The federal government just wanted to tax the mining industry to bits, and I believe that was the final death nail for Kevin Rudd and when Julia decided to throw the knife in.

However, be that as it may, I do commend this motion. I think it is a very sensible piece of legislation. We should all be doing our best to generate as much green power as we can. I note that the Premier comes into this chamber and keeps talking about the 100 gigalitre desalination plant that will be hooked into green power. Well, no, what will happen is that the desalination plant will be plugged into essentially the black grid and we will pay more for the power. It will just be a feel good option that, supposedly, we are running on 100 per cent green energy. Well, if the government can guarantee that the wind will be blowing all the time and that the sun will be up all the time, which I don't think it can, it will not be running full time on green energy.

We do support green energy on this side of the house, but we know the realities of generating it and we know the vagaries of when it is available, and it is certainly not available all the time. However, anything we can do to ease our load as our population grows is worthwhile so that people can feel good about themselves in their own small way. In fact, we will have people who will virtually be able to wean themselves off the grid, but it does take a big investment. So, there is certainly that disincentive for people. However, people need options such as wind power so that they can make it economical.

Mr VENNING (Schubert) (11:21): I rise very briefly to speak on this subject, which I have a fair bit of passion about. I indicate that I support the motion, and I also congratulate you, Mr Acting Speaker, for introducing it. I think this motion is correcting an oversight. I think it is quite wrong that people installing photovoltaic cells on their roof can get the feed-tariff, whereas they cannot for a wind power generator, or anything else for that matter. If you can get a feed-in tariff for these photovoltaic cells, I cannot understand why that is the case. Apparently, there has been an attempt to right that, but it has not happened.

I was brought up with wind power. Some would say that I generate a fair bit of it myself! We were brought up with 32 volt power and, living with it, we had many options back then. We had the free lights, as we called them, the 32 volt free lights, and we had the generators and batteries. We had two or three options. When we were shearing, we had the generator on to top up the batteries all the time. So, there were a lot of options open to us.

I thought that free light was part of the scene back then, particularly in country South Australia, and you still see the occasional tower. In fact, our free light tower is still there, thinking that one day we might just put it back again. So, we were brought up with the free light, or the wind turbine, and I think communities, families and homes today ought to all have their own wind turbine, and then families would feel that they are doing their bit to help save the environment.

They are a very visual thing, sir, as you would know, and they are not unattractive in a home situation, whereas I believe as a wind farm they are not attractive. That is the problem; I do not believe that wind farms are the answer. I was initially quite supportive but I have to say that now I believe they are unsightly, especially at night with all those flashing lights, and they are very high cost. It is costing millions to put them there and, of course, they are extremely high maintenance.

I happen to know a couple of people who are doing the maintenance and they are fully employed, particularly as we have a lot of the lesser quality ones being installed in South Australia and, I am sorry, they have to be at them all the time. So, the question is: how long will these machines last and whose cost is it, if it does fall over, to remove them? That is always a question I put up. I do not believe it is a long-term answer, sir, I really do not, but I do believe this is and I commend you for it.

We have wind turbines to the south of our farm at Crystal Brook and yes, we are used to them, but I often enjoyed the beautiful ambience you have in living in the country looking at the skyline and the horizon, but with these things up there I have to say that I feel as if it has been vandalised, it has been vilified, and now there is an extra push in the next few weeks to install 60 more of these wind turbines between Crystal Brook and Collaby Hill, which is right alongside the southern Flinders there, which is going to have a high visual impact. This is a lovely skyline horizon and I am not in favour of that, but I will certainly go along to the public meetings and find out about it.

If these wind farms are a good idea, then why not run them across Mount Lofty? You know and I know that would not be acceptable, it would go down like lead boots. So, why then can you foist these onto other smaller communities where the voting power is not so strong? In certain locations I think I could accept them, where they do not have the visual impact, but when you can see them from 30 or 40 kilometres away that is a visual impact.

This idea of households having a wind turbine, in conjunction with photovoltaic cells and a generator, I think, is a great idea. We have to give this incentive to people to be able to invest the money in it—because it does cost to invest in it—and then to be able to get the benefit of the feed-in tariff. We went through this exercise ourselves as a family, where we were considering putting in the photovoltaic cells and the rest of it. We had a very good arrangement with our electricity supplier anyway, but if we put these things in it would change the tariff regime that we were currently on. We would lose the discount that we were running on, and I thought that was wrong.

When we worked it out, for us to put the photovoltaic cells in was a disincentive, our power would have been more expensive, so we did not do it. I think a lot of the power companies were using this leverage over their consumers to say, 'Well, okay, if you're going to put these things in you won't get the same rate of power per unit from us.' I think that was unfair and it ought to have been addressed.

I think that families can play their part, very much so, in relation to addressing the power needs of the future. I think that everybody who puts up a wind turbine, a photovoltaic cell or a generator can feel that they are doing their bit. It is good training, not only for the families but also for the young people coming on to say, 'Hang on, this power, when you switch a light on it just doesn't happen, it has a cost.' I think this is a good idea and I am amazed that it has not been done before. I congratulate the member for Finniss and we certainly support this bill.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mrs Geraghty.

SPEED LIMITS

The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher) (11:29): I move:

That this house calls on the state government to conduct a review of speed limits, with a view to—

(a) obtaining greater consistency in application;

(b) improving speed limit signage, including additional painted speed limits on roads where appropriate; and

(c) allowing greater demerit point loss in lieu of a heavy fine.

At the outset I should make it clear that this has nothing to do specifically with my court case, which is now before the Supreme Court, and I will not be commenting on that—not at this stage.

I notice the former minister for road safety is here (Hon. Michael O'Brien). He helped advance this issue, and I will come to that in a moment. I think you would have to be getting around with your eyes shut not to be aware that we have speed limits that seem to change very quickly, and the vast majority of people do not intend to break the law but unwittingly do break the law because the speed limits change very frequently.

There are some examples through the Adelaide Hills, and I am sure the member for Kavel would have something to say about this. Someone was telling me the other day they have a

property at Mannum and they no longer drive through the Adelaide Hills towns because they are always in fear of breaking the speed limit and they are up and down with the speed limit, so now they go up the freeway. What happens is that those small towns in the Adelaide Hills miss out on passing trade.

We have a lot of other inconsistencies, and I know the former minister was in the process of looking at this, and I met this week with the current minister (Hon. Jack Snelling) and I urge him to continue the work done by his predecessor. In the parklands, for example, Sir Lewis Cohen Avenue is 50km/h. There is no-one living there whatsoever and there are only parked cars. That has a limit of 50km/h. Then you go to Unley Road, which is in virtually an identical situation in the same southern part of the parklands and that is 60km/h. You can think of other examples where the surrounding environment is virtually identical. In my electorate Reynell Road is 50km/h and parallel to that is Kenihans Road which is 60km/h, even though the two roads have houses on both sides. Obviously you have to have speed limits and they need to be enforced, but the arrangement—the display, and so on—has to be fair and reasonable so that people are not unwittingly breaking the law.

New South Wales has a practice where, when you leave, say, an arterial road and enter a side road which is 50km/h, it is signposted at that point. It does not undermine the default system because, when you enter that 50km/h default zone once you have come off the arterial road where there is a sign, you no longer have to signpost each and every residential street because people know they have entered a zone which is 50km/h. So, you still have the default system. I invite people next time they go to New South Wales to hire a car and go for a drive. When you come off the Great Western Highway through the Blue Mountains, as soon as you turn off that highway there will be a sign saying 50km/h, and once you are in the zone there are no more signs because that is a 50km/h zone.

The other practice (which I understand is also applied in Queensland) is that the New South Wales Road and Traffic Authority will not approve a road being less than 60km/h (unless it is a school zone, or something like that) unless the road is designed for that speed. I met with Michael de Roos, the general manager for safer roads in the Roads and Traffic Authority in New South Wales. He said he will not approve any speed limit less than 60km/h (unless, as I say, it is a school or some special situation) if the road is not designed and constructed in a way that requires people to drive at that lower speed. Yet, what we have had here, and what we have had for a long time, is that councils have just whacked up signs that have been approved by the department of transport on roads that are collector roads which are not within the normal definition of what should be a 50km/h zone.

I think just putting up a sign saying it is 40km/h is not warranted. What we have had is blatant pork-barrelling in councils such as Mitcham where certain areas have been given 40km/h and others have not. When I raised this with one of the councillors she said to me, 'If you don't live there or don't work there, don't go there.' That is ridiculous. We live in a community. This is Adelaide, which is one city. To the credit of the City of Onkaparinga, it got rid of its 40km/h zones once we had the standardised default 50km/h system.

There are also some other issues that need to be tightened. One is road works signs. Some contractors, whether they be government or private, indicate road works and, often, you are puzzled as to when the road works end. I will not name the person but I know a senior and respected person who works in this place who entered a road works zone on South Road and immediately got fined and there was nothing to tell them it was a road works area. Once again, you need proper signage. It has to be fair and reasonable, and it has to be fairly transparent.

There are some other issues that I think need to be addressed also in relation to reviewing speed limits. New South Wales has for 20 years painted speed limit information on its roads, particularly its arterial roads. That costs, according to Michael de Roos, $1,000 each and they last seven or eight years. He said that, contrary to what is trotted out here by the department of transport, they have not had a problem with motorcyclists. He said the motorcyclists do not like complete road coverage at school crossings or railway crossings because they pose a problem for them. It is hard to do much about that because my argument is that motorcyclists should be slowing down at those points, anyway.

When you paint the numbers on the road for whatever the speed is—80 or 100, or whatever—you are not covering the whole road. They use a special paint. Other countries do it. They do it in parts of Europe. For the life of me I cannot understand why the Department of

Transport here will not consider it. You do not have to do it everywhere. You do it where there is some ambiguity.

For example, one used to exist—it has now been rectified for other reasons—at Old Noarlunga, where you went from 80 to 60 and the signs were hidden amongst the trees. What you need is for the reduced speed limit to be painted on the road. I do not think you need to paint it when the speed limit goes up because people are less likely to offend unwittingly in that situation. When it goes from 80 to 60 that is a substantial fine if you get caught not adhering to the lower speed limit. You don't have to do it everywhere. You have to apply a bit of commonsense in its application.

Some other points which relate to this whole issue need to be considered. I will pursue this issue over time. When people are handed an expiation notice, they do not get the detail they need unless and until they go to court. What you get is information that says you were apprehended speeding, for example, on South Road. Well, South Road is a long road. If you challenge it and go to court they have to supply page 2. My argument is that at the same time you get page 1 you should get page 2, which tells you where the officer was and other detail. Some seven months later witnesses, and whatever, have flown and it is difficult. Once again, the system needs to be fair.

I have raised this issue before and the government has said it is always difficult: I cannot see why pensioners and other people on low incomes, with necessary proof cannot get a reduced penalty. We seem to be able to do it for a whole lot of things. Currently, the fines payment unit is owed in excess of $100 million. I am not surprised. If you impose a heavy penalty on a pensioner, you basically wipe out their whole weekly or fortnightly income. I think that is blatantly unfair.

As we know, under our system if you own a business you do not even cop a demerit point loss because, if you are prepared to pay the fine, the business camouflages your behaviour. The current system is blatantly unfair. It also means that if you are rich and you are happy to pay fines, and so on, you are in a lot better position than a pensioner or someone on a disability benefit. Those people are struggling anyway, and with computerisation I cannot understand why they cannot be given a concession. We do it in other areas. I do not think there would be a sudden outbreak of speeding by grey power. What you will get is an outbreak of fairness.

Another point I want to make relates to heavy fines. The minister might respond by saying, 'Well, people can do community work.' Some of that is a farce. One of my constituents has racked over $1,000 worth of community work orders, but she claims that she was told, 'Look, it will never be enforced so don't worry about it.' Another character who is a serial traffic offender said that he was given community work which involved sitting at desk but he now says that his shoulder does not allow him to do even that. In many of these cases no consequence is followed through or applied.

It is only people who follow traditional values of being accountable who pay up and get penalised. As an option we should consider greater demerit point loss in lieu of a heavy fine, particularly for people on low incomes. People have come to me and said that they have never had a speeding fine in their life but they have inadvertently copped one. The fine is very heavy for them but, because they are not serial offenders, it would not matter if they lost five demerit points because they are not likely to offend again. Rather than impose a huge financial burden on them, why not have a greater demerit point option or something like that?

Another point (which has not been picked up here) is that our penalties are a lot higher than many other places. Talking on a mobile here is a fine of $240, in New Zealand it is $NZ90 and in California it is $US50. I do not encourage people to talk on the phone while driving because it is dangerous. The fact is that our penalties are very high. Given that, in general, the income level in South Australia is lower than most other states it is another example of unfairness.

In conclusion, I urge the government, particularly the Minister for Road Safety, to look at these issues and the Minister for Transport to bring about greater fairness and transparency. I think they would win a lot of support in the community because we do not want to encourage or promote speeding, but we want fairness and people to be held accountable. If they transgress when the signs are up and the information is there, then they have to wear the consequences. I commend this motion to the house.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education, Minister for Science and Information Economy, Minister for Road Safety, Minister for Veterans' Affairs) (11:44): I sat down and had quite a long and fruitful discussion with the member for Fisher about a number of these matters, and I have looked at a number of the

things he has raised in his speech and during the course of our meeting. Nonetheless, I rise to indicate that the government is opposed to the motion. Essentially, in terms of a review of speed limits, this is something that happens all the time anyway. The government does not sit down one day and decide that it will review speed limits. We are constantly reviewing speed limits.

I you look at the correspondence I receive, both from members of the public and from members of parliament, you will see that a fair chunk of it, maybe even as much as of half of it, is from people wanting me to review speed limits for particular areas and particular roads where they think that the speed limit is either too high or too low. My department is constantly going out, looking at roads, looking at the various safety factors, looking at the incidence of casualty crashes on those roads and making decisions about whether or not the speed limits are appropriate.

We do aim for and try to get consistency, but consistency is just one of a number of factors that we must take into account when we are setting speed limits. Managing speed limits within South Australia is and will continue to be an ongoing process and needs to reflect the changing nature of the road, the volume and type of traffic, the presence of vulnerable road users, the crash rates and, importantly, the community's understanding of the relationship between speed and crash risk.

Mean travel speeds in both urban and rural South Australia have been gradually reducing in the last few years, which I think is a good sign. The benefits of reducing travel speeds and better aligning speed limits to infrastructure and the road and traffic environment are gaining greater understanding and momentum within the community. The recent changes in the Barossa Valley and the Onkaparinga are evidence of this.

The member for Fisher has raised the issue of the possibility of having painted speed limits on the road surface. It has been considered by my department from time to time and by councils and, to date, they have not been implemented for a number of reasons. There is a concern. I know that the member for Fisher assures me that painted speed limits are not a concern for motorcyclists in terms of providing a skidding risk. I know that he is quite passionate that that is not the case. My department, however, is of a different opinion.

I will continue to have a look at the matter, but at the moment my thinking is that I do not think that any increased safety benefit of having the painted speed limits on the road will be enough to outweigh the additional risk posed to motorcyclists by having the painting on the roads. Nonetheless, it is something that I remain open-minded about; and, if there is more information on that issue, I am happy to have a look at it.

In relation to the speeding penalties, issues for consideration include the mix of demerit points and expiation fees, the relationship between the penalty mix and the risk imposed by the speeding behaviour and the relativity of speeding penalties with other types of offences for which the risk relationship is known, such as drink driving.

All those things are taken into account in their totality when we are making a decision about penalties and about the mix between the fine and the loss of demerit points. It is a mix of the two, and the aim is to create an overall deterrent to prevent people from engaging in risky, dangerous driving behaviour. In conclusion, I thank the member for Fisher for the motion. I assure him that all the matters he has raised are constantly being looked at by both me and by my department on an ongoing basis. Therefore, the house calling for a one-off review into all these issues is superfluous and, for that reason, the government is opposed to the motion.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel) (11:49): Surprise, surprise! The government is not prepared to support the motion put forward by the member for Fisher in relation to a review. All the member for Fisher is calling for is a review. This government is not prepared for any form of scrutiny. It is out of touch and disengaged from the community. The Premier said after the election that he wanted to re-engage with the community; he wanted to start listening again. Well, that is an admission that he had stopped listening, and that was highlighted after the election campaign.

Mr Pengilly: He's never here to listen.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: That's right. The member for Finniss raises an important point. This is a mechanism by which the government can re-engage with the community, so members on this side of the house support the member for Fisher's motion. We have some reservations about some aspects of it; however, in general, we are prepared to support the intent of the motion concerning a review.

Some aspects of the member for Fisher's motion are consistent with the state Liberals' road safety policy, and I refer to page five of our policy document, under the heading 'A Transparent Approach to Enforcement', which states:

> A Liberal government will:
>
> ...
>
> - Review the current speed zone settings and develop a consistent approach supported by clearer signage, and the use of repeater signs. We will work to deal with special zone problems at known sites.

There it is, in black and white. It is almost as if the member for Fisher has looked at the Liberal Party's policy and copied it word for word, but that is good work by the member for Fisher if that is what has actually taken place. This motion comes from a similar motion moved by the member for Fisher back on 30 April last year (previous to the election we just had in March), which really raised similar issues, but he has added the third dot point in terms of allowing greater demerit point loss in lieu of a heavy fine.

As I said, it is no surprise that the government would not support this. I note the minister's comments that the department and the government review these speed limits as an ongoing process, but it is catch-up. They are playing a catch-up game, because this policy was rushed in, from memory, in 2003. The then minister for transport, the member for Lee, I think it was at the time, had been elected for only a year or so and he rushed that policy in.

He went out to local government and said, 'Tell us which roads you want to keep at 60 km/h and 80 km/h. The rest will be a blanket change to 50 km/h.' We are eight years down the track and still playing catch-up, because I can tell members that, in electorate of Kavel in the Adelaide Hills, people are confused about the speed limit signposting on those roads.

Mr Hamilton-Smith: And in Waite.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: And in Waite. The member for Waite pre-empts my argument, because if there is confusion in the Kavel about the speed limits on roads in the Adelaide Hills, then there would be confusion right across the state; that is, in every one of the 47 electorates which comprise the state of South Australia. I can tell members that a couple of roads have two different speed limits on the same section of road. It is 80 km/h for traffic travelling in one direction and 50 km/h for traffic travelling in the opposite direction. How can you have two separate speed limits on the same section of road?

I have written to DTEI about this and they say that is acceptable. I can tell members that it is not acceptable to the local community because they are very confused. When they are leaving the particular town it is 50 km/h, but when they are entering the town it is 80 km/h. If that is not an example of inconsistency I do not what is and it also creates confusion within the community. When you question speed limit settings on council-administered roads, the council says, 'We have to get approval from DTEI to change the speed limit.' When you go to DTEI, the minister, the information we get back is that the council has to make the submission. Confusion reigns supreme between local government and state government.

The member for Fisher has handed me a note saying that the RAA supports a comprehensive review. Not only is it in our road safety policy but the RAA and the member for Fisher support it, but, guess what, the government does not. As I said, the government is bereft of any scrutiny; it is out of touch; it is not interested; it is lazy. We have seen many an example of how this government operates. We see confusion on the other side of the house when ministers are dealing with a whole range of issues. The Treasurer is confused about how the Adelaide Oval redevelopment is taking place and the like.

This goes to the broader issue of road safety as a whole. I have said this in the house before and I will keep on saying it: the government's road safety strategy is not working. You only have to look at the road fatality statistics to prove that. There have been 75 road fatalities on our roads to date. If my information is correct, that is one more than at the same time last year, so it is about the same. However, if you look at the three-year average, year to date it is 61. So, we have a 25 per cent increase on this year's road toll compared with the three-year average. If that is not a—

Mrs Geraghty: I think you are misleading the house. Our road toll has actually gone down—

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: You look at the statistics.

Mrs Geraghty: I have looked at the statistics.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: Go on the website and look at the statistics. I am certainly not misleading the house. It is my understanding that those statistics are correct. In my opinion, the government's road safety strategy is not working because the road toll is not coming down and it is 25 per cent above the three-year average, so that is a clear indication.

Yesterday we debated some legislation in the house and the minister was talking about wanting to ramp up the penalties for street racing, and we agreed to that. He was adamant that the new offences had to be in the Criminal Law Consolidation Act, so that, if someone was convicted of offences under those new provisions, then that person would have that on their criminal history. That crime would be listed under criminal history matters. I have done some checking over the last 24 hours, and it is my understanding that, if anyone is convicted of an indictable offence, no matter what act it is in, whether it is the Road Traffic Act or the Criminal Law Consolidation Act, then that person has a criminal history.

I think the minister's argument is pretty flimsy in saying that the provisions have to be in the Criminal Law Consolidation Act—this is my understanding of what the minister was stating yesterday. The majority of indictable offences are in the Criminal Law Consolidation Act, but that does not mean they have to be. The majority of offences concerning hoon driving and other very dangerous driving behaviour are in the Road Traffic Act. I make the point that it is not essential that the offences are in the Criminal Law Consolidation Act.

We do have some reservations in relation to some aspects of the member for Fisher's motion; namely, the painting of speed limits on the roads and allowing greater demerit point loss in lieu of a heavy fine. However, as I stated earlier, it is about a review. The member is not asking the government to implement these measures, it is purely a review. I think the motion has merit, hence our support on this side of the house for the motion.

Mr VENNING (Schubert) (11:59): I certainly support the first two paragraphs of this motion moved by the member for Fisher. The confusing range of speed limits in South Australia has been the subject of many debates in this house, Madam, as you would be aware. I moved a motion in early 2009 calling for a statewide review of speed limits due to the confusion being experienced by motorists and calling for extra signage. This motion is very similar, and so I am happy to support it. I understand and note the personal fight the member has taken on and I fully support him in that.

Just last night, when driving to my home in the city at quarter to 12, I went through the lights at the intersection of Cowandilla Road and Sir Donald Bradman Drive and the car in front of me set off the camera. I looked at my speed: 59. Guess what? The camera went off again. How come? It is 60 kilometres all the way down there, so I am going to be very interested to see what happens and whether I get a letter. I looked down—59 on the hold, it is digital, and I know my speedo reads high anyway. It will be interesting to see what happens, member for Fisher. I put that on notice because I looked down and there it was, exactly.

This issue is definitely gaining some momentum. It is really quite serious and particularly since the introduction of 50 km/h default speed limits in built-up areas. It is giving our police a very bad name. I am surprised that the police commissioner has not more to say about this. I know that we do not interfere with the commissioner's work; that is part of the act of the parliament. I am amazed that the commissioner has not said, 'Hang on, we need better guidelines than this. We need to sort this area out.'

Why is it that, when you are driving across the Southern Parklands, some of the roads are zoned at 60 and some are 50? If you do not see the sign, or if you forget, or if you are concentrating on the road in front of you—bang, you're pinged, especially now that tolerance is also being reduced. It really is a revenue-raising exercise.

I wholeheartedly agree that a review of the speed limit should take place across the state, as the member for Fisher's motion states. Extra speed limit signage or markers, such as painting the zones on the road, as in the member for Fisher's motion, must be implemented to eliminate the confusion that the wide range of speed limit zones causes to motorists across the state. The argument has been put that painting on the road is dangerous. I am a motorcyclist. I used to drive a Harley-Davidson, as people know, and a Harley certainly does react to slippery paint. I can recall driving around the city with the member for Waite on the back. Even better than that, I had former premier Hon. John Olsen on the rear of the motorcycle, driving from Glenelg to Hahndorf for the annual bike push for the children.

Mr Goldsworthy: The Toy Run.

Mr VENNING: The Toy Run. And yes, you do feel the white line, you do feel the bike skid a bit when the road is wet. That is correct. Today, however, you can use a different sort of paint. You do not have to use shiny paint; you can use aggregated paints and also you can use coloured grout. This is not new. Other states paint their roads, particularly as the member for Fisher said. We do not want them all over the road, but certainly on the areas where you know people are going to get confused you put it on the road. Better than that, why do we not have coloured guideposts? It is not very hard to put a coloured band around the guidepost. In a casual look to the side of the road, you will see a colour and think, 'Oops, this is a 50.' If you do not happen to see that sign, if you miss it once, you're gone.

The RAA in the past couple of years has called on the Rann state Labor government to conduct a review of all speed limits and for more speed limit signage to be constructed across the state. The traffic and safety manager for the RAA, Rita Excell, stated that a survey of its members showed drivers were also confused because often speed signs could not be seen or were hidden by a high, slow-moving vehicle. 'Why not have different coloured guideposts?' was my comment at the time.

I believe that the proliferation of the 50 km/h speed limit is far in excess of the original idea or the original concept. All arterial roads were supposed to remain at 60 and all roads within urban and built-up areas were to be 50. This is definitely not the case now. Motorists are being told that the default speed limit in built-up areas is 50 kilometres. There does not seem to be an accurate definition of what constitutes an arterial road.

There are roads that I can think of that one would think are arterial roads, for instance North Terrace, yet they are speed limited at 50 km/h. No wonder motorists are confused. As you drive around the four terraces of Adelaide, the speed limit changes five times at least—that's if there are no road works, and if there are there's a lot more.

When it is clear that motorists are obviously confused about whether a particular road is zoned 50 or 60, surely the logical answer would be to install more signs, paint the road or something to remind them. But the state Rann Labor government seems to be reluctant to do so. I believe it is because of the revenue generated from speeding fines. It is a sizeable amount of money. It is now a key budgetary item

I have received many phone calls from constituents—good, honest, law-abiding citizens—who have been penalised because they were innocently travelling at what they thought was the speed limit and, because speed zone signs are infrequent, they did not realise they were driving too fast until they received a fine. I have even had contact from police officers who have been caught like this. A large proportion of the population has been affected. They are not criminals. People automatically assume what the speed limit is and they do not see the sign—ping, they're gone. Some of these fines really hurt, particularly if you are a country person and you accumulate points. You can lose your licence extremely quickly. The amount of money certainly hurts a lot of people.

I am aware of a few locations where reminder speed limit signs have been put up, so the transport department obviously can install these signs if it wants to. It is not a criminal offence. Why the reluctance to install more signs or paint limits on roads? I have heard and read that it is to keep the clutter of signs to a minimum, but that does not wash with me. More to the point is that we should be painting on the road.

As members of this house would be aware, I have been vocal over the past few years about having extra signage, either coloured markings on the road or on the side of the road, to indicate and delineate the limits. More frequent signage or marking the speed limit on the road are all measures that can be taken to reduce confusion. They ought to at least be trialled on some sections of road. As has been said earlier, the RAA supports this, so why doesn't the government?

When you are driving, you are supposed to concentrate on the road, on what is in front of you, not on what is happening on the side of the road. So, if there is a contradiction in regards to road safety—if you are too busy looking around for speed limit signs because you are not sure—this is when you have a rear end collision or worse, run over a pedestrian.

Reminder speed limit signs at regular Intervals and painting the speed limits on the road would be simple and enable drivers to feel more confident about the speed that they should not be exceeding. It could also prevent some road rage where cautious people keep to the default 50 kilometre speed limit because they do not realise they are in a 60 kilometre zone or 80 kilometre speed zone, due to a lack of regular signage, while other drivers sit on their tail urging them to go

faster. Road rage in the state is on the increase and driver behaviour has deteriorated. Madam Speaker, I want to ask the minister one straight question and I would like an answer.

I want to ask the minister why the police have removed the 'speed camera in use' signs. When we brought this legislation in here I can clearly remember the government at the time saying, 'We will agree to this on one condition: that the warning signs go in.' The member for Mawson at the time, now a member of the other place, was the minister, and he agreed that they would always be there, so why have they been removed? It was never mentioned in this house. Were they removed by regulation? Some people can be picked up two or three times in one day. You can lose your licence in one day, if you do not know the cameras are there or are in use. They were a good deterrent.

I know there was an argument that some police officers felt worried about their security. Well, I am sorry. Fix the laws up and do not leave it like that. I want to find out from the minister why those signs have been removed, who made that decision and how he did it. You should not be able to do things like that by regulation. The issue could be easily fixed firstly by reviewing all the speed limit zones to try to put in place some uniformity and secondly by installing more speed limit signs and painting the roads.

I urge government members to support this motion. I commend the member for Fisher. I do understand exactly the private stand he is making. I do not have a problem with him being an MP doing this. He is just doing what thousands and thousands of other South Australians would do if they could afford it or had the courage to do it. I wish the member good luck in his pursuit. I certainly support him, and I certainly support this motion.

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (12:08): I rise too to speak on this motion, and I think we do need a review of speed limits in this state. A lot of us in this place—I would say pretty well all of us—grew up with the default speed of 60 km/h.

Mr Hamilton-Smith interjecting:

Mr PEDERICK: Yes. It is confusing when you drive around Adelaide and in some of the suburbs you even have to get down to 40 km/h on all the connecting roads and, yes, they are signposted, but then you get out on the other roads and you have to look for the 60 on the main arterial routes. However, there are a lot of roads that look like major connectors that you think would be 60 km/h roads, but they are unmarked so they default to 50 km/h.

That is where some of the confusion comes in, and there are certainly plenty of reports from people I know driving around Adelaide where there are frequently used streets that, for whatever reason, are put back to 50 km/h and there does not seem to be a real reason why they are not signposted and kept at the not very much faster limit of 60 km/h. It does seem at times that revenue raising is the greater thought of the government here in regard to these speed limits.

I want to also reflect on country roads. There are issues down my way on the Dukes Highway, the main road between Melbourne and Adelaide, where most of the freight in and out of the state is carried. It is a very busy road. I believe it can be as high as 4,000 vehicle movements a day or more, and all the time we have these ongoing roadworks for extra parking bays and overtaking lanes—and they are good things. Let me lay that on the table: they are very good things, but why do they take so long?

It is just incredible, and I note that the same issues are at Port Wakefield. It just becomes a logjam as people run into roadworks. I note down our way before you get to Tailem Bend where the dual lane kicks in—obviously, I get on the road just before Coomandook and head up through Cooke Plains—parking bays are currently under construction and have been for months. Why do they take so long? I heard a member of the police force, I think, or perhaps someone from the Department of Transport, being asked a question on the radio one day and saying that there are time constraints on how long the contractors have to do these things—either overtaking lanes or parking bays.

Well, they are obviously getting a fair bit of lead time, because it is really confusing for people driving up these main arterial routes, especially when you have thousands of semitrailers and thousands of B-doubles trying to conduct their rightful business on these main arterial routes. You are driving along, and there is one just south-east of Cooke Plains, and they picked a really good spot to put a parking bay right amongst the salt swamp. I am sure it took a fair bit of work—

Mr Goldsworthy: Saltier than the sea.

Mr PEDERICK: Yes; it's just unbelievable—trying to find a decent place to build the road base in, because I know for a fact that when the high-voltage power line went through there several years ago they had to tip in so many loads of cement just trying to cement the poles in that they just had to keep going. I know when they tipped the first lot in, it just disappeared so they said, 'Right; just keep going.'

You have to wonder about the planning that goes into some of these things. Let me repeat: we do need these things. In the first instance, I would rather see dual lane all the way to the border, and let us hope we get there sooner rather than later, because not only will it improve traffic movement through to Bordertown and the Victorian border but it will also save a lot of lives, because we are losing too many people on that section of road.

These parking bays and overtaking lane extensions or new overtaking lanes get opened up and people get slowed down to 80 km/h coming into them, then 60 km/h, then sometimes there are even 40 km/h signs left there. You go through some of these areas at night and there are 60 km/h signs, and you think: what for? There is nothing going on; you can still quite easily go through this section of road. There are no roadworks happening overnight.

It is simply because, obviously, there is a standard, and I appreciate that, but the standard is that they need to have white posts in clearly marking the edge of the road. That is fair enough, but why are they not put in sooner? Then they would not be upsetting the thousands of users per day utilising these roads and upsetting the chain of traffic.

This is where problems happen, where people get upset about having to slow down and speed up and line haul operators having to back off. I am sure there have been times where the police could have had a field day with a camera at some of these locations and raise a lot of money for this government, because people just get sick and tired of these restrictions being there for so long because the white posts have not been put in so that we can get it back to a 110 km/h speed limit on those main arterial routes.

In my speech today, I wonder why it does take so long to get to the stage where the pavement can get put down so that these pieces can be finished. I know that at one stage last year several overtaking lane extensions were put in on the Dukes Highway, from Tailem Bend heading further south past Keith. One contractor was doing the lot and opening them up and just leaving them. You would think that it would be simpler perhaps to do one or two and complete them. It seems to me, coming from a small business background, to be the wrong way to do things. It certainly is frustrating, the number of speed limits we have. I know that at times on a main road you can go anywhere from 110 km/h through a 90 zone, an 80 zone and occasionally a 70 zone, a 60 zone, a 50 zone and a 25 km/h zone. You have to wonder why we need so many increments that are only 10 kilometres apart.

I know that interstate road train operators get frustrated. I believe the ruling in this state is that they can sit on only 90 km/h, yet I believe in the territory (and I stand to be corrected), they can do 100 km/h. The one piece of smart legislation we did approve in this house in relation to speeding and speed limits was letting learner permit drivers sit on 100 km/h. That is such a smart move for people, especially in the country. You only have to drive on the main arterial roads in the country to come across a lot of learner drivers. Yes, we all have to learn to drive, but sitting on 80 km/h with 60 tonne B-doubles swarming around you, you can appreciate the terror experienced by a learner driver at the time and especially the person helping them to drive. So, that was a smart move.

Before closing, I note that the Hon. Graham Gunn, the former member for Stuart, made some very wise comments about where he thought speed limits should go. I think that one of his infamous Gunn amendments was the 130 km/h speed limit north and west of Port Augusta. I really do think that needs to be looked at, because I think he was right on the money—there is nothing worse on country roads and distance roads, as long as they are capable of maintaining a decent speed, than going so slow that people fall asleep.

There are plenty of people who undertake long drives, and there are plenty of members on this side of the house who do upwards of 60,000 kilometres a year. In fact, I know the former member for Stuart, and probably the current member for Stuart, could do up to—

Mr Pengilly: A good member.

Mr PEDERICK: Hear, hear!—100,000 kilometres a year. We on this side of the house spend a lot of time on the road. We know the distances that have to be covered, and we know what you have to do to stay awake. It is a tough call.

In any other workplace, they would rule against people having to drive the kilometres and hours that members have do in their line of work. Let me just make that point here today. We legislate for everyone to have safe work practices. I certainly believe, and having talked to some of my colleagues about what can happen when you have a lot of meetings in a row, that people have a problem with fatigue, yet we are expected to do it. We do not mind doing it; we do it as our duty. However, I just lay that out there to let the house know that it does take all your concentration sometimes to keep making it to your destination.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher) (12:19): In closing the debate, I will make the following points because they have been mentioned by some members. The RAA does support a comprehensive review of speed limits; I make that quite clear. I would like to see the RAA be more vigorous and aggressive in its campaigning on behalf of motorists. Sir Eric Neal, I understand, recommended as chair of the Road Safety Committee (I do not know whether he is still chair of the committee) that those roads through the Parklands have a consistent speed applied to them. That has already been recommended, so there is no need for a delay on that.

I have seen radar cars in Sir Lewis Cohen Avenue at 8 o'clock on a Saturday night trying to catch people travelling in excess of 50 km/h in a street that has a couple of magpies living in it; it does not have any houses and there is no pedestrian movement there. It is quite silly. For those who question the value of painted speed limit signs on the road, I invite them to go to New South Wales, where they have been doing it for 20 years. They should ask for someone to show them around, and I am sure members will come away convinced. If members want to travel further afield, they should go to Holland or the UK and other places. Everyone else in the world is not totally ignorant on this subject. There is no issue in terms of motorbike safety; it is a red herring.

I do not know why, but there seem to be some bureaucrats here who seem to push their own barrow on this issue rather than acting in the interests of the wider community. One of the reasons I think there has been little movement on this issue is that, as we know, ministers and others get chauffeured around; even the Police Commissioner gets a chauffeur. If they were driving every day, like the rest of the community, they would be in there supporting this review. So, whilst they are being insulated by having a driver, they are not going to experience what the rest of the community, the ordinary citizens, experience.

The fact that we have to have signs up saying 'Remember 50 km/h' is a tacit, if not more explicit, acknowledgment that the system of the default in some areas is not adequate. Why put up 'Remember 50 km/h' if people are not remembering it? What you need when you come off some of these arterials is a 50 km/h sign. The member for Schubert asked why we no longer have signs indicating that you have just passed a radar car. The reason is that the PSA kicked up because it said that its members were vulnerable. I can understand that there are idiots in the community.

People have told me that some of those cars are now unattended, which is puzzling, and I would be interested in a response on that. I wrote to the police minister saying, 'Why don't you have a sign in the general area? You don't have to nominate exactly where the car is, but you could indicate with a sign saying "Police targeting this area for speeding"' They do that in some country areas now with a fixed sign. The answer that came back was that people would steal the sign. I do not know whether they have heard about chains and locks, but I think they are still available at hardware stores.

The other thing—and this blew me away—the answer said: 'Motorists should be looking at the road, not distracted by signs.' Hello, hello! That is what the signs for speed limits currently tell people, and they are on the side of the road. The answer from the Minister for Police, presumably written by the police, says that motorists should be looking at the road not being distracted by signs. We know that police operate on a quota, which I think is outrageous. It violates basic principles in a democratic society that they have quotas, that they have to get so many people a day for traffic offences, and I think it is outrageous.

The other point is that people are not told, but in South Australia the margin for speeding, with radar camera, has been reduced down to about four, and in Victoria it is even less at two. Given that speedometers, particularly in cars made up until 2006—the tolerance on them is significant—the system currently in force is lacking. I urge members to support this motion. I think

the government is being shortsighted by indicating that it will not support it, but the public opinion out there does support it, as does, as I said before, the RAA.

Motion negatived.

RAIL FREIGHT

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite) (12:24): I move:

That this House—

(a) notes the Federal Government's Discussion Paper entitled Adelaide Rail Freight Movement Study, dated October 2009;

(b) commends the City of Mitcham Council and members of the Rail Freight Sub-Committee for their efforts in seeking action on rail freight infrastructure reform;

(c) calls on the Federal and State Governments to advance the Discussion Paper to a plan of action to re-route rail freight traffic from the City of Adelaide through a northern by-pass south of Truro; and

(d) notes that a rail freight by-pass should also provide a corridor for road freight transport to by-pass metropolitan Adelaide.

When I gave notice of this motion in the house on 22 June 2010, the Adelaide Rail Freight Movement Study had not been released. Finally, on 24 June 2010, the federal Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Anthony Albanese, released that long awaited study. This is a very important issue for all South Australians, but particularly for all who live astride the line from Murray Bridge through to Adelaide, which carries an enormous amount of freight.

It took federal Labor three long years to deliver the study. They finally rushed it out on the day Julia Gillard rolled Kevin Rudd for prime minister in an attempt, I believe, to hide it from public scrutiny. This is no surprise when you look at the findings of the study. It contains little evidence and data to support its findings and the cost of the report has been extraordinary. It comprises 45 pages. If the entire $3 million was spent producing it, it has cost the taxpayers almost $67,000 per page. It is another example, at this point, of Gillard Labor government waste, because the report needs reworking. In particular, economic modelling for the social benefits of a bypass in relation to option 3 is confused and lacking in detail.

The study in its current form is a failure. This is largely due to the terms of reference the consultants were given. My constituents in Waite—and constituents in other electorates—need to know whether the full $3 million was provided to consultants GHD for this work, or was the budget cut? Because the final study is a poor outcome. The study recommends that nothing be done. Each option identified is dismissed as not being cost effective.

Let us consider the nature of the problem. There are freight problems along this route. As noted by the Adelaide Freight Movement Discussion Paper, and then the study, the freight line runs parallel to a passenger line; the line is characterised by steep grades and tight curves which prevent double stacking of containers; freight trains have to travel more slowly than on other lines; freight trains use 50 per cent more power than on other lines; and freight trains are restricted to a maximum of 3,500 tonnes.

Then there are safety issues: derailments, the potential for bushfires caused by poorly maintained undergrowth along the track, and level crossing interactions with road traffic. Then there is the noise issue: noise pollution is causing great discomfort, inconvenience and disruption to local residents all the way along the line throughout the day and night, with wheel squeal being a particular problem.

Let us go over what has been done, or not done, about this problem. It is a long-term problem, with no short-term solution, especially given the dire state of federal finances thanks to the Rudd and Gillard Labor government's fiscal mismanagement and wild spending sprees. At the last election federal Labor was forced to commit to a $3 million study. Two years later, in October 2009, a discussion paper was finally released. Almost three years later, federal Labor rushed out the results of the discussion paper, the Adelaide Rail Freight Movement Study, as I mentioned, on the day that the prime minister was toppled.

In amongst this activity, and in recognition of the serious nature of the problem, Mitcham council established its own Rail Freight Committee. I commend the Mitcham council and the Rail Freight Committee for their significant efforts on the issue, one result of which has been that 65 of 68 South Australian local councils have now agreed that a northern bypass should be built. Local

councils of the City of Unley, the City of Mitcham, The Rural City of Murray Bridge, along with Regional Development Australia Barossa and Regional Development Australia Murraylands and Riverland also committed their own funding to prepare a strategic assessment of corridor options, which agrees with the state Liberals' assessment that the cost benefit analysis of social aspects of this matter has been sadly lacking.

I commend the councils for all of their efforts on behalf of my constituents and the broader community affected by this issue. I further note that the City of Mitcham will be holding a public forum on this issue on 30 July 2010. Stakeholders, I am sure, will make sure that this issue does not go away. It would be pertinent at this time for those opposite to state their position on the matter. The Minister for Transport was reported in *The Advertiser* on 3 July 2010 as stating:

> ...while the state government would not rule out support for a long-term solution, it was up to the federal government to undertake a new study.

If that is tacit support for the federal government to go back to the drawing board and get the study right, then I agree with the minister, but is this the best the Rann Labor government can do?

Let us look more closely at the study. It was to look at the forecast freight volumes and task, and the ability of the existing rail line to meet future demand having regard to economic, environmental and social factors. In particular, the study was required to specifically consider the feasibility of a new alignment (proposed by Mitcham council rail freight committee) that would run to the north of Adelaide.

I now want to talk about this option, known as option 3. This option is supported by the majority of stakeholders and came with a preliminary costing of $1.4 billion in the discussion paper, a figure that rose to $2.4 billion in the final study. The reason for this increase in cost is poorly explained in the study. Option 3 involves making the ascent of the Mount Lofty Ranges around Truro, requiring extensive bridge and cutting work. In addition, improvements would be required to the short tunnel and the bridge at Murray Bridge.

The budget allows for the bypass to be developed to a standard capable of handling 1,800-metre long, double-stacked container trains. The option would provide enough capacity to meet the rail freight demand through to 2039. Track operating costs for this option are relatively low, and it would reduce transit time and costs for rail freight between Melbourne and Perth. However, it is described as a less effective option for freight to and from Adelaide without, in my view, sufficient evidence.

As the study notes, although the option allows the use of more efficient trains than can currently be accommodated, the route taken by these trains operating to and from Adelaide would be indirect. Under this option, freight traffic on the existing route would cease. This would provide a full resolution of the community amenity issues associated with operations currently on the Adelaide Hills route, as the northern bypass would travel through currently sparsely populated country and pose relatively few new social issues. Preliminary assessment suggests that there are two heritage sites along the route within 100 metres of the alignment that could be affected. However, it is possible that more detailed investigations will reveal refinements to this alignment which would allow these sites to be avoided.

The findings of the study showed that, based on freight demand forecasts, including ARTC's estimates, and in light of the committed works on the corridor, capacity is not likely to be a constraining factor until between 2025 and 2030. The current alignment can handle 10.7 million tonnes of freight per year, which is more than double the 4.8 million tonnes per year that is currently carried on the rail line.

But this is the important point, because on page 13 of the study it is noted that, in the high case scenario, which is a very real prospect, traffic on this freight route is likely to increase 4.6 times by 2039. That is almost five times more freight traffic than we are seeing on the Belair line today. This is an increase of freight tonnage from 4.8 million tonnes, not to the 10.7 million tonnes mentioned earlier but to 22.2 million tonnes by 2039, five times the current rate. This represents an annual average growth of 5 per cent over the 30-year evaluation period. This is what lies ahead.

The study dismisses option 3, the northern bypass, claiming that the net social benefits are minimal. As the study notes, this outcome is largely explained by the way in which this benefit cost analysis quantifies externalities. The unit values used to calculate externality benefits are distance rather than intensity-based values (that is, dollars per train kilometre travelled).

This means that the magnitude of noise benefit is a function of alignment length as opposed to severity of impost on local residents. This was in the terms of reference. Given the northern bypass is approximately 90 kilometres longer than the existing alignment, calculated externality costs (the study argues) will be higher in the northern bypass option than in the status quo.

By adopting a distance-based approach to quantifying noise externalities, it effectively assumes that the intensity and the cost of noise impact per train movement along the northern bypass route is the same as that experienced along the existing route. This is a complete flaw in the study. Had it applied intensity-based values, noise-based values or social dislocation-based values the whole methodology would change.

The study asks us to believe that the noise and inconvenience to people when a train passes through an open expanse of paddock on the way to Truro is the same as a train running past the homes of residents in Blackwood, Belair, Mitcham, Unley or Adelaide. Imagine that! This study is fundamentally flawed and the economic modelling is also flawed.

The work must be redone. The community knows that. That is why 65 of 68 South Australian local councils recently voted to support a northern bypass (option 3). I know constituents in my electorate are deeply affected by the issue and they want to see it resolved. The state Liberal Party has a position of supporting option 3 of the study, and has held this position for some time.

The state Liberals acknowledge that there is no short-term solution here. There may not even be medium-term solutions to this issue, given the now dire state of federal finances, thanks to the Rudd and Gillard Labor governments' spending spree on acknowledged failures such as home insulation and school halls. In the long term there must be an answer. It is not good enough for federal Labor to flick off the study to Infrastructure Australia and the Rann Labor government for inclusion in other studies and plans. This is simply code for doing nothing.

There must be action on the issue. No-one expects a short-term fix. There is no money for a short-term fix. Labor has squandered it, but we need to look at the medium to long term. First, we need to get this study right. We need to get the economic modelling right. We need to know how much was spent on the study.

I am advised that the amount spent on the study may have been underspent by as much as 50 per cent. If that is correct—and I am calling on the federal minister to indicate exactly how much has been spent—the money may already be there to go back to the drawing board and to get the study right at no additional cost. We need the social benefits of option 3 to be properly examined.

Finally, a plan of action must be formulated, even if it is a long-term plan beyond the current budget estimates. In recommending a plan of action I recognise that there is no short-term solution, given the dire state of federal finances. In recommending that the true cost of the study be revealed, a better and more comprehensive cost/benefit analysis be conducted and a plan of action be formulated, I want to know whether those opposite will support us. Will the Minister for Transport and the Rann Labor government start to take this matter seriously for the people of South Australia? They need some long-term infrastructure planning and a bypass in the long term needs to be part of that plan.

Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder) (12:39): I rise today to support the member for Waite's motion. I recognise the importance he places upon it and the importance that the people of the cities of Mitcham, Unley and Murray Bridge, the District Council of Mallala, the Adelaide Hills Council and regional development board structures around those areas also place upon it.

There is absolutely no doubt in my mind, after reviewing this discussion paper and discussing this matter with the member for Waite, that it is critical that the state government recognises the importance of this report and, importantly, the fact that the report is incomplete in many areas and that additional pressure needs to be placed upon the federal government to ensure that a report is prepared that identifies options that will translate into a project that will occur.

I have great frustration, as does the member for Waite, in being told that, basically, 'Yes, this is a $3 million report.' It is some 46 pages in length, but it makes no firm recommendation on how to proceed because the option of not proceeding is not an option. It is very obvious to me that a line with the capacity of 10.7 million tonnes—which is currently used to some 4.8 million tonnes, but the projections over the 30-year period use a base case, a low case or a high case of freight

that will travel on that line—clearly indicates that using the low case of 14.3 tonnes per year or the high case of 22.2 tonnes per year of freight travelling on that line (which will reflect upon the economic growth in our state) means that it is very critical that this investment takes place.

The people who live in the hills have lived with this rail line for many years, there is no doubt about that. Many of those people have been rather placid, I think, in their level of frustration, but the community is now coming to a position where it sees the need for investment to take place. I note that, in a recent Local Government Association vote on this, 65 of the 68 councils supported option three occurring which takes in the northern bypass, because they want to see investment happen in our state.

It is frustrating to me that an alternative option proposed in some other areas for an investment to occur, namely, the Barkandji option of some $300 million, will take investment out of South Australia and take it due north towards Mildura, which, I think, runs the risk of consigning South Australia's rail hub future to a much poorer one than it should be.

It is critical for the infrastructure needs of this state and for the economic opportunities that exist that this report be done properly, that it takes into account the economic, environmental and social impacts of the communities of the Adelaide Hills and the people in the surrounding areas who deal with this issue every day and that we make sure that the investment occurs.

It is a long-term solution; I do recognise that. Capacity exists within the line for the freight increases projected for the next few years, but if we look at the fact that we want South Australia to grow economically, that we want South Australia to become a transport hub given its central location in relation to Australia, it is important that we look at investment opportunities, and this is absolutely one of the key ones.

The member for Waite has referred quite often to financial contributions that the federal government has made to other projects around Australia. All within the nation have read the continuous media examples of poor investments being made, or cost overruns being incurred. Yes, this project comes at a tremendous cost option (my understanding is that option three is some $1.4 billion), but it is important that governments of all persuasions plan for it, and it is important that this state government gets behind it and offers its support to a review of this study to ensure that we get the outcomes that we need.

Rail freight will be increasingly important. I know that, in my meetings with freight operators, I am constantly told that transport will double over the next 10 or 15 years. We all hope that our population increases, that our produce from our state increases, that we get more export opportunities and that revenue comes into our state. It is important that we have a rail freight opportunity to get those products out—and, indeed, bring products in—as we allow our economy to expand.

Rail will be one of the key players. Road investment, obviously, is going to occur, too, but rail will be one of those key players. A government that is focused on opportunities for the future, that has a report which talks about potential growth over the next 30 years and that sees that that growth is more than twice the capacity that sits within the current rail network will recognise the opportunity that this presents. It will push as strong as possible the case for an investment to occur, and it will ensure that that actually happens.

I know that members on this side of the chamber are committed to this. We have held this belief for some months. We welcome the fact that $3 million was provided several years ago for the review to be undertaken and for the study to be prepared, but unless you are actually committed to it that money will be wasted.

Let us ensure that we go back to the drawing board, that we use this data provided as part of this report for the base of it, that we revise the social and environmental impacts that the member for Waite has so well and truly put to the chamber and that we look at the economic opportunities.

I am a person with figures in my head a lot, but this is a real obvious one to me. Tremendous community benefit will occur. It will create opportunities in the Adelaide Hills, it will open up and guarantee South Australia's rail hub future and it will ensure that this state has a chance to move forward. I urge members on both sides of the chamber to support this motion.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (12:44): I will not hold the house long. I rise to support the motion moved by the member for Waite and the comments of the member for Goyder. The house will be aware that I have raised this issue since 2004 and have been calling on the federal

government to make moves to move the freight line from its existing route to northern Adelaide. I was pleased that, at the last election, the two major parties gave a commitment to spend $3 million on a study, as the member for Waite outlined. We are now debating that particular study.

I will not repeat everything the members for Waite and Goyder said, other than to say that the report is lacking in a lot of detail. It did not really take into account a lot of the benefits that would flow to South Australia and the suburbs as a result of moving the freight line. By freeing up all the intersections from Belair to Adelaide along the railway line, there is a huge saving to the state and to the taxpayer in infrastructure projects not having to proceed. The issue in Blackwood is that, if the freight train is taken out to the north of Adelaide, then the existing freight route can be used to create a bypass route around Blackwood, because the land corridor is there. So the passenger train would stay, but a bypass road could be built around Blackwood. Blackwood main street could then be rebuilt like the Norwood Parade or the Stirling main street, and dressed up to be a more attractive place to visit. I know the local business networks certainly support that concept.

They did not cost any of these social issues into the study, as the member for Waite quite rightly points out. The other issue they did not take into account is that, if you move the freight line to the north, which is the line which the Melbourne Express runs on, you could then run the Melbourne Express into the Barossa and have Adelaide to the Barossa overnight, the Barossa to Melbourne, or Melbourne to the Barossa overnight and then into Adelaide. It opens up that whole tourism link into the Barossa Valley, and again that has not been costed into the exercise and neither has the aspect of then running the passenger line to meet the Melbourne Express, which would provide a passenger service from the Barossa through the northern suburbs.

I congratulate the member for Waite on bringing the motion to the house. I congratulate the local residents who have worked long and hard since 2004 on this issue. I think we should understand what happens if we do not move the freight line. The Labor government's plan is to do up the existing route so that it can take longer and larger trains from Melbourne through to Adelaide. Very simply, longer and larger trains mean more traffic congestion and more noise.

I point the following out to the house and I invite anyone in the house to join me. My residents do not complain greatly about the engine noise. It is not the engine noise that is the issue in my electorate so much. The issue is the high-pitched squeal of the steel wheels grinding on the steel rail. There are distinct two noises: the base of the wheel on the top of the steel rail and the flange of the wheel on the side of the two rails. When I was minister for the environment we moved legislation to license the trains and the train track so the EPA could try to deal with the issue. That has not been as successful as everyone would have hoped, but that was a world first in that sense.

The EPA, with the ARTC, introduced sound-measuring technology. It identified which axle squealed and then it would email the owner of that axle and they would have a maintenance regime on that axle to try to address the problem. The ARTC spent over $2 million, from memory, developing that particular technology. The industry has been genuine in trying to deal with this issue. I invite any one of you to come to Blackwood to listen to the squeal and to tell yourself that that is acceptable. No-one in the district is saying that the engine noise is the issue. The squeal is the real issue and the ongoing traffic congestion.

The Labor Party signed off on the Blackwood Park development before losing the 1993 election. There is a 20 per cent increase in Blackwood's population. Blackwood Park only has two exits in case of fire. Traffic congestion in Blackwood as a result of the Blackwood Park development and the Flagstaff Pines development is significant. The residents are very concerned that in time of fire, with the freight train coming through at the wrong time, there is going to be a real issue of evacuation and traffic movement in those times.

So, I agree with the member for Waite and the member for Goyder. The federal government report is lacking, and I am hoping that during this election process there might be some more progress made in the federal election in relation to this issue. Again, I congratulate the member on moving the motion.

The SPEAKER: Member for Schubert, I am sure you have something to say on this matter—anything to do with trains.

Mr VENNING (Schubert) (12:50): You amaze me, Madam Speaker. Your perception, again, is impeccable. This issue has been raised over many years. This is not a new concept. In fact, it was first raised with me when I was a member here in 1995-96 by a person under the name of Mr Ron Bannon—no relation to the former premier. Mr Bannon used to operate a Barossa

passenger train service. It was an entrepreneurial service; I think he used to use red hens. He did this in conjunction with other rail entrepreneurs, and it was very successful.

So, Mr Bannon came up with this idea many years ago and put up the concept. For those members who do not understand, the corridor that this is going to go in is largely all there. It is the old rail corridor. It leaves the main line at Tailem Bend, comes up through Apamurra, then to Cambrai and Sedan. This is an existing corridor, even the bridges are still there. It is just a matter of reopening it. I think even the rails are still there. Admittedly, the sleepers would have to be upgraded.

So, the corridor is there. As the member for Waite and the member for Davenport have said, the benefits for South Australia are obvious. You do not need to bring all this freight into Adelaide. I do not have the stats here, but a huge percentage of it is going past Adelaide. It is purely throughput, so why cart all this stuff into the city?

The big issue for me as the member for the Barossa is the entry point back onto the main line. This could be done—and this has been mentioned by the member for Davenport—via the line to Angaston, which has been covered over by a bike track, but it is not far away. It goes down to Nuriootpa, through that line; it could be linked onto that. There are only about 10 or 15 kilometres to put in there. A more popular option is to go around the top into Truro and come down. That is one of the options listed here. Another option is go to in through Eudunda, and there are existing corridors there too.

So, it is just a matter of putting all this together, because it can—and I think it should—happen. The corridors are already there. So, I commend the member for Davenport and I particularly commend the member for Waite for bringing this motion before us today. The benefits are obvious. He has taken this line from the residents in his electorate, residents in Adelaide; I am taking the line from the residents in my electorate. The residents of particularly Cambrai and Sedan would welcome this. They are lovely communities, and I am sure this would bring about their rebirth.

More importantly, in the future we are going to have to have two new deepsea ports in South Australia. We have already heard one being discussed north of Port Lincoln, which is going to have to happen—and it will happen—and one on our side of the gulf. Without a doubt I think that will be in the area north of Wallaroo. It is called Tickera or Myponie Point, whichever atlas you look at. That is an area where there is deep water, it is open space, it is a greenfield site, and it has railway lines not far away—or at least a corridor is there. The corridor links from Wallaroo through to Snowtown, and that corridor is still there.

We should never have taken up that railway line or stopped using it. It was not the government's fault. I blame the farmers' organisation, the SACBH, with which my family has always been connected. The railways did not upgrade the rail unloader at Wallaroo, so it became inefficient and they closed the railway line. They should never have done that; they should have upgraded that line, that service through the hills. They had some steep grades in there. They should have flattened those with a couple of D9s and kept the line there, and it would be a major line today, because Wallaroo was certainly a major port and still is.

I think the future of this rail service is not just for the quality of life of those living in eastern Adelaide, particularly in Waite and in Davenport, but it is also for the future of South Australia. I will be long gone and so will every other member of this place, but I am sure you will see in the future that Adelaide will not be the major port of South Australia. There will be a port to the north where there is plenty of room to link in this rail line, plenty of room to put an industrial area and plenty of room for a great port expansion, and we will have one on each side of the gulf.

I have always supported this concept. There have been many speeches made about this. I hope that the government will agree and support the member for Waite's motion. I agree that the federal report is severely lacking when you read it. They say that it cannot be justified. Well, heavens above! What price do you put on safety and peace and quality of mind?

Really, the port of Adelaide is going to get totally smothered. The congestion is bad there already, particularly now that we have the deep sea grain port there. Luckily—and I commend the government for putting in the loop line down there—it is going to be extremely efficient in relation to the turnaround of the grain trains and we are going to have a very good operation down there, but the whole area is going to be—

Mrs Geraghty: We get all the road traffic. It's terrible.

Mr VENNING: You do. As the member says, you get the road traffic but, hopefully when the system is working properly, madam, and the costs are proportioned accordingly, I think we will find that the farmers will be attracted to dropping their grain, say, at Roseworthy and it will be trained in on these special trains that do not even stop. They drive into Port Adelaide and they just automatically trigger it as they drive over the grid and they do not even stop. That is the way to do it. That is the way of the future. Likewise, it is the same with Tailem Bend in the south. That will be the same, where the farmers will leave their grain and there will be high-speed trains running from Tailem Bend and from Roseworthy to the port.

When the ships are coming onto the horizon there will not be enough grain actually held at the terminal, but the grain will be held at those two places and can be got in very quickly by this large, fast operating trains. This is the way of the future. We are all going to benefit from this. I hope the government will support this motion, because it is just common sense, and I think you might as well bite the bullet now and start planning. It is going to take a lot of time and a lot of money, but I think it is a step in the right direction. I commend the member for Waite.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher) (12:57): I will be very brief. I commend the member for Waite for bringing this motion before the house. I have always been suspicious of the whole consideration of this issue, as I do not believe that the federal authorities have really been serious about this. I think that they have put up a bit of a smokescreen to make it look as though they are doing something and then, lo and behold, come out and say that it is too difficult, too costly, to divert rail freight away from the Adelaide Hills. As the member for Schubert pointed out, the base is already there for an alternative rail route, and that could be and should be explored.

One of the problems at the moment is that you cannot double stack and triple stack the freight coming through because of the tunnels. If you want to modify the tunnels in the Adelaide Hills the cost would be enormous, so that is just one aspect. In regard to the squeal, I live three kilometres from this line. We do not suffer so much from the squeal. I quite like the sound of the diesels pulling the freight through the hills, but I sympathise with the people who live nearby who have to put up with the squeal, because it is quite penetrating and very unpleasant.

I think it is time that the federal government—and it has to be the federal government—and the Rail Track Corporation get fair dinkum with the people who live in the hills and with the community at large and come up with a proposal that is fair dinkum to divert rail freight traffic around the Adelaide Hills with a northern link, which would bring a lot of benefits to the people of South Australia as well as alleviate the torture of the people who live in the Adelaide Hills.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Pederick.

CLASSIFICATION (PUBLICATIONS, FILMS AND COMPUTER GAMES) (PARENTAL GUIDANCE) AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

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

POINT LOWLY DESALINATION PLANT

Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens): Presented a petition signed by 596 residents of South Australia requesting the house to urge the government to place a condition on the approval of BHP's Environment Impact Statement that BHP relocate the Point Lowly Desalination Plant to ensure it discharges into an oceanic environment.

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: I draw members' attention to the presence in the gallery of some year 6 students from Hallett Cove Primary School, who are guests of the member for Bright. Welcome. Also, we have some young year 6 and 7 students from Our Lady of Mount Carmel, who are guests of the Minister for Education. I say welcome to them also; it is nice to see you here.

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Minister for Infrastructure (Hon. P.F. Conlon)—

Land Management Corporation—Amended Charter

By the Minister for Health (Hon. J.D. Hill)—

Health Practitioner Regulation National Law Regulation

By the Minister for Gambling (Hon. A. Koutsantonis)—

Rules made under the following Acts—
Authorised Betting Operations—
No. 1 of 2010—Advertising
No. 2 of 2010—Responsible Gambling

PUBLISHING COMMITTEE

Mr BIGNELL (Mawson) (14:04): I bring up the report of the committee for the first session.

Report received and adopted.

CARNEGIE MELLON UNIVERSITY

Mr PISONI (Unley) (14:04): Point of order, Madam Chair: 103. On 1 July 2010, I asked the Premier a series of questions relating to Carnegie Mellon University's Adelaide campus. I asked the Premier to confirm whether there were fewer than 20 students enrolled at Carnegie Mellon for the 2010 mid-year enrolment and whether the two degrees offered at the remaining Carnegie Mellon University campus are accredited with Chinese Ministry of Education and Training. The Premier could not answer the questions but promised to report back to the house. Three weeks later, the questions remain unanswered. I ask whether you will now direct the Premier to provide those answers before the house rises today.

The SPEAKER: Under standing order No. 103, I do not have the authority to order the Premier to do that. However, it is up to the Premier whether he presents it by the end of today.

QUESTION TIME

DESALINATION PLANT

Mrs REDMOND (Heysen—Leader of the Opposition) (14:05): My question is to the Treasurer. Can the Treasurer confirm to the house that the total cost of the Adelaide desalination plant has now blown out by $400 million to at least $2.2 billion? The original announcement on 5 December 2007 was for a $1.1 billion 50 gigalitre per year desalination plant, plus a $304 million pipeline project connecting the Hope Valley and Happy Valley reservoirs, totalling $1.4 billion. A recent government briefing to the opposition confirms that the interconnecting of the northern and southern supply networks, an integral part of the desalination plant, will cost $403 million in addition to the announced $1.8 billion cost of the desalination plant, giving a total cost of $2.2 billion.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Port Adelaide—Deputy Premier, Treasurer, Minister for Federal/State Relations, Minister for Defence Industries) (14:06): Madam Speaker—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Well, the Minister for Water may have, but I am a joint shareholder of SA Water.

Mrs Redmond interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Treasurer will ignore interjections and answer the question.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: She is a clever person, isn't she? We will come back to the house with a detailed answer.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: The opposition clearly wants to direct all questions to me, and that is fine. That is my job; I am happy to take them, but it should not be surprising that I don't have at my fingertips the exact cost of the desalination plant.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Given my previous efforts to give an exact cost to the house, I would much rather take it on notice and give the member a considered answer although, given what she has said, she has already had that from her briefing.

GOVERNMENT ADVERTISING

Ms FOX (Bright) (14:07): Can the Premier tell the house the progress of his decision to cut government spending on advertising?

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Ramsay—Premier, Minister for Economic Development, Minister for Social Inclusion, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Sustainability and Climate Change) (14:07): I thank the honourable member for her interest.

Mr Pisoni interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, the member for Unley!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: We will talk about outrageous in a minute. One of the first acts I undertook as the Premier after being sworn in at Government House for this third term was to sign an order to cut government spending on advertising. It was clear to the government during the election campaign that taxpayers and, indeed, the media wanted to see far less money being spent on advertising. We have listened, and we are acting. I wanted it cut by millions of dollars but, of course, I did not intend to affect all of our essential advertising campaigns for issues such as road safety and bushfire warnings or even the recruitment of police and nurses, for example, because they will be calling for cuts to advertising—

Mr Williams interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, deputy leader!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: —but if you cut individual areas they will be opposing us, because that is what this opposition is about. It is about attacking everything, including our state. A suspension of government advertising was implemented, and new guidelines were developed by the Premier's Communications Advisory Group. All government advertising across the board was placed under review.

Central to the formulation of new guidelines was: where and what do we spend our advertising dollars on, and what do we get out of them? It was about determining whether the advertising was absolutely necessary. So, the communications advisory group had the task of determining where we could cut non-essential advertising and where we could cut back on what was deemed necessary but overdone. New guidelines for advertising were then issued to all ministers, chief executives and officers engaged in advertising for their departments.

I am pleased to inform the house today that, in the 12 weeks from the suspension to the end of the financial year, the cost of government advertising was cut by 15 per cent compared to the same period last year. Within this figure there has been a 30 per cent cut in the cost of functional advertising, that is, recruitment, tender and notices, and a 10 per cent cut in the cost of government information campaigns.

There we go: within this figure there has been a 30 per cent cut in the cost of functional advertising (that is, recruitment, tender and notices) and a 10 per cent cut in the cost of government information campaigns. I am informed that this equates to a saving of $1.6 million in the past 12 weeks alone.

If this figure is annualised and if the cuts remain in place over the next year, this will, I am advised, equate to a saving of $6.4 million compared to the previous year. So if that 12 weeks, to make this clear to the opposition, was turned into an annual figure, we are looking at a cut of $6.4 million to government advertising.

This is good progress in a relatively short time, and I will keep the house updated on how we are continuing to ensure that government advertising remains essential and is focused on delivering a clear outcome. I am pleased that, with the support of the media, with the support of the community and with the support of the opposition, we have made substantial cuts to government advertising, with more to come.

WATER PRICING

Mrs REDMOND (Heysen—Leader of the Opposition) (14:11): My question is again to the Treasurer. How much extra will South Australians have to pay for water now that the desalination plant will cost at least $2.2 billion and the government has failed to secure the $228 million in federal funding for the project? The Treasurer told radio on 11 March 2008 that because of the—at that stage, $1.4 billion—desalination plant, water prices would double within five years. We now know, however, that the cost has blown out to $2.2 billion (an increase of over $800 million) since the government announced that water prices would double within five years.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton—Minister for Environment and Conservation, Minister for the River Murray, Minister for Water) (14:12): What is it with you people?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P. CAICA: Madam Speaker, what I would like to start with is comments in respect of the first question asked by the Leader of the Opposition—

Mrs Redmond interjecting:

The Hon. P. CAICA: I will get there, Isobel, all right? Calm down—and, in particular, some of the rubbish that has gone on with respect to, amongst other things, the government attempting to be secretive and attempting to hide stuff and other issues that are related to the interconnector. Of course, what we have had over the last couple of months or so is several meetings that have included local councils. I could go through all these, but it would take me a significant period of time. Of course, we also heard on the radio the other day the member for Norwood in an interview with—well, it doesn't matter what radio station it was—

Mr WILLIAMS: Point of order, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER: There is a point of order. The deputy leader.

Mr WILLIAMS: There is no relevance in the answer the minister is giving to the question, which is about the price of water due to blowouts in the project.

The SPEAKER: I will see. It is very early in the answer to the question. I am sure that the minister will stick to the question.

The Hon. P. CAICA: There is far more relevance in what I am saying than the relevance of the question, Madam Speaker. What we have announced on numerous occasions, of course, is the government's intention to ensure that there is connectivity between north and south with respect to the water system—the distribution system that we have in place. It has been clear over a period of time that there was not sufficient connectivity between north and south. The desalination plant, of course, is to ensure that we are able to secure Adelaide's water supplies, and that we would be able to distribute that water across the entire system makes a lot of sense.

At the briefings that were held with the former deputy leader and the deputy leader, we put that very clearly to them. In addition to that, only last Tuesday we had a briefing of local members of parliament with respect to this particular program, and that included many from the opposition. So we are not, in fact, trying to hide anything. At that meeting it was not disclosed, but made very clear to them that there was $403 million that was going to be—

Mrs Redmond interjecting:

The Hon. P. CAICA: I will get to that, Isobel. You want a proper answer; you will get a proper answer.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. P. CAICA: No; they don't want a proper answer. Madam Speaker, it was made clear to them at that particular meeting, notwithstanding that the member for Norwood was on the radio that very same day saying that we were trying to hide something. I notice he has not come back to this matter yet, Madam Speaker. I know that his nickname here is 'the peacock', and with deference to others I would say, 'All feathers and no meat.'

Mr PISONI: I have a point of order, Madam Speaker. It is not parliamentary to refer to members of parliament as animals. I ask the minister to withdraw.

The SPEAKER: I thought you would have had a different point of order, actually. I was going to get you to direct the minister back to the question.

The Hon. P. CAICA: If the term 'peacock' offends, Madam Speaker; if the member for Unley is offended by that, I am happy to—

Mr PENGILLY: I have a point of order.

The SPEAKER: Member for Finniss, we haven't finished that point of order. You were explaining yourself, minister; I am sure you were going to withdraw the remark.

The Hon. P. CAICA: Yes, Madam Speaker. What I will say, referring back to the question, and given the knowledge that they have on that side—

The SPEAKER: I suggest you get on with your answer.

The Hon. P. CAICA: Certainly, Madam Speaker. The sum of $403 million is the cost of the—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! We have asked him to answer the question, so you will listen in silence.

The Hon. P. CAICA: The sum of $403 million is the cost to ensure the connection between north and south. The simple fact is that that is in addition to the $1.8 billion that has been allocated to the desal plant. I am further advised that that has been incorporated into the prices, about which we have been transparent over a significant period.

Mrs Redmond interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, the leader!

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. P. CAICA: I don't need protection—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. P. CAICA: A bit of courtesy, that's right. Madam Speaker, that has been incorporated into the prices. In addition, the opposition leader made some comment about the commitment of the federal government with respect to the $228 million. That commitment still exists, and that has been built into the prices as well.

WATER PRICING

Mrs REDMOND (Heysen—Leader of the Opposition) (14:17): I have a supplementary question. Will the minister confirm that we are actually going to get the $228 million? My understanding is that the federal government has said it will only supply $228 million if we reduce our take from the River Murray; and there is no intention on the part of this government to use the desal plant to reduce the take on the River Murray for some 20 years or more.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton—Minister for Environment and Conservation, Minister for the River Murray, Minister for Water) (14:18): In order to assist the deputy leader, that is not quite based in fact. Sorry: the former deputy leader for a few hours; there are so many of them over there. There is no threat to the $228 million. It was not about reducing our draw, as was intimated by the Leader of the Opposition. It was about reducing our reliance on the River Murray. We have had very productive discussions with the commonwealth. There is no doubt that this matter will be resolved, and it is included within the prices, about which we have been transparent.

TOUR DOWN UNDER

Mr SIBBONS (Mitchell) (14:18): Will the Premier provide the house with an update on preparations for the 2011 Santos Tour Down Under?

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Ramsay—Premier, Minister for Economic Development, Minister for Social Inclusion, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Sustainability and Climate

Change) (14:19): I am very pleased to have had this most timely question. I met with Hitaf Rasheed yesterday for a briefing on the preparations. She has just returned from being at the start of the Tour de France and talking with the president of the UCI and others who are intimately associated with the Santos Tour Down Under. The preparations for 2011 are in full swing. Earlier this month I announced the race routes for the 2011 UCI Pro Tour event, which will head east of the River Murray for the first time, with a stage from Tailem Bend to Mannum.

Honourable members: Hear, hear!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: And thank you for that support. It is going to be terrific. The 2011 event will once again start with the Cancer Council Classic. Obviously, the members who have been here today promoting the great work of the Cancer Council Classic would also be pleased about the association between the Cancer Council and the Tour Down Under and, of course, with the associations that we also have with LIVESTRONG.

The Cancer Council Classic around Rymill Park will be on Sunday 16 January and will finish with the Adelaide City Council street circuit on Sunday 23 January. On the five race days between these dates, the tour will wind its way through some of the most picturesque areas of our state, with these images beamed into homes around the world.

Supporters of the Tour de France are, of course, well aware of how powerful television pictures can be in showcasing beautiful countryside, particularly in recent days as the Tour de France has been going through the Pyrenees; and, of course, we look forward to treating viewers worldwide to visions of the Adelaide Hills, the Barossa, McLaren Vale, the Fleurieu Peninsula and other very beautiful parts of our state, including, of course, our city in a park.

Tailem Bend, on the banks of the River Murray, will host its first ever race start, joining Mawson Lakes, Unley, Norwood and McLaren Vale as hosts of next year's stage starts. Communities hosting stage finishes in 2011 will be Angaston, Mannum, Stirling, Strathalbyn and Willunga. I want to acknowledge the member for Mawson, who has been, of course, a very keen protagonist of the Tour Down Under. I know that Willunga has been one of the features of every Tour Down Under, and I understand that huge celebrations are being planned in each town.

We look forward to the race returning in future years to regions such as the Clare Valley, which put on an outstanding display in this year's Santos Tour Down Under. I know that the member for Frome was very keen to have a stage start in the Clare Valley, which we are pleased to have done. I think that the township of Clare put on a great show, as did the valley.

This year's public ride, the Mutual Community Challenge Tour—which I hope that members around the chamber will join me in—features four distance options, all finishing in Strathalbyn, and early bird registrations close on 31 July. I waved off a record turnout of 8,099 riders in this year's public ride, and we are hopeful of an even stronger turnout in 2011. I just advise members that there are various distances which they can ride.

The highlight of next year's race will once again be the Skoda King of the Mountain duel on Old Willunga Hill, part of the Jayco stage 5 circuit from McLaren Vale to Willunga. Tour de France champion Alberto Contador won the stage in the 2005 Tour Down Under—a two-time winner of the Tour de France who is obviously the favourite this year, along with Andy Schleck—after coming back from a brain haemorrhage and brain surgery. He said about Willunga Hill, and this is after winning the Tour de France:

> This was the most important victory of my life and it thrilled me the most.

That is when he was asked whether winning the Tour de France was his greatest achievement, so I am told. This demonstrates the high esteem in which our event is held. Cyclists and team managers who come to South Australia for the tour often comment on how highly—

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Yes; it is a shame it could not get Pro Tour status. That is testament, of course, to the outstanding leadership and organisation of the Santos Tour Down Under from the team at Events South Australia under the leadership of Mike Turtur and Hitaf Rasheed.

The Santos Tour Down Under has repeatedly broken virtually every record for a sporting event here in South Australia, especially since achieving UCI Pro Tour status.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Okay; someone doubts that. Who is the brilliant person who doubts that there has been a difference? Okay. This year's event attracted crowds of 770,500, more than double the turnout before we achieved Pro Tour status, and brought 39,700 visitors specifically to the event, compared to 10,500 in 2007. Each year, we endeavour to attract the very best cyclists to compete at the Santos Tour Down Under, and let me just say that 2011 will not be disappointing. We have ongoing discussions with the leading teams and cyclists and work hard to attract the strongest line-up of riders.

I want to pay tribute to Stuart O'Grady who is a great ambassador for the race, and we know he speaks highly of our race to his teammates. Of course, negotiations are also continuing with one of the world's best known cycling names, Lance Armstrong. Obviously, we would love to have him back in South Australia in 2011, not only for the Santos Tour Down Under but also to inspect progress on the new $27 million Flinders Centre for Innovation in Cancer, incorporating the LIVESTRONG Cancer Research Centre. Construction work on the LIVESTRONG Research Centre will start next month and will be completed towards the end of 2011. I am delighted that this investment has opened up a new relationship between Flinders University, the Flinders Medical Centre and the FMC Foundation, and LIVESTRONG, Lance Armstrong's cancer foundation.

I understand that the first ever cancer survivorship conference being held at Flinders University on 11 September this year will include a live link with the team at LIVESTRONG in Austin Texas. The new centre will be a lasting legacy of Lance Armstrong's passion for helping cancer survivors and will provide a world-class home to more than 100 of Australia's leading cancer researchers. The centre will have a global importance in research on cancer prevention, early detection and innovative treatments. It is interesting that some members who are yelling out abuse about this—

The Hon. J.D. Hill: The member for Bragg.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: The member for Bragg. It is a shame that, given what I would have hoped today would have been support for the Cancer Council and the work that is being done, we would have comments as nasty as that. I want to thank the honourable member for the question, and I am very pleased to say that I think that 2011 will be the best yet.

WATER PRICING

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:27): My question is to the Treasurer. Will the Treasurer confirm that the operating cost for the Port Stanvac desalination plant has escalated by $25 million per year for each of the next 20 years; and can he inform the house what impact this will have on South Australian water prices? Last year the parliament was informed that the cost of energy, operation and maintenance for the desalination plant would be $105 million per year. The government tenders website reveals that an energy, maintenance and operational contract was executed on 16 February this year at an annual cost of $130 million per year for the next 20 years, an increase of $25 million per year.

The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton—Minister for Environment and Conservation, Minister for the River Murray, Minister for Water) (14:27): I thank the honourable member for his question. I do not have those specific details in front of me. What I will do is get back to the house with a specific answer to that question.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There will be no quarrels across the floor, thank you; go outside.

POLITICAL FUNDRAISING

Ms FOX (Bright) (14:28): My question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. Can the minister advise the house if he is concerned about any emails to staff in his office seeking their participation in political fundraising?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Elder—Minister for Transport, Minister for Infrastructure, Minister for Energy) (14:29): I am concerned on a number of levels about an email one of my ministerial staff received just yesterday, and I will read it to the house. It says:

David would like me to let you know about Luke Westley's Business Luncheon on Thursday 29 July at the Hilton Hotel. Luke is the Liberal Candidate for the Federal Seat of Adelaide. Luke will be speaking, as well as—

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: No, I will get to the point in a moment. We don't mind you fundraising. I note your leader thinks it shouldn't be done; it is a bit grubby. Business fundraising shouldn't be done, a bit grubby. Let me go on:

> Luke will be speaking, as well as the State Leader, Isobel Redmond—

that's the one who doesn't like business fundraising—

> and the Shadow Minister for Education and Federal Member for Sturt, the Hon. Christopher Pyne MP.

My real concern is that this was sent to my office by the trainee in the Unley electorate office. I have a number of concerns. Firstly, I am a little concerned that the Liberal Party fundraising is going so badly that they are trying to get Labor staffers to go. I did say to him, 'You know, it is your choice. It would not be a good one, but it is your choice.' Apparently, however, he did not want to spend $150 to listen to Isabel Redmond and Christopher Pine, even together.

Mr WILLIAMS: On a point of order: I have been listening patiently to the answer to the question, and I fail to understand what responsibility the minister has to the house for this matter.

The SPEAKER: I will let the Minister for Transport go on a little bit longer and see.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: For the benefit of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition—and isn't he getting a bit stale in the job? He has been at it for a while, one of the longest serving ones, and I am just getting a bit stale with him. I reckon it is time for a new face. But for his benefit—

Mr WILLIAMS: On a point of order, Madam Speaker: you gave the minister an opportunity to explain to the house what relevance it had to his portfolio and I think he has failed miserably. I ask that you rule that we move on.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: May I?

The SPEAKER: Well, yes, very quickly.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I do not want improper emails in breach of the code of conduct for public servants being sent to my ministerial office. I do have responsibility for my ministerial office and, for the benefit of the deputy leader, he of the high standards in fundraising, and for the member for Unley, who does like pointing out that I am a constituent, I would prefer that his electorate staff work on electorate matters, not on his selfish fundraising—as a constituent.

Mr PENGILLY: On a point of order: the minister is clearly engaging in debate, not answering the question.

The SPEAKER: No, I do not uphold that point of order. He has actually now got to the point.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: For the benefit of the member for Unley—and let's all be fair; we are in politics. We do have some staff who are members of our parties and who are enthusiastic, but requiring trainees to participate—really! Where are the standards? Let me explain. There is a guide for ministerial and electorate offices, and can I assure members of the house that trainees, we are told, are to be treated the same as public servants in electorate offices. It states:

> For example, no public servant can be required to participate in political activities like doorknocking as part of their employment.

I would have thought that fundraising is probably even a little more icky. We get a load of stuff from this bloke. Whenever there is something about a standard, you can always find the member for Unley. When it was dodgy documents, he found them. He handed the exploding cigar to Martin Hamilton-Smith. He said, 'Here you go, have a go at this.' And Martin Hamilton-Smith sits behind him now. I don't get it, but that's their standards. I would say, before they make noise about standards, that perhaps the Leader of the Opposition could have a quiet word with the member for Unley and ask him not to require trainees to do this sort of thing.

HEALTH CARE

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (14:33): My question is for the Minister for Health. What is the total combined budget overrun for the health regions in South Australia for the 2009-10 financial year? The opposition has been advised that blowouts for the former and current health regions total more than $300 million, that is, $200 million for the Central Northern Adelaide

Health; $60 million for the Southern Adelaide Health; $35 million for Country Health; and $15 million for the Children, Youth and Women's Health.

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Kaurna—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Southern Suburbs, Minister Assisting the Premier in the Arts) (14:34): I am happy to provide that information to the member when it has been provided to me.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Reynell.

ADELAIDE FESTIVAL OF ARTS

Ms THOMPSON (Reynell) (14:34): My question is to the Minister Assisting the Premier in the Arts. Minister, what was the economic impact of the 2010 Adelaide Festival of Arts?

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Kaurna—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Southern Suburbs, Minister Assisting the Premier in the Arts) (14:35): I do indeed.

Mr Williams: You're really across the important things. A $400 million blowout in your department and you don't know about it.

The Hon. J.D. HILL: Look, if you'd like to ask me another question about the health portfolio, deputy leader, then go ahead. I was asked a straight question—was it true that a certain set of figures were the case—and I said that when I have the information I will provide it to you. It is a reasonable thing, I would have thought. If you have other questions, deputy leader, please ask away. I am very comfortable to talk about our record in health funding, as I am in relation to the arts.

The SPEAKER: Could you answer the question, please, minister?

The Hon. J.D. HILL: I was inadvertently distracted by interjections on the other side. They're naughty people, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER: You're naughty to respond, minister.

The Hon. J.D. HILL: The Adelaide Festival of Arts celebrated, as members would know, its 50th anniversary in 2010, and the state government provided once-off additional funding of $1.775 million to the Festival Corporation to allow it to mark this very special occasion. These additional funds allowed the Festival to provide a free opening weekend spectacular family event at Victoria Park to reprise and adapt the *Northern Lights* initiative that saw our beautiful public buildings in North Terrace illuminated and to present an enhanced Indigenous dance and music program.

Artistic Director Paul Grabowsky and the Adelaide Festival team, led by Kate Gould, who is an excellent public servant, brought together an impressive program of opera, theatre, music, dance, literature and visual arts that attracted huge audiences. The economic impact survey of the 2010 Festival reveals that there were an estimated 66,000 ticketed attendances and 600,000 attendances at non-ticketed events. An amazing 70,000 people attended a sensational opening weekend pyrotechnic performance called *A Little More Light*.

The total attendance of 666,000 for all events was up from 458,000 in 2008, so there was a massive increase in people participating in the Festival of Arts. The survey gauged total visitor numbers to Adelaide for the Festival as 13,662, slightly up from the 13,602 in 2008. Based on face-to-face interviews with these overseas, interstate and intrastate visitors, the survey calculated that the overall economic impact to our city and to our state was $13.645 million. *Northern Lights* proved to be the most popular special event for the group, with 73 per cent of those interviewed indicating that they had attended it. WOMADelaide was the most attended music event (23 per cent) and Circus Oz was the main family event attended with 10 per cent attending that.

Thirty per cent of surveyed Festival visitors indicated that they were staying in Adelaide for more than seven days and 77 per cent indicated that they were not staying any nights elsewhere in Australia on this visit. For the majority of respondents (54 per cent), attending Adelaide Festival performances was the main reason for visiting South Australia. According to Festival patrons, an

overwhelming majority of 92 per cent indicated that they were likely to attend the Adelaide Festival in the future; 92 per cent said that they were likely to come back.

The main purpose of a festival, of course, is to entertain, to thrill, to challenge, to delight and to encourage us to reflect on the world in different ways, and the 50th anniversary Adelaide Festival certainly did that. I think members will agree with me that the 2010 Adelaide Festival was an artistic success and a fitting 50th anniversary celebration, particularly through its inclusion of a range of impressive Indigenous performances and exhibitions, the inaugural Adelaide International exhibition that was developed in collaboration with five of Adelaide's contemporary arts organisations, and the successful extension of WOMADelaide to a four-day format.

The Adelaide Festival, coupled with the Adelaide Fringe's 705 events and $35.1 million in estimated ticket, entertainment and accommodation expenditure, shows the significant cultural and economic benefit of these festivals to South Australia. While many did not believe making our much-loved WOMADelaide and Fringe festivals annual events would work, both have continued to grow in size and popularity and have only boosted our identity as the Festival State.

I am looking forward to the Adelaide Festival going annual from 2012 and all the cultural and economic benefits from this that will flow to our state. I congratulate everybody involved in the fabulous Festival, particularly Paul Grabowsky and his team but also those who worked on it in a variety of ways both as paid staff and volunteers and, of course, the sponsors who helped make it such a great success.

HEALTH DEPARTMENT

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (14:40): My question is again to the Minister for Health, and I will probably get the same answer. What is the budget blowout in the Department of Health's central office?

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Kaurna—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Southern Suburbs, Minister Assisting the Premier in the Arts) (14:40): If this were a court of law, the question would be ruled out of order. The question—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.D. HILL: —contains argument within it. The member for Morphett is making an assumption and, on the basis of an assumption that is unproved, he is then asking a question. I have said to the member for Morphett that we will get for him the arrangements for all of the divisions within the health portfolio—they, of course, are presented to the parliament as a matter of course through the budget process—and he can ask questions about them during estimates. The fact is that, as all members would know, all health services in Australia are under enormous pressure because of a range of factors. Those factors include the continuing growth in the number of people—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.D. HILL: The pressures on the health portfolio right across Australia and, indeed, internationally are based on a range of factors, in particular, the ageing of our population and the concurrent burden of disease that is associated with this. There is also, of course, enormous pressure—

Mr Williams interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Deputy leader, it is not your chance to ask a question.

The Hon. J.D. HILL: All I would say to members opposite is that I am happy to answer your questions, but I can only do them one at a time. The point is that we have an excellent health service in our state, which performs extraordinarily well under very difficult circumstances. It would be nice if it always came in on budget, but it didn't do it when you were in office and I am afraid it doesn't always do it when we are in office. That is the reality of a health service when you provide services to people who walk through the door and you don't limit those services once you have spent the money that has been provided to you. You have to keep spending money when people come in sick: that is the reality of it.

CONTAINER DEPOSIT LEGISLATION

Mr PICCOLO (Light) (14:43): My question is to the Minister for Environment and Conservation. Can the minister advise the house how successful the South Australian container deposit legislation has been since the doubling of the container deposit refund in 2008?

The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton—Minister for Environment and Conservation, Minister for the River Murray, Minister for Water) (14:43): I thank the honourable member for his question, and I acknowledge his commitment to resource recovery. For more than 30 years South Australia's container deposit legislation has played a significant role in diverting waste from landfill and keeping beverage containers out of the litter stream. The container deposit legislation throughout its history has placed South Australia at the forefront of recycling in this country. In 2006, the scheme was declared a heritage icon by the National Trust of South Australia in recognition of the role it has played in contributing to South Australia's cultural identity.

In 2008, the Rann government doubled the refund for beverage containers from 5¢ to 10¢ to provide a greater incentive for people to recycle and further reduce waste going to landfill. Today, I am very pleased to inform members that recent figures show return rates of beverage containers have jumped markedly since the government increased the refund amount in 2008. Since the refund increase, the return rate for beverage containers has increased by 14.6 per cent, which means that the total return rate for all beverage containers has reached 80 per cent for the first time in the history of the scheme.

Over the past 22 months, more than 1.1 billion beverage containers have been returned to recycling depots, representing approximately $112 million going back to the South Australian community. This also represents approximately 91,300 tonnes of beverage containers that may have otherwise ended up in landfill or in the litter stream.

KESAB, another very good South Australian organisation, conducts regular litter surveys in South Australia, and its most recent report of May 2010 shows that the number of CDL containers in the litter stream has reduced by approximately half compared with levels prior to the refund increase. Furthermore, the litter rates are nearly four times lower than they were in May 2003 when the container deposit legislation was expanded by the Rann government to include other types of containers, such as flavoured milks and fruit juices.

The CDL scheme has also become a unique way for local community groups, sporting and recreation clubs and local charities to raise extra funds and engage the broader community. Indeed, I recently had the pleasure of attending the CanDo4Kids charity launch along with the honourable leader of the opposition, who I know recognises the great benefits that the scheme brings to our state.

Our CDL scheme is one of the most successful recycling schemes in Australia, and I am very pleased that the Northern Territory government has recently indicated its intention to implement a container deposit legislation scheme next year, based on the South Australian scheme. South Australia has shown outstanding leadership to the rest of Australia with respect to our container deposit legislation.

We will continue to raise this at the federal level so that other states can indeed learn from the evidence that we are able to provide about what a success this scheme is. The success of the container deposit scheme is undisputable. Not only has it benefited the environment through diverting waste from landfill and the litter stream, it has also made a considerable contribution to the success of community initiatives right around our state.

BUDGET ALLOCATIONS

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (14:46): My question is to the Treasurer. Since the 20 March state election, has the government approved extra appropriations to cover significant overspends in the Department of Health and the Department for Families and Communities and, if so, what is the extra appropriation for each of those two departments? A document leaked to the opposition shows that cabinet was asked to approve about $400 million to cover the balance of the 2009-10 year and in the forward estimate periods out to 2013-14. That $400 million was for health and it was more than $150 million over the same period for the Department for Families and Communities.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Port Adelaide—Deputy Premier, Treasurer, Minister for Federal/State Relations, Minister for Defence Industries) (14:47): I have made no secret—you did not need a leaked document or something to ask me about this.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: 'The minister must have been asleep,' says the wizard from Bragg over there. I have said repeatedly, and I am sure the minister has said repeatedly, that the single biggest challenge confronting state governments, confronting national governments and confronting the Western world is the rapid increase in health costs. Health inflation is running at between 9 per cent and 11 per cent. It is a factor of technology, a factor of living longer, a factor of new drugs and the fact that we are providing health services to people much later in their lives. It is a massive cost.

We, like the previous Liberal government, have not been able to sufficiently restrain the demand on our system to meet the budget allocations that we have provided for. There is a distinct difference between the way we manage our budget and the way that sloppy mob over there used to manage health. What the opposition would do is that if they were to have a cost overrun, which they did, they would fund it at the end of that financial year and make no provision for it in the out years, almost hoping that a miracle would occur and that the 9 per cent inflation, or whatever it was, would evaporate and they could keep within the budget the next year. But it did not: the bubble just kept rolling through, and the next year there was the overrun plus the previous year's overrun to fund. When we came into office we had to reverse that practice. So, in recent budgets—

Mr Marshall: Didn't you just have an overrun last year?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Yes.

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There is one question already on the board. The Treasurer will continue.

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Norwood, be quiet! The minister will finish his question.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: You think you are impressing your colleagues. I think they think you are a goose, interjecting all the time. Just try to pick the moment.

Mr Marshall: I reckon I'd have more friends on my side than you have on yours.

The SPEAKER: Member for Norwood, I warn you!

Members interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I tell you what: if you think you have got friends over that side, you are annoying the hell out of them.

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Listen to it!

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Madam Speaker, what we have done when we have had an overrun in health is project that overrun in terms of demand for services into the forward estimates. That is prudent budget management. But if members opposite are saying that we should slash our health budget to the level at which that overrun has occurred, that would mean turning people away at the emergency—

Mr WILLIAMS: I have a point of order, Madam Speaker. The minister is now debating the answer. He has given us the answer and now he is entering into a debate.

The SPEAKER: The member for Bragg.

DISABILITY EQUIPMENT

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg) (14:50): My question is to the Minister for Disability.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Members on my right will behave also.

Ms CHAPMAN: Why has the government failed to deliver any one of its five promises to clear the disability equipment waiting lists? On 5 March 2010 the Premier announced, 'A re-elected Rann Labor government will inject an immediate $7.7 million to clear waiting lists for equipment for

South Australian children and adults with a disability.' The government previously made the same promise (to clear the disability equipment waiting lists) in June 2004, in December 2004, in 2007 and in 2008 and, each time, failed to deliver.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Families and Communities, Minister for Housing, Minister for Ageing, Minister for Disability) (14:52): Yes, we did make that commitment during the election campaign, and we are working towards clearing—

Ms Chapman: Working towards?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: Well, we are not talking about buying packets of bandaids here.

Ms Chapman: Working towards?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: Well, let's compare the state Labor government's commitment to the provision of disability services in this state to that of the previous government and its election commitments. Since being in government, we have increased disability funding by in excess of 80 per cent of what the opposition was putting into disability services. Ask anyone in the disability sector—ask David Holst, and he will tell you families in South Australia know they get a better deal out of this Labor government than they ever got out of the Liberal government and are ever likely to get out of any Liberal government in the future.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I can't hear the minister. There is too much noise.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: During the last election campaign we made a number of significant commitments in relation to disability services. The Liberal opposition made a commitment of $10 million over four years—a lousy $10 million over four years. I would be embarrassed if I were the member for Bragg to come in here and try to compare what they were committing for disability services and what we are providing for people here in South Australia. Your lousy—

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Norwood!

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Norwood, I warn you again. The member for Norwood is warned again—the second time.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: Your lousy $2 million would not have touched the sides of the priority one waiting list. It would not have touched the sides. You are a disgrace, and the disability sector knows it.

Ms CHAPMAN: I have a supplementary question, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER: I will listen carefully to your supplementary.

Ms CHAPMAN: What part of 'immediate' didn't you understand?

The SPEAKER: There is a point of order. Minister for Transport.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: It is not a question. It is plainly out of order. It is debate.

The SPEAKER: I think we will ignore that supplementary question.

The Hon. P.F. Conlon interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister for Transport will be quiet.

CAPITAL WORKS PROJECTS

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (14:55): Will the Treasurer guarantee to the house that all capital works projects announced as part of the 2010 state election campaign and in the Mid-Year Budget review will proceed in the time frame announced for each project? The opposition has been advised that, as part of the increased savings task approved by cabinet, one strategy outlined in the submission was to delay project time lines to create savings in the forward estimates period.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Port Adelaide—Deputy Premier, Treasurer, Minister for Federal/State Relations, Minister for Defence Industries) (14:55): Tragically, I cannot

guarantee that, because the Adelaide Oval is in it; I wish it would get up but I cannot guarantee it. That has been the subject of much debate in recent weeks—so that is one project in particular. The problem facing our state government is no different from any other state government.

The Hon. I.F. Evans interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Eight budgets: seven AAA credit ratings. That is something you never achieved.

The Hon. I.F. Evans interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Just thank the fact that you had a very sloppy treasurer in Rob Lucas, who could not get the budget into surplus. The problem with state governments is not the capital side of the budget. In fact, the capital side of the budget under this government has grown to four or five times what it was when we came into office. What occurred when we came into office is that we were spending less capital than what was a depreciation requirement on the state's balance sheet. We were under-investing in capital in net terms. We were not keeping up with the need to—

Mr Williams interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Madam Speaker, as I said earlier, you can be critical of me on a number of fronts—we all make mistakes—but when it comes to budget management this government has a stellar record. That is not our government saying that with self-adulation: the rating agencies are saying that. The rating agencies repeatedly comment on that.

In terms of the capital profile of the state going forward, we remain committed to our projects. Obviously, there are issues with timing in any capital project. There is slippage in capital projects and there is reprofiling of capital projects. That occurs in the natural course of every budget, but the critical issue for our budget and for any state government's budget and state treasurer is the recurrent expenditure and recurrent outlays of government; that is, the insatiable demand for services in our community and the limited capacity for us to meet those demands.

Mr WILLIAMS: I have a point of order. The question was about the capital expenditure in the budget. I think the Treasurer has already answered it: that he will not guarantee that he will meet the promises he made only a couple of months ago.

The SPEAKER: Order! I almost uphold that point of order. Treasurer, I suggest that you wind up quickly.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I wind up by saying that is a total misrepresentation of what I just said.

Mr Williams interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: And one way we may not do it is because you get your way and destroy the Adelaide Oval project. Make no mistake, Madam Speaker; if football does not come back into the city; if Adelaide Oval is not redeveloped into one of the great inner city grandstands in this nation, it will lie at the feet of the Liberal opposition. It will be mission accomplished by Iain Evans and Isobel Redmond—mission accomplished by Iain Evans and Isobel Redmond. Make no mistake, the Liberal Party is on a charge, on a mission—

Mr WILLIAMS: I have a point of order. I fail to see the connection between this and the capital budget.

The SPEAKER: I uphold that point of order. The member for Davenport.

STATE SAVINGS TARGET

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (14:59): My question—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister for Industry and Trade will be quiet. The member for Davenport.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Thank you, Madam Speaker. My question is to the Treasurer. In the April cabinet submission that dealt with the new $1.3 billion savings measure, did the cabinet submission suggest that the reason that the cabinet had to agree to the new $1.3 billion savings measure was that, without this new savings target, the state's AAA credit rating could be at risk?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Port Adelaide—Deputy Premier, Treasurer, Minister for Federal/State Relations, Minister for Defence Industries) (15:00): There is no doubt, if we do not achieve the required savings necessary to sustain our budget going forward, we will lose our AAA credit rating. That is obvious. But what we should also take into account is that the April cabinet meeting did set a number of targets in terms of what the situation was as at 6 April. What was required, as I said yesterday, was—

Mr Williams interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Yes. The worst day in government is always better than the best day in opposition.

Mr Williams interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: After 8½ years and another 3½ ahead of you!

The Hon. P.F. Conlon interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Minimum, 7½. The savings requirement has not been decided and will not be decided until such time as I formulate the final draft of the budget. That is, as I said yesterday, the parameters that were mentioned in that budget submission of 6 April will vary and have varied, and I said yesterday that there are inputs and outputs. By that I mean that there is more revenue or less revenue, there is more expenditure or less expenditure, and the mix means that we deal with the scenario and the situation when we come to frame the budget. The inference yesterday of some $2 billion worth, I assume, of recurrent expenditure cuts on a yearly basis is a nonsense figure. What the quantum is—

The Hon. I.F. Evans interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Are what?

The Hon. I.F. Evans interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. I.F. Evans interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Qualified what?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Yes, well, Madam Speaker, the $2 billion figure that the Leader of the Opposition interjected with yesterday is a nonsense figure. The quantum of savings in aggregate terms over the four-year forward estimate period will be a figure determined ultimately by what is required in the budget.

Mrs Redmond interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: In what sense?

Mrs Redmond interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Treasurer will continue with his answer. We have still got a question to go, and we have only three minutes left.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I'm not the sharpest tool?

An honourable member: That's right.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Madam Speaker, the $1.3 billion figure—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: —the leader mentions, in aggregate terms over the forward estimates, is a figure that does not necessarily have relevance now as we formulate the budget.

Mr Pisoni interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Unley will stop displaying material in the chamber. Member for Unley, you will put that material away.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: The savings target is a significant ask of government, and it will be a significant task for us to meet the savings needs of this budget across the forward estimates. This is not new. We had a commitment for over $900 million in our first and subsequent budgets throughout the term of this government. We have had significant savings required. There are still savings from previous budgets that have not yet been achieved, and they will be incorporated in this mix. But the actual numbers and the parameters set on 6 April were the parameters as they were at that point. The parameters when we come to finalise the budget some three months later will be vastly different. That is the nature of framing a budget. So, in terms of the quantum of savings, you will need to wait until you see the budget.

ADELAIDE OVAL

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (15:05): I do have one last question to round out the session before the budget, and it will be of no surprise that it is to the Treasurer. Is the Treasurer's reason for saying in the media yesterday that the Liberals inner-city stadium would cost $1.2 billion when the Stadium Management Authority and the government's own officers had documents prior to the state election showing that an Etihad Stadium, with a roof, just like the Liberals promised could be built at February 2010 costs for $635 million because the Treasurer was briefed on this before the election but decided not to tell anyone; or because the Treasurer was briefed before the election but told no-one and then forgot; or because, on the soul of his grandmother's grave, the Treasurer had not received that advice; or because the Treasurer was not told in any way, shape or form of this before the election; or because it was a preliminary estimate and could not be relied upon; or because at the meeting where the stadium was discussed everyone decided not to talk about costs due to caretaker conventions; or because the Treasurer did not know because the Premier put minister Conlon in charge of the project; or is there some other reason?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Port Adelaide—Deputy Premier, Treasurer, Minister for Federal/State Relations, Minister for Defence Industries) (15:06): As I said, Madam Speaker, your worst day in government is much better than your best day in opposition, I can assure you of that.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Madam Speaker, I am quite happy to answer this. What has been lost in this debate is that the opposition has never, ever, ever had to verify their claims about what it would cost to build an inner-city stadium. We have never seen their costings. I do recall a conversation I had recently with Andrew Demetriou when talking about the Telstra Dome and, from memory, Andrew said that Ian Collins, the head of Telstra Dome, had mentioned that to build the Telstra Dome today you would be looking at $1 billion to $1.2 billion. What is more, with a covered stadium at Telstra Dome with 44 matches a year, they find it difficult to make an operating profit because of the cost of those stadiums to operate. We somehow with 22 games would do it better and make it work.

The other point that was made to me was that the cost of resurfacing Telstra Dome each and every year is in the $1.5 million to $2 million range, and any footballer whom I have spoken to has always been critical about the playing surface of Telstra Dome, given the problems with the roof. The truth of the matter is no-one believes you can build a stadium for the cost that members opposite said, but that gets lost in this debate—and that is the nature of politics.

I have to carry the burden of Adelaide Oval, an initiative that was widely popular both in my party and in the wider community at the time of the announcement. I still believe it is widely popular in the broader community—I am not necessarily certain about my party—but the thing is that, in the lead-up to the state election, it was considered a very, very positive move. Ultimately, if the opposition is serious about ensuring the survival of our two AFL clubs and the growth of our two AFL clubs; if they are serious about revitalising and rejuvenating the CBD of this state; if they are serious about supporting the development of an exciting precinct along the Torrens, well then, drop your opposition, drop your attacks, stop your undermining of the project and allow it to happen. Mark my words.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Mark my words. If the opposition succeeds in destroying this project, it will be your fault and your fault. Everyone will know—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Everyone will know who destroyed this project: the member for Davenport and the Leader of the Opposition.

RURAL DOCTORS

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Kaurna—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Southern Suburbs, Minister Assisting the Premier in the Arts) (15:10): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.D. HILL: In February 2010, agreement was reached between the Rural Doctors Association of South Australia and Country Health SA on a new deal for rural general practitioners who provide medical services in public hospitals across country South Australia. At the time, I understand the Rural Doctors Association said in a press release that the deal is 'currently the best statewide agreement across Australia for rural GPs'. The new terms will provide consistency in the engagement of rural general practitioners and, over time, we will see a move away from a few existing locally-negotiated arrangements.

Copies of the new terms were sent by Country Health SA to the 412 rural general practitioners and registrars in South Australia, along with an invitation to enter into a formal agreement under the new terms. By 1 July 2010, 317 rural practitioners (77 per cent) had signed up to the invitation to enter into a formal agreement. Doctors can still sign up but will no longer be eligible for back pay from 1 January this year under the new conditions.

Once a doctor has signed up to an intention to accept these new terms, the finer details pertaining to their specific circumstances are negotiated. Members would appreciate, I think, that, while the rates are consistent, the mix of services and the number of general practitioners varies from location to location across rural South Australia and the contracts, of course, need to reflect those local variations. In most cases, the negotiations have proceeded smoothly.

Of the 95 doctors (23 per cent) who have not signed up, 77 are currently on existing contracts. These are generally doctors at the largest country sites; 19 doctors at various Whyalla practices covered by the Upper Spencer Gulf agreement, and doctors at Mount Barker, Port Pirie, Port Augusta and also the South Coast Hospital locum arrangement. When some of these contracts come up for renewal, the opportunity will arise for them to move on to the new agreement. This figure also includes doctors in the Riverland and Gawler, which offer a different model. That is a 24-hour service rather than on-call service. However, Mount Gambier Hospital is not included in these numbers as the hospital already has an in-house service provided by salaried doctors.

There are also eight registrars who have not signed up because their supervisors are amongst those who have not signed up to the new agreement. This leaves 10 doctors who have not signed up to an accident and emergency contract with Country Health SA. Nine of these doctors are at Millicent. Currently, Millicent general practitioners are not prepared to perform full-time emergency, on-call and inpatient services for the rates agreed to by the Rural Doctors Association of South Australia and Country Health SA in the recently negotiated on-call payment schedule. As a result, the doctors are only providing services for approximately 16 days out of the month, usually on weekends and days preceding or following a weekend.

Country Health SA representatives have been negotiating in good faith with the general practitioners in an attempt to resolve the issues. However, no more money will be paid beyond that recently negotiated with the Rural Doctors Association of South Australia. The new agreement represents a new, fairer and more transparent system for which the Rural Doctors Association, the peak representative body, has been lobbying.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

FOOD LABELLING

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (15:14): This grieve is directed to the ministers for agriculture and consumer affairs. I wish to let the house know that I stand here as a proud citrus grower in the Riverland, and this is part of my grieve today. Food labelling has been a longstanding issue in Australia. It impacts on everyone in this country—the farmers who produce the food, the industries that process and sell the food and the consumers who buy the food. It is of particular importance to rural communities like those in Chaffey. Their economies rely on having good domestic markets for their produce in addition to good export markets.

When making their food purchase decisions, Australian consumers increasingly rely on labels for health factors and just as importantly to determine where that food comes from. Given the choice and accurate information, many Australian consumers will choose Australian produce because there is an increasing awareness of the benefits that the choice brings to the national economy and the rural communities.

There is also increasing awareness that Australian food is generally superior, safer, cleaner and greener. It is unfortunate, however, that our current labelling laws allow food to be labelled Australian when the ingredients are in fact sourced from overseas with all of the well-documented health and biosecurity risks that come with it. An excellent example of this is the use of cheap inferior fruit juice concentrate imported from overseas. This can have water added to it in Australia and actually be labelled an Australian product on the bottle or carton in which it is sold in Australian shops.

Such a practice takes money from Australian farmers and rural communities and misleads Australian consumers. As a citrus grower myself I remember very well the days when local growers were receiving as little as $60 per tonne for their high quality Valencia oranges because it was cheaper for juice companies to source concentrate from overseas. It was not a good time for the Riverland citrus industry as production costs were always well above $220 per tonne. This is why I strongly support all Australian primary producers in their quest for truth in labelling.

This issue was recently raised in the story on *Today Tonight* earlier this month and disappointingly the story on *Today Tonight* did not focus on the need for accurate labelling that shows which countries food products come from. Instead it shed a very negative light on the process used by juice companies which enables to them to source their fruit from Australian orange growers instead of resorting to cheap inferior concentrate imported from overseas.

This process is known as a septic treatment. Essentially the juice is pasteurised which means it undergoes a heat treatment to kill bacteria and it is then cold stored. It is not all that different from the pasteurised milk we use every day. It is a process that has been used by juice companies in South Australia since the mid-nineties. It is supported by the majority of Australian citrus growers because it enables the juice companies to source Australian oranges when supply is relatively high and to meet consumer demand when supply is relatively low.

It is further supported by the Australian citrus growers because they almost always get a fair price for oranges that end up as pasteurised juice. The process enables juice companies to provide a more consistent quality product to consumers when supplies are low and the process further enables juice companies to manage the supply risk associated with uncertainty about our water for irrigation.

It is disappointing that *Today Tonight* did not highlight these important points which shed a very different light on the matter. As a result, *Today Tonight*'s report represented inaccurate and misleading information in its quest for a sensational story. As a result, the report has severely damaged the very citrus growers that *Today Tonight* purported to be protecting. I am not alone among the citrus growers who now have thousands of bins of quality Valencia oranges which local juice companies cannot take now because of the consumer resistance. I cannot emphasise enough the damage that this report has done to Australian citrus growers and the rural communities in Chaffey. This outcome should make this issue very clear to Australian consumers and media outlets that report on the use of pasteurised juice.

Time expired.

DENTAL SERVICES

Ms FOX (Bright) (15:19): Madam Speaker, before speaking on the matter of dental services today, I would like to address some statements made by the member for Unley on Tuesday regarding yourself, as the member for Giles, in a grievance debate. He said that you refused to meet with the principal of the Coober Pedy Area School or attend a visit to the school prior to the public meeting in the town regarding the school.

Madam Speaker, I think it should be noted, as do you, that you had a telephone link-up meeting with the principal before the public meeting. No formal visit to the school was arranged. The public meeting was requested by the community and chaired by the member, that is, you. You believe, as do I, that you have acted professionally and fairly in your dealings with the principal, the staff, the parents and the community in the whole sad process, and I hope the member for Unley notes these comments and, indeed, perhaps corrects the record.

I also want to speak today about dental services in South Australia. Constituents have approached me about waiting lists. One constituent in particular, who works in a very public job and has to deal with people on a daily basis, has had considerable troubles gaining access to dental health care. She has approached me about waiting lists, and she really is distressed by the fact that she has to wait.

I should point out that when the Rann government came to power in 2002, the waiting list for dental care sat at 49 months; that is just over four years.

Mr Sibbons: Shame!

Ms FOX: Shame indeed, member for Mitchell! That number has now fallen to 18 months, but for some people, of course, that is still too long, and rightly so. The reasons for delays in the provisions for pensioners and other concession card holders are varied. A delay in the reintroduction of the commonwealth dental health program has had a major effect on waiting lists. Of course, the previous federal Liberal government withdrew from that program in 1996 and, in doing so, removed annual funding of $10 million from the South Australian Dental Service at that time. Think about the value of $10 million in 1996 compared with now in 2010, some 14 years ago. So, the state government was left to try to cope with the hundreds, if not thousands, of people who were just abandoned by the then federal Liberal government.

I now return to the reasons for the delays. As I said, the previous federal government withdrew from the program in 1996, and the new federal government announced its intention to reintroduce that program from July 2008, and that would have provided $24.7 million over three years for additional funding for South Australian public dental services from that date. This was projected to rapidly reduce the average waiting time for public general dental care to around 11 months by June 2009. The average waiting time for dentures was expected to reduce from 39 months to 22 months over the same period.

The reintroduced program was to be funded with savings achieved through the cessation of the previous federal government's Medicare chronic disease dental program. The delay to the reintroduction of this program has caused significant difficulties in funding new projects already approved, and the SA Dental Service has had to put strategies in place to manage these projects while continuing to provide essential services to the public.

Madam Speaker, imagine when I go to my constituent and say, 'Well, the Labor federal government that was elected in 2007 had plans to fix this.' Why were they stopped? Well, they were stopped because of the Liberals in the Senate. That is correct. Due to action taken by the federal Liberals in the Senate, that has now stalled. So, how do I explain to my constituent that, because of the actions of a few mischievous Liberal senators, who are more interested in headlines and fighting amongst themselves within their party room, she does not have access to the care she needs? It is awful. The matter remains unresolved, and I hope that it will be resolved after the federal election, because this cannot go on. It is an absolute disgrace, and I simply feel terribly sorry for my constituent in this instance.

DEFENCE SERVICE PERSONNEL

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite) (15:24): I rise to speak on a number of issues to do with veterans and ex-service personnel. I will start with a report in the local newspapers concerning Lance Corporal Mason Edwards of the 2nd Commando Regiment, who lost his life when shot by accident during live fire battle inoculation in October at Port Augusta, at the Cultana Military Training Base. *The Advertiser* put the pertinent point in its story that, in some respects, Lance

Corporal Mason was a forgotten soldier. It certainly made the case that his family felt that his sacrifice had not been valued to the same extent as that of the 17 Australian diggers killed in Afghanistan on actual operations.

I think this raises a very interesting point of principle that this house should recognise, and it is that as a nation we need to review the way in which we deal with accidents in training, and particularly fatalities in training, as they affect our servicemen as they train to deploy on operations. I intend to take this matter up. I must say that *The Advertiser* article did stir my conscience.

I spoke in the house earlier this week about a recent decision by the Defence Honours and Awards Tribunal and the government, with bipartisan support, to grant recognition to members of special forces involved in counter-terrorist and special recovery operations and how valued that decision was. I think this is a related issue.

It is very important to remember that, whether a soldier dies on operations or during the build up training for those operations, he or she leaves behind a grieving wife and children and/or parents and siblings. It is tragic that our system of defence honours and awards recognises those who are killed on operations but not necessarily those who are killed while training for those operations, even at the latter stages of pre-deployment.

It saddens me that the spouse of a soldier killed during pre-deployment training in Australia has no medal to pass on to a son or daughter, where the death occurs in Australia or in an overseas pre-deployment base. The difference is that it was in Australia or outside an overseas theatre of operations.

I am not suggesting that we go for an American style system of Purple Hearts, but I think there is a case for some medal to be given in the case of soldiers who die on pre-deployment training, if only for their families. I will be taking this up with the Chief of the Defence Force, the Chief of Army and the minister, and I will be pursuing it on behalf of the Edwards family.

I now move to the issue of pension support for veterans and ex-service personnel. In doing so, I declare, as I have in my register of interest, that I am eligible for such a benefit. I just want to make that clear as I speak. Military veterans and ex-service personnel are seeking a federal government commitment to index their pensions in the same manner as the age pension.

There was a promise from the current federal government that it would deal with this issue prior to the 2007 election—it has not. As it stands, these entitlements are indexed to CPI for members aged 55 and older, whereas the age pension is indexed according to the greater of CPI, male total average weekly earnings or pension beneficiary living cost indexes. The federal Labor Party's 2007 election policy was that it would fix it.

The coalition announced on 27 June that it will so index these pensions. I am calling on the Gillard Labor government to match that. I note that, after the coalition made its announcement, the Premier wrote a letter, on 1 July, as, I think, a backside covering exercise, to indicate that the veterans needed help. Ms Gillard has not responded. I think that is a tragedy.

It is shocking that our soldiers, Corporal Mason and others who have been killed may be examples, are facing a situation where their service pensions passed wives and children do not keep up with other pensions. I think this is a related issue to the one I raised earlier about people killed during pre-deployment training rather than on operations. It is an important issue and I urge the house to give it its attention.

INFANT MORTALITY

Mr PICCOLO (Light) (15:29): Today, I wish to raise a matter which is one of great emotion and pain and trauma for couples. I would like to talk about those couples who have lost a baby through stillbirth or neonatal death. This is obviously a very tough time for couples. In particular, it is a very traumatic time for women, and I know a number of women who have had a stillbirth or neonatal death and have taken quite a bit of time to deal with the grief.

Until recent times, the pain from the loss has been compounded by the fact that the baby has no legal recognition and, in many cases, no place for the parents to mourn. It is not so long ago that stillborn or other neonatal death babies were disposed of through the hospital system or placed in a coffin alongside an aged person who may have died in their care. The grieving process has been particularly difficult for women who in the past have not had an opportunity to mourn the loss of their baby.

The reality was made very clear to me by a former resident of my electorate, the late Mrs Del Cooper, who approached me, when I was running for mayor, for the establishment of a memorial for stillborn babies and neonatal death babies in the local cemetery operated by the council. The reality was that, despite her losing her baby in 1946, it was obvious she still felt the pain after all those years that had gone by because there was no memorial for her child.

In February 2009, a submission was received from a local resident, Mrs Ali Chapman, a member of SANDS (Stillbirth and Neonatal Death Support group), requesting that the local council consider options for the Willaston Babies Memorial to be inclusive of past, present and future community needs and to allow memorials for babies lost after 1986. The original memorial built there was in response to the action undertaken by Mrs Del Cooper and her lobbying, and I am pleased to say that the original memorial was built before Mrs Del Cooper passed away.

The current memorial is for the 190 babies that were buried at the Willaston cemetery between 1877 and 1986 without recognition or ceremony. As I mentioned, Mrs Cooper lost her own son, Leonard, and he was buried with some sort of tribute under the Mulga tree in the cemetery in 1946. The local SANDS committee, comprising councillors Patricia Dent, Lillian Bartlett, Penny Johnston, Warren Dibben, local resident and funeral director Ms Giselle Forgie, Ms Ali Chapman and Ms Julie Marshall have been raising funds to build a new memorial in the local cemetery. Moneys have been raised by the SANDS members—in fact, they have raised in the vicinity of $20,000 in this year—to build this new memorial.

The council was happy to have the memorial built in the local cemetery but did not have the funds, so this group has raised funds. The project can now go ahead. The money was raised through committee pledges and the recent Precious Souls Dinner held in Gawler, which I attended with the Hon. John Dawkins. There have been a number of people involved in this project. Now that the funds are available, a team of officers from the council, including Gary Kerr and Grant Hemmerling, will work with some landscape architects under the direction of Ms Heather Barclay, who is the manager of asset services at the council, and we hope to have the new memorial open in late September or early October.

Also, the money raised will assist with the maintenance of the memorial. Architect Hillary Hamnett and Martin Corbin have been engaged to help with the design to ensure that the new memorial also complements the original one and also pays a fitting tribute to those people who have lost a child through stillbirth or neonatal death. This project is of importance for two reasons: first, it demonstrates what communities working together can achieve; and, secondly, it pays tribute to particularly those women who have lost their child through stillbirth or neonatal death.

Time expired.

ELECTORAL MATERIAL

Mr MARSHALL (Norwood) (15:34): I rise today to talk about the approaching federal election, in particular, electoral material. As the dust settles following the state election we are now thrust headlong into the federal campaign, hoping that the mistakes—and there were plenty of them—of the recent past are not repeated but, less than one week in, already South Australians have been subjected to dodgy tactics which bring the electoral process into disrepute. Voters in several South Australian electorates—one of which is mine in Sturt—have recently received official looking letters; and here is the one I received, emblazoned with the Australian crest. It is a very handsome envelope with the Australian crest on the front.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I haven't opened it.

Mr MARSHALL: You didn't look at it?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have been very busy, member for Norwood.

Mr MARSHALL: Well, there's plenty of time. It provides the reader with 'important' (it states very boldly) postal voting information, and also a postal voting information hotline. As members can see, it is a very official looking document that I actually received.

Of course, this is to be expected and certainly it is not unusual in any way, yet these official letters are not from the Australian Electoral Commission at all. Despite the Australian government crest, they are in fact from the offices of two Labor senators (Anne McEwen and Dana Wortley), and I believe there are many more across South Australia. These are letters in disguise. This is electoral material in disguise—but for what purpose? At no point is it made clear to the reader that

these are not official Electoral Commission documents and at no point are the senators' party affiliations shown.

The postal voting information hotline is in fact a Labor senator's office. All returned forms go straight to Labor senators' offices instead of directly to the Australian Electoral Commission. Although the senators may have every intention of dutifully passing on each form received, voters still have the right to know to whom they are sending their details. There are simply no laws in place to protect people in this situation, with nothing to stop the information intended for the Australian Electoral Commission ending up on a Labor senator's database.

Voters are justifiably concerned, especially due to Labor's track record of dodgy tactics at election time. We all remember the fake Family First tee-shirts—not, of course, in Bright. Nevertheless, we all remember the fake Family First tee-shirts being worn, often by Labor staffers, as they handed out bogus voting cards during the state election. Now we are faced with a letter masquerading as an official Australian Electoral Commission document while clearly supporting the Labor candidates for various federal seats. The voters of Adelaide are not stupid, and they are wising up to the ploys of political parties, as evidenced by the number of people who called into an Adelaide radio station on Tuesday this week to voice their concerns.

Callers asked the ALP State Secretary, Michael Brown, to assure them that unfavourable votes would not be sat on in Labor offices. Although he dismissed these concerns, he could not offer any guarantee beyond his word. In the same program, Brown went onto admit that he had been involved in the now notorious Family First how-to-vote card fiasco. He was also the man who registered the www.isobelredmond.com website. Given his track record, you would have to forgive me, Madam Deputy Speaker, if I am not entirely comfortable with his personal guarantee.

I will recap. People have received an envelope, with nothing to tell them it is actually from the Labor Party. It has on it the Australian government crest. It contains a lot of information and, basically, looks like it is from the Australian Electoral Commission. People who receive these letters would fill them in thinking they were a postal vote application. They would be sent off to the ALP. Surely, there is a temptation to not pass them on or not pass them on in a timely manner. We have no assurance that this is not the case.

The Liberal Party does send out postal voting applications, which clearly state they are for the Liberal Party. Why is the Labor Party not disclosing its alliance? Using taxpayers' funds to churn out postal voting application forms with a hidden agenda may not be illegal—and the Labor Party is very clear about what is legal and what is not—but it is certainly dodgy. These dubious methods undermine the confidence that ordinary Australians have in our electoral system and the integrity of that electoral system. Ultimately, these attacks chip away at the public's confidence in our electoral integrity and cheapen our democratic process.

FAIRVIEW PARK PRIMARY SCHOOL

Mr ODENWALDER (Little Para) (15:40): I had the great pleasure yesterday of attending the Fairview Park Primary School with the member for Makin, Tony Zappia, a great local member and someone who is very active up there. He officially opened the new library facility at the Fairview Park Primary School, which was built using the federal government's Building the Education Revolution money.

Mr Marshall interjecting:

Mr ODENWALDER: I know that it is much maligned by those opposite and has caused them much angst, but, as I go around my electorate, I do not hear any complaints about these new buildings. I do not hear any complaints from Salisbury Heights Primary School about its 12 new classrooms, and I certainly did not hear any complaints from Fairview Park Primary School yesterday about its excellent new library facility.

However, I am not going to talk about the Building the Education Revolution. What became clear at yesterday morning's ceremony is that leadership development is very important at this school. The school prides itself on developing their kids and, in turn, developing future leadership in their own community.

It is a small school and it does manage to hang onto its students in the face of some pretty stiff competition from private providers around the place. The way that works is that the principal, Vanessa Mortimer (and I have to congratulate her on this initiative), invites all 26 year 7 students to apply to be team leaders in what the school calls its 'enterprise teams'.

These positions are hotly contested amongst the year 7s. Applications go to a panel of staff representatives, including the principal and their year 6 peers; so, they are voted in by their peers and by the staff. The selected eight leaders work with students from years 3 to 7 in eight teams and report to Vanessa Mortimer and the deputy, Graeme Fenton, every fortnight.

The eight teams and leaders are as follows. The leader of the public relations team, a year 7 student called Beth Pontifex, did an absolutely fantastic job heading the ceremony yesterday. She basically ran the show, and Vanessa Mortimer calls her her 'little PA'. She ran the show yesterday and introduced Tony and me.

Dr McFetridge: Did you get your name on the plaque?

Mr ODENWALDER: I did not get my name on the plaque, unfortunately. I allowed Tony to cut the ribbon.

Mr Pederick interjecting:

Mr ODENWALDER: It was generous of me, I know. The principal speaks very highly of Beth; clearly, she has a lot of leadership potential. Another group is the student action team, which works with the assistant principal to address a positive and safe school climate. They run lunchtime activities and wear special peer mediator vests and support activities in the yard. Younger students learn new games and have the support to feel safe in their environment.

The web and weed group helps to manage the grounds of the school and also manages the school website. There is a school displays group and there is also an art group, which plans art exhibitions throughout the school, including some for fundraising in the local community. They also contribute to the general amenity of the school through the visual arts.

The information and communication technology group works with the learning and technologies coordinator to manage IT across the school; the healthy lifestyles group coordinates special events to promote health and wellbeing; and, finally, the sports team helps the specialist sports teacher with equipment. They are currently planning the sports day themselves.

So, there is leadership from the school in terms of planning school activities and really contributing to their community. The development of leadership skills at such a young age is, I think, something to be encouraged. I have nothing but admiration for the work that the principal and the Fairview Park School community, in general, are doing to promote leadership, teamwork and community spirit.

Time expired.

TRUSTEE COMPANIES (COMMONWEALTH REGULATION) AMENDMENT BILL

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill without any amendment.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: Madam Deputy Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the house.

A quorum having been formed:

MENTAL HEALTH (REPEAL OF HARBOURING OFFENCE) AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Kaurna—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Southern Suburbs, Minister Assisting the Premier in the Arts) (15:48): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

I will not hold the house up for very long. During the debate on the Mental Health Bill, the opposition moved an amendment to create an offence of harbouring or assisting a patient at large. The amendment was opposed by the government at the time. However, the inclusion of section 105 was made a condition by the opposition of passing the legislation, as I understand it—I was not the minister at the time—as a whole. I gather that was what the majority wanted in the upper house.

The Hon. Tammy Jennings has sought to remove that harbouring provision and we are fully supportive of the amendment, because that accords with our original position. The amendment which was put in at the time and which is now part of the legislation creates an offence of harbouring or assisting a patient at large. The penalty for this offence is $25,000 or two years

imprisonment. Section 105 of the Mental Health Act of 2009 is not in any way consistent with the philosophy of the act generally or the contemporary provision of mental health services in South Australia.

Modern mental health law does not equate mental illness with criminality. The Mental Health Act of 2009 is about providing the best care and treatment to people who have had very serious mental illnesses, with the goal of bringing about their recovery. Excuse me, folks.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Is that just a bit of chitchat? The minister might be saying something a little fascinating. In fact, I have been listening very carefully, and he is saying something fascinating.

The Hon. J.D. HILL: I am talking about mental health.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: That is actually a very important subject, so no chitchat in the background.

The Hon. J.D. HILL: That's right. 'Harbouring is a term that is generally associated with prisoners and is a completely inappropriate description for the individuals who may provide accommodation for a patient who has left a treatment centre. These people are not criminals. If the opposition and others who supported this clause had spoken to mental health clinicians, carers and consumers, they would know that the provision has a very damaging effect and is not supported, as I understand it, by those groups.

The act is concerned with supporting those people who often provide the most care to people with mental illness: their families, carers and friends, yet it is these people who are likely to be captured under section 105 and who would have been imprisoned. That has been the point made in a variety of briefings by carers' organisations and the executive director of the Mental Health Coalition of South Australia.

Under the original amendment to section 105 moved by the opposition, the parents of a mentally ill person, for example, could become criminals simply because their son or daughter arrived home. This was an appalling amendment that the government, unfortunately, was forced to accept as a condition of getting the bill through. I think the opposition parties at the time were mistaken to move the amendment in the first place and, unfortunately, they are maintaining their position in relation to this amendment. It is now been through the upper house.

Educating the community about the health issues and the need at times for people to be placed on detention and treatment orders is a preferable approach to that of criminalising the families and friends of patients by retaining the harbouring clause. Even if the offence provisions in the act are designed to act as a deterrent rather than provide the basis for prosecutions, there is no clear rationale for retaining the offence of harbouring in the act.

I have received correspondence from family members of mental health patients asking me to support the removal of this section. Their concerns arise from the fact that, if their relative were to leave a treatment centre and return to their family and friends—people they believe they can rely on to protect and nurture them—then those very same people who are providing that protection could be fined, imprisoned or further stigmatised as criminals.

Worse, I guess, they are likely, if they were nervous about being sentenced, to say that their son or daughter who has arrived in the middle of the night seeking harbour and protection, 'I'm afraid I'm going to have to call the police.' Then, the person with a mental illness is likely to leave, and God knows where they would go and what circumstances they might end up in. There is also the possibility, of course, that a patient may not be honest and tell their family, friend or carer that they have legitimately been given leave by the treatment centre or have been discharged.

Families have also expressed concern as to whether they will be deemed to have been 'recklessly indifferent' if they fail to contact the police to check if their relative has left a treatment centre without permission each time their relative turns up on their doorstep, distressed or end need of comfort. Even if family and friends may know of the person's mental health condition or their detained status, they cannot necessarily prevent the person from coming to see them.

Relatives of people with mental illness have told me that they fear that, if they refuse to allow the person to re-enter their home or are forced to contact authorities immediately so as not to risk breaching section 105, it will escalate what may already be a sensitive situation. Such action may serve to break down trust between the mentally ill person and those people with whom he or she previously felt safe.

In fact, the mentally ill person may be left with no-one he or she considers safe or may interpret the situation as the family, friends or carers having turned against them. The mentally ill person may see this as evidence to support any paranoid delusions or beliefs which could escalate the situation to violence and self harm. Far from protecting the mentally ill person, retaining section 105 could increase the risk of harm to the patient and others.

If a family, friend or carer is uncomfortable about having a patient who has left a treatment centre in their home, of course there is nothing preventing them from contacting authorities straightaway, but it should not be legislated that they must. Often families, friends and carers with a history of contact with the person are best placed to assist the approach that would provide assistance and reassurance to the patient to encourage them to return to the treatment centre.

I think if, as the Hon. Tammy Jennings has done, the opposition had consulted with Carers SA, the Mental Health Coalition and the Health Consumers Alliance prior to the insertion of section 105, they would be aware that those groups were not supportive of its inclusion in the act. Mr Ian Bidmeade, who, I understand, wrote the report 'Paving the way' which informed the provisions of the Mental Health Act 2009 said:

> ...the last thing families dealing with the stress of mental illness need is a threat of prosecution for the very human behaviour of trying to protect a family member albeit inappropriately. The legislation needs to reflect an understanding of the traumas of mental illness and avoid being punitive.

Section 105 is not congruent with the philosophy underpinning the Mental Health Act 2009. It will serve no useful purpose for people with serious mental illness and their families, friends and carers. All it will do is harm both the family and the patient, particularly if the patient's key supporter is imprisoned for assisting them. It is not consistent with a contemporary approach to mental health care and consequently it should be removed from the act.

I certainly indicate the government's strong support for this measure which, as I say, I am moving on behalf of the Hon. Tammy Jennings in another place. The Hon. Tammy Jennings moved this and it was one of her first announcements. I understand that she worked in the mental health area prior to coming into parliament and she is to be commended for moving this. I checked through the debate in the other place and I note that the Liberal Party opposition indicated that it did not support the change; nonetheless, they did not cause a division (which I thank them for) and the matter went through on the voices.

I do not know who in the upper house changed their vote from last time to this time, but the Hon. Tammy Jennings was obviously very good at getting that matter through, so I congratulate her for it. It is a rare achievement for a member of a minor party or a backbencher to change the law, and for them to do it in the first session of a new parliament after their election is quite a feat and I congratulate her for it. I commend this change to the house.

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (15:58): I am the lead speaker for the opposition on this bill. We will not be supporting this amendment. It was moved by the opposition in the debate in 2009. The last thing that I or any member of the Liberal Party want to do is to put the fear of criminal prosecution into the minds of families whose relatives or friends are mentally ill.

My father's first job when we came to Australia in 1954 as £10 Pommy migrants was to work at Z ward in what was then the Parkside asylum. He was a military policeman in the Royal Marines, my dad, and the first job he could get here was as a psych nurse in Z ward. I remember quite vividly the stories he told me about the way mental patients were treated back then—the fitting of straitjackets, electroconvulsive therapy, the fairly bizarre ways (such as bondage and other things) in which mental patients were treated in those days.

It is completely wrong to say that that is acceptable now; it was what was acceptable at the time. However, what we are looking at now is new legislation and new language. Something I have had to tackle a little is the language that is being used. We do not want to stigmatise in any way people who have a mental illness, because they are ill. They are not bad and they are not mad. They are ill, and they need to be given every opportunity to get better in the same way as anyone with a physical illness.

We have cooperated as much as we possibly can with the government in changing the mental health legislation to move with the times. In relation to this particular amendment, if it is such an important thing to do, why didn't the government do it between now and when the bill was assented to. Anyway, the Greens are doing it, and the government is backing the Greens. So, all is moving forward, to use that colloquialism.

However, I need to put on the record why we did this, and it goes back to October 2008. There were four recommendations in a Coroner's report on the death of a man who had been a mental health patient, and the first two were about changing protocols and methodology in the mental health wards of hospitals. One recommendation was about the police should not recognise absconded mental health patients (that is the Coroner's words) as missing persons and that they should be recognised as being persons who are 'unlawfully at large and liable to be apprehended under the law, and the necessary vigour should be brought about to facilitate their return'. That has happened, and the police have changed their protocols.

The Coroner's third recommendation in 2008 was that the Attorney-General or the Minister for Health consider introducing legislation that would render it an offence to knowingly assist an absconded detainee under the Mental Health Act 1993, as it was then, to avoid apprehension. That is what this is all about. The Coroner, who I know has a much broader understanding of the legal ramifications of this legislation if it were to be introduced and enacted, and it has been, would understand that this will have some ramifications, but, for the greater good, this was a necessary thing to do.

I am not a lawyer, and I am boasting not apologising there. I think the member for Bragg will be speaking after me about this measure. I know she is going to explain the legalese around 'knowingly or being recklessly indifferent to harbouring someone who has absconded from a mental health treatment centre'. It is very, very important that we do not stigmatise mental health patients because they are ill. The last thing we want to do is to make relatives and friends of people with a mental illness feel in any way that they are criminals.

However, I do think they have an obligation to assist in returning people who are ill and who have been put under a detention order to the treatment centre. That does not mean that it has to be then and there, that they cannot have a cup of tea, bring them in out of the rain and look after their general welfare. However, in the interests of people who have been put under a detention order (these people are very, very ill and are incapable of making decisions for themselves regarding their illness, so they have been detained by well qualified professional people), they need to be returned to the treatment centre as soon as possible. That is what this is about.

In April 2009, the Liberal Party moved the amendment in the upper house, and at that time the government did not have the numbers and the amendment got up. The then minister, Jane Lomax-Smith of honourable memory, said that they would accept the amendment for the sake of expediency. None of this should be done for the sake of expediency. If it is wrong, then they should have objected; they did not. It is interesting that the government has allowed the Greens to make the move on this, and it is following along and supporting it.

We can count on this side and we know where the numbers lie but, if section 105 is such a terrible thing, why did the government not do it earlier? If section 105 is such a bad thing, why are we not looking again at section 60, where it is an offence to hinder or obstruct an authorising officer? By having somebody in your home and not notifying the authorities—I note that the minister said you should phone the police. Ask Leon Byner who you should phone; ask anybody out there. It should not be a police matter. It should be mental health staff going out to help these people come back to receive the treatment they deserve and they need. It should not be the police.

We need to make sure that we give these people the very best treatment. Under section 60 it is an offence to hinder or obstruct, so hiding somebody or not telling the truth about their whereabouts is an offence, and that is staying in there, and that is up to a $25,000 fine. So, if section 105 is so bad, then what about section 60? Should we not be looking at that and section 104? If section 105 is such a bad thing then why is it an offence to assist a detained person to leave a treatment centre, with a similar penalty of $25,000?

If it is an offence to harbour somebody in your home, and the government thinks that is such a bad thing, or perhaps if you are well meaning and you think that the detained person is better off with you and you want to help them get out of the treatment centre, you might think that is the best thing for that person, but it is an offence, and it is an offence punishable with a similar penalty to a section 105 penalty of up to $25,000.

I will admit that I personally have difficulties with a two-year gaol sentence being added on to the penalty in section 105, and why that is there I do not know. It may just be for legal drafting. It is so important that we make sure that people who are detained under the Mental Health Act are given the best treatment possible, and that treatment should not be interrupted if the person who

has been receiving that treatment absconds, probably through no fault of their own, because they do not comprehend what is going on with them.

Even that word 'abscond': that is the word that the Coroner has been using in his report. I know the minister does not like the word 'abscond', and it does have some connotations to it. When you are detained, that is a legal thing to happen to you. You have to stay, you have to be there, so when you leave, I suppose 'absconding' is an appropriate word to use. It does have some stigma attached to it, and I suppose we are trying to move away from that, but in the Coroner's report that is the word he used.

The Coroner, in his report talking about detention orders, points out that detention orders are made for the patient's own health and safety or for the need for the protection of other people, including the general public. We must also remind ourselves that these people are extremely ill, and sometimes they do not understand the consequences of their actions, and that may be personal harm or threats of harm to others. We have to make sure that we do something about protecting these people from themselves as well as protecting the general public.

The new Mental Health Act is a big step forward, as I have said. We do not want to go back to 1954 and the Z ward and straitjackets. We do not want that. We want to make sure that we are moving forward. I think section 105—as I said, the member for Bragg will broaden the house's knowledge on the meaning of 'knowingly or recklessly indifferent'—is not as draconian as people try to make it out to be.

I think people who are living in fear of being thrown in gaol because they keep their friend at home for a cup of tea or give them a bed for the night are sadly misinformed. The perception is that that may happen, but the reality is that that is not the intent of this part of the legislation. It is good legislation and it should be maintained in here, but we can count.

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg) (16:10): I rise to speak to the Mental Health (Repeal of Harbouring Offence) Amendment Bill which was first introduced in parliament in another place on 26 May by the Hon. Tammy Jennings. As indicated by the minister today, he on behalf of the government introduces this bill for our consideration.

The opposition opposes this bill, and I say this for good reason. I will briefly reflect on the history of the development of the legislation, because this bill is now addressing an alleged defect. Until the beginning of July this year, when the Mental Health Act 2009 became effective, South Australia's severely mentally unwell people were dealt with under the Mental Health Act 1993 and, after several years of consultation and a review of the 1993 legislation, the Mental Health Act that we now have came for consideration to this parliament.

It is important to understand that during that period of consultation, late in the piece, there had been a coronial inquiry in which the Coroner investigated the death of Damien Paul Dittmar, who had been detained at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital with a mental health condition under the previous mental health act, and he absconded and subsequently committed suicide.

This amendment was introduced by the Hon. Michelle Lensink in another place at the time of the debate on the principal act. The recommendations of the Coroner in that case were considered and presented to the parliament, including the importance of ensuring that there be some protection for a seriously ill, mentally unwell person absconding from a facility when the law and the medical profession have determined that he or she is in need of care.

I want to say that the Mental Health Act, as its predecessor did, provides for a very small proportion of mentally unwell people in our community. I think it is important for members to appreciate that, in essence, seriously unwell people can come under consideration for whether their personal liberty is going to be restricted and, effectively, they can be forced to take medication. They can be forced into confinement and forced to have treatment whilst in confinement, and the like.

This affects a very limited number of people in the community and, largely, it is those who, due to their mental health condition, are unfit, unwilling or unable to participate in what is determined to be in their best interests. So I will not re-traverse the merits of that or otherwise. I think it is fair to say that everyone in the house appreciates that in some very limited circumstances it is necessary to impose significant restrictions.

So, we start with the premise that this bill is dealing with the very sick and that circumstances exist where their interests and the interests of others in the community (particularly those who are around them and care for them) need to be protected. Where possible, as the act

provides, provision needs to be made for the treatment, care and rehabilitation of the persons in question.

The concerns raised by the Hon. Tammy Jennings suggest a number of things. One is that there will be the unwitting inclusion of people into potential prosecution and conviction for offences. Carers and concerned members of a family might receive into their home a very sick relative or a person who has been in their care, administer to them support, assistance and counselling and inadvertently they could be prosecuted.

Secondly, the language is severe, unacceptable and not contemporary. It is inappropriate to suggest that someone should be described as absconding and, more particularly, that potentially innocent people (in her view) would be treated as someone who is harbouring another. On the first matter I want to say this: to whom will this apply? The current provision (as described by the minister as an amendment to the original act) is that it is an offence to harbour or assist a patient at large. Section 105 of the act provides:

> (1) A person who, knowing or being recklessly indifferent as to whether another is a patient at large, harbours or assists the patient to remain at large is guilty of an offence.
>
> Maximum penalty: $25,000 or imprisonment for two years.

To suggest that a caring, concerned sister, mother, relative or carer (professionally trained or otherwise), who answers the door to a person (the subject of a detention) who has absconded from a facility and offers them a cup of tea, ascertains or observes they may be agitated and frightened, and the like—that in some way, by bringing them into their home providing them with a cup of tea or refreshment (or whatever), quietly speaking to them about the circumstances in which they have come to the property and even keeping them there for a while—will somehow be held responsible, and indeed liable to be prosecuted under the current provisions of section 105, is ridiculous.

Anyone in that situation, who feels they are confident and safe in the circumstances—because they may know the relative or person they have cared for very well and know how to manage any symptoms which might cause abject distress to either the patient or the relative—would clearly be concerned about any distress to the patient. Even if they themselves are not fully trained, they would probably have a pretty good understanding and see the signs of any state or condition to which the person might respond adversely—whether they are likely to grab a knife, attack someone, cause harm to themselves or the like.

I suggest that these people are relatives who in those circumstances, in the interests of their loved one, would contact the professional party representing them and/or a hospital and/or the police (if they think that is necessary) to say, 'My relative is here, can we sort out how this will be remedied.' It is ridiculous to suggest that these people will be captured. It is important for the house to appreciate that there is another group in the community who are not so generous.

Let me give members this scenario: a friend of the patient says to his mate when he knocks on the door, 'Yes, come in. You can stay in the back room. I'll make sure that nobody knows you're here, because I know, as you know, there's nothing wrong with you, and those cretins down there at the hospital have got no idea what they're talking about, and I'm going to keep you safe in the back of the house. I'm certainly not going to ring the police, the hospital or anyone else, because they're all nuts and you're not.'

That is, clearly, a circumstance where someone is knowing or recklessly indifferent as to that patient being at large and aids and abets the continued removal of that person from the secure facility they need to be in for their own recovery and rehabilitation. They are the people we need to be dealing with here, not the caring relative who gets a cup of tea and who sensibly and carefully, where appropriate, brings the situation back in control, understanding the importance of that to protect the patient as well.

Then, there is another group, and I want the house to be aware of this. There is another group, and these are the people who contacted me prior to this, when this bill was debated before. They say, 'Look; I am a relative, and I know how sick my son or daughter is. When they do come from the hospital and they are not supposed to be here—they have agreed to be under a voluntary order, they are under detention and they've come out—what am I going to do? I'm terrified. I'm frightened to death about what they're going to do to me.'

Alternatively, they have written to me, saying, 'I've actually been a victim of an assault in those circumstances, and I'm worried for my child and others.' I think that the house needs to appreciate that it is significant that we protect those people. If ever there was an endorsement of

what was proposed under this legislation it came from Commissioner Ted Mullighan QC, who undertook an extensive report into children who were under the care of government (that is, guardianship of the minister), who were at large and who were victims of child sexual abuse.

He gave a number of reports to this parliament, and one of them was that it is unsafe to leave children on the streets. He said that they are exposed to the risks of harm and, of course, exposed to circumstances of drugs, sex trafficking and the like. He said, 'That is not acceptable, and I am advising the government and the parliament to make a law that makes sure that, if a child is under the guardianship of a minister and has been directed to live at certain premises, then, in that child's interest with a diminished capacity to be able to make decisions for themselves, that should occur and, furthermore, that anyone who interferes with that, wilfully or with reckless indifference, should face the criminal courts for the harbouring of that child.'

Indeed, this very parliament has passed legislation to do just that—not in the context of criminal activity, let me say. The child has not committed a crime. The child may be at large or under the guardianship of the minister for their own self-protection. But did this parliament say, 'No, no, no. We are not going to use a crime and introduce a penalty for harbouring, and use the words 'absconding' and 'harbouring'. It's too difficult, it's too ugly to say no to that, and we won't protect those children'? No; we followed the advice of Commissioner Mullighan and we acted on it. We should do the same for mental health patients who are very sick in this community, as we have done for children.

The innocent, by reason of age or mental incapacity, are not able to make those decisions for themselves. They deserve our protection, the same as mental health patients who are very sick. So, I say that it is a nonsense. When I asked the Hon. Tammy Jennings to explain to me how we might better deal with the language (because this is the second leg of her argument), she said, 'Well, look; there are other jurisdictions that don't use such harsh words', and I am paraphrasing her position on that. I said to her, as I do to the house, 'I think that language is important.'

We do not use the word 'juvenile' a lot now, even though it refers to a certain age group in human and animal kind. It does describe behaviour which is now associated with, to use an old term, delinquency: the misconduct, illegal behaviour, etc., of young people. We are careful to use the words 'young offenders' instead of 'juvenile'. It is important to understand the significance of language in those circumstances. Even though we would use the word 'harbouring' in the protection of children and the legislation we introduced post the Mullighan inquiries and reports, I was very happy to look at that.

She said, 'Other jurisdictions have done it differently.' I said, 'Look, I will be more than happy to look at amendments to that effect,' and so she did send to me, as she indicated she would, the application of law in other jurisdictions. I must say I was stunned to read it when I received it not because there was not an opportunity to perhaps tame down, soften, etc., the wording, but because the jurisdictions she sent to me use exactly the same language as this current legislation and words which she claims need to be removed from this bill to remedy harsh, cruel and inappropriate language.

Let me summarise them: Northern Ireland, which I would not say is some sort of conservative, right-wing administration. Section 124 of the Mental Health (Northern Ireland) Order 1986 has a harbouring offence in which a person is guilty if they knowingly harbour a patient who is absent without leave, or inducing or knowingly assist: imprisonment six months and penalties that go with it; imprisonment not exceeding two years on the conviction of an indictment. Scotland—and again I would not see them as radical conservatives—has a Mental Health (Care and Treatment) (Scotland) Act 2003 in which again it is an offence to knowingly induce or assist a patient to abscond, or to fail to act and, in particular, goes on to say 'harbours a patient, who with the result, done or failed to do anything, shall be guilty of an offence: penalty six months for a summary conviction; two years on indictment.

The list goes on. In England they oscillate from socialist to conservative governments. They have a Mental Health Act 1983 (UK) which again provides for an offence for a person who knowingly harbours a patient who is absent without leave—that is the description they use there, as distinct from absconding—and again there is imprisonment for six months for summary offences and two years for conviction on indictment. At the invitation to provide examples of jurisdictions which might have softer wording, she sends me three contemporary jurisdictions which have exactly the same provision (although slightly different penalties and fines) for exactly the same offence, with the same language.

What is going on here? This is not really the situation. What has happened is that the government did not want this. It never wanted this in its bill, in the first place. The Hon. Ms Jennings, as committed as she might be to remedying the situation by the repeal of the harbouring provision, should have been completely honest with the parliament when she introduced this bill to disclose that she was one of the people prior to the principal act being debated and passed who advocated not to have it included. This is not new. Now she is in the parliament, she has decided she is going to have a second chop and she is going to the get government, which had consented to its inclusion before, to support her amendment.

I am disappointed that she was not entirely frank about that, but nevertheless the Mental Health Coalition Carers Association has come along and said, 'We are worried for that group.' I understand the concern they have. I think that it is without foundation, but it is reasonable to raise the issue. That is one group. As Commissioner Mullighan makes perfectly clear for children, we need to ensure that we protect these people in another situation.

Finally, if the government was really concerned about language that is too harsh, criminal offences, or the concern of the patient, which is what the whole legislation is supposed to be about, then I ask: why, even after briefings and an entire investigation into the mental health review, does it still allow for neurosurgery on mental patients in circumstances where two things happen. First, in relation to section 43 of the act (which was passed after a briefing by a psychiatrist who has now been appointed as the chief psychiatrist under the new legislation), she acknowledged that nowhere in the world did she know of any current medical procedure of a neurological kind that was being undertaken on a patient with a mental health illness.

In fact, the only thing she could think of which was close was neurological intervention for epilepsy. That is not a mental health illness, but, arguably, it is near the brain. After what occurred with lobotomies in the 1940s and 1950s, this should not even be in here. There are criminal offences if a professional person undertakes the procedure against the rules. If the government was serious about non-criminal behaviour, it ought to read its own act.

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Kaurna—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Southern Suburbs, Minister Assisting the Premier in the Arts) (16:30): I thank members for their contributions to the debate.

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

MATTER OF PRIVILEGE

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (16:31): I rise on a matter of privilege. On 30 October 2008, in answering the question about the Easling matter, minister Rankine told this house:

> We had people going into that house and finding semi-naked boys in his bed.

The answer continued:

> If you want me to go into detail, I can. It's very unsavoury.

Mr Easling was overseas at the time and upon his return, his lawyers immediately wrote to the minister on 12 November 2008. In that letter, Mr Easling's lawyers state:

> As you are aware, our client was acquitted by a Supreme Court jury in December 2007 of all charges of having allegedly interfered sexually with youths placed in his care. That trial followed an extensive investigation by the Special Investigations Unit of the Department for Families and Communities. That investigation was the subject of intense scrutiny in the trial.
>
> Prior to the trial, via applications under the Freedom of Information Act, through disclosure by the Office of the Director of Public Prosecutions and by production in answer to subpoenae issued by the Magistrates Court and the Supreme Court, every record kept by the Special Investigation Unit and the South Australia police in connection with that investigation was produced and examined by us. Nowhere within it can be found any reference to any suggestion by any person ever that semi-naked boys were found in our client's bed. Needless to say, our client vehemently denies that this ever happened.

The letter continues:

> When you made your remarks about our client in parliament, you were prepared to give detail of the alleged circumstances you described. We invite you to do so now. Please identify the boys claimed to have been found in our client's bed in a semi-naked state, the occasions when they were found and by whom. You might also care to explain why these allegations were never put to our client during the years in which he was a registered foster carer; why, despite these allegations, he was permitted to remain a registered foster carer and why the evidence upon which you rely was apparently withheld and not disclosed in answer to subpoenae issued by the Magistrates Court and the Supreme Court in the criminal proceedings.

The minister was quoted in *The Independent Weekly* on 14 November 2008 as saying that, when making the above remarks to the house, she 'had relied on documentation provided by the department's special investigations unit'.

On 14 November 2008, Easling's lawyers wrote another letter to the minister requesting the documentation relied upon by the minister in making these comments. To this day, I understand that neither of these letters has received response from the minister.

On 26 November 2008, the minister was asked a series of questions in this place, giving her a chance to correct the record:

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: My question is to the Minister for Families and Communities. Given the minister's statement to the house regarding Tom Easling that 'we had people going into that house and finding semi-naked boys in his bed' and a statement to *The Independent Weekly* that in making those comments 'she relied on documentation provided by the department's special investigations unit', can the minister explain how no document provided to Mr Easling or his representatives by the government has any reference to any suggestion by any person ever that semi-naked boys were found in Mr Easling's bed?

The minister responded:

I thank the member for Davenport for his question. In response to a barrage of interjections whilst the member for Davenport asked the question to which he refers, I used my own words to summarise information that was in my possession in relation to the allegations.

A second question states:

My question is again to the Minister for Families and Communities. Given the minister's statement to the house regarding Tom Easling that 'we had people going into that house and finding semi-naked boys in his bed'...will the minister immediately release to Mr Easling the document she claims she relied upon in making the comments, as requested in a letter to the minister of 14 November; and, if not, why not?

The minister said:

I have a letter that I have received from Mr Easling's solicitors and I am giving that consideration.

The next day, on 27 November, I asked this question:

My question is to the Minister for Families and Communities. In answering a question about Tom Easling on 30 October, where she claimed that 'we had people going into that house and finding semi-naked boys in his bed', did she accurately summarise the information in her possession?

The then attorney-general answered the question, and in part of his answer said:

The member for Davenport would know exactly the incident in the trial and the summing up to which the minister was referring.

I then asked as a supplementary question:

Will the minister explain to the house why she will not stand by her earlier statement that 'we had people going into that house and finding semi-naked boys in his bed'?

Again, the then attorney-general answered the question. You will note that the then attorney-general suggested that I would know exactly the incident in the trial and the summing up to which the minister was referring. I assumed that the attorney-general stated this as, in the letters written to minster Rankine by Mr Easling's lawyers, they set out why she could not be referring to a visit to Mr Easling's home by Mr Craig Reed, a public servant, on 22 December 1992 and, if the minister was referring to that visit, why she was wrong.

As Mr Easling's local MP, I submitted a number of FOI applications for documents relating to the minister's claim. For the purposes of this speech, I have left out Mr Easling's address, but they were on the FOI applications. The FOI applications I raised were these. I asked for all documents relating to any report by Craig Reed on his attendance at the residence of Tom Easling, [address], on 22 December 1992. One record was found. Access was denied due to confidentiality.

I also FOI'd documents relating to any report by Craig Reed that he attended the residence of Tom Easling [address] and found semi-naked boys in his bed. One record was found, and access was denied due to confidentiality. I also FOI'd all documents relating to any report of a public servant that they attended the residence of Mr Easling and found semi-naked boys in his bed. Six pages were found, and access was denied due to confidentiality. These FOI requests cover any public servants, not just Mr Reed.

I also FOI'd all documents concerning the minister's statement to parliament regarding Thomas Frank Easling on 30 October 2008 that 'we had people going into that house and finding semi-naked boys in his bed', and, 'If you want me to go into detail I can. It is very unsavoury.'

Seventeen pages were found. One public media article was released. Access was denied to the other 16 pages due to confidentiality.

If the minister's claims were true, the documents would exist. If a public servant attended the home of a male foster carer and found semi-naked boys in his bed, a report would exist in the department. If it was 'very unsavoury', as the minister claims, a report would also be in the department on that issue. The four applications were then internally reviewed, and access was denied on the same basis as the original application.

All four applications were then sent on appeal to the Ombudsman for review. On 18 March 2010, I received a fax of the Ombudsman's response and determination. I received the original of the response and determination on 19 March 2010, the day before the state election. The Ombudsman's determination required the department to release further documents to me and changed two determinations.

What do these documents show, and what do the two new determinations show? The documents released are part of a transcript of an interview between public servant Craig Reed and the investigator from the Special Investigations Unit of the Department of Families and Communities. The investigators questioned Mr Reed about his visit to Easling's home on 22 December 1992. When asked what the boy was wearing, the public servant states as follows:

OATS: So did you see X getting dressed?

REED: No I didn't. I couldn't even tell you what X was wearing, because when I observed X he actually had bed covers pulled up over the top of him so I can't make any comment as to whether...he was clothed or unclothed, I don't know.

The public servant who went to Easling's home could not confirm the boy's state of dress. The minister has, in my view, no factual basis to make her claim that semi-naked boys were found in Mr Easling's bed. One boy, not boys, was present at the time. The public servant told the investigators that:

...he actually had bedcovers pulled over the top of him so I can't make any comment as to whether...he was clothed or unclothed, I don't know.

The documents also show that the public servant told the investigators that the boy 'was happy, smiling, talkative' and that it was the same comment he would make about Mr Easling. He also told the investigators that, when he entered Mr Easling's home, Mr Easling was in the kitchen, fully dressed, doing up his shoes. The minister claimed of course to the parliament that it was very unsavoury.

The minister's statement that 'we had people go into that house and finding semi-naked boys in his bed' and that it was 'very unsavoury' totally contradicts the interview given to the Special Investigations Unit by the public servant who went to Mr Easling's house.

The minister is now in a position that her department has confirmed in writing that there are no documents held by the department that relate to any report by Craig Reed that he attended the residence of Tom Easling and found semi-naked boys in his bed; or related to any report of any public servant that they attended the residence of Tom Easling and found semi-naked boys in his bed. We know this from a letter sent to me on 25 March 2010 by Jill Francis, Director of Legal Services for the Department of Families and Communities. The letter states:

Mr Evans,

I refer to the recent External Review of the following Freedom of Information applications:

Application 2-DFC/07077-F01012

Access to all documents relating to any report by Craig Reed that he attended the residence of Mr Easling...[address] and found semi-naked boys in his bed.

Application 3-DFC/07079-F01010

Access to all documents relating to any report of a public servant that he attended the residence of Mr Tom Easling address, and found semi-naked boys in his bed.

As you are aware, the Ombudsman has varied the above two determinations made by the Department on 31 August 2009 and 28 August 2009 respectively.

The Department accepts the variation of the said determinations. Such variation resulted from a strict interpretation of the particular words used in the applications, and consequential assessment of whether documents held by the Department fit within the narrow and specific description provided by way of applications.

It is therefore determined that no documents are held by the Department based on a strict and narrow interpretation of the particular wording contained in the applications both dated 19 August 2009.

Yours faithfully, Jill Francis

On these two freedom of information applications and the department's response, the Ombudsman varied 'the Department's determinations to conclude that the Department holds no records within the scope of the application'. The Ombudsman found that there were no documents to support the minister's statement. There has been no appeal against the Ombudsman's determination by the department. The department has confirmed that there are no documents that contain the allegations made by the minister.

In the full knowledge that Mr Easling had been cleared of 18 counts of sexual abuse and a further two counts had not even been proceeded with by the court, Mr Easling believes minister Rankine has effectively reaccused him in full view of the public and the parliament under parliamentary privilege. It remains on the public record today through *Hansard*; it has remained on the public record for nearly two years.

The documents released on the Ombudsman's instructions indicate that the minister's claim is not supported by any departmental document—not one. I believe the minister has deliberately misled the house. I believe she has recklessly attacked Mr Easling's reputation and breached the ministerial code of conduct. Mr Easling, having been cleared by a court, should not have to accept being reaccused through unsubstantiated allegations by a minister in the parliament. In my view, it is a most serious misleading.

This minister has had 20 months, almost two years, to correct this record. Easling's lawyers wrote to her twice about the false and malicious claims. She was questioned in parliament numerous times. She was aware that her department had received a number of freedom of information applications and these applications were reviewed. She was aware the documents were released as a result of the external review by the Ombudsman. She has made no attempt to correct the record.

I therefore ask you to consider the above and rule whether prima facie the matter relates to a matter of privilege and should therefore be accorded precedence for a motion to enable the house to determine if there has been a breach of privilege.

The SPEAKER: The matters raised by the member are very serious and voluminous. I would hate to make a judgement now. I would certainly be wanting to spend some time looking through the material that I would ask you to give to me. I want to defer my decision. I will report back to the house at the first opportunity on whether I consider the matter prima facie to be a matter of privilege.

Unfortunately, we are now going into recess, and there is no way that I could make a decision tonight, so I would expect to bring back my decision in the first week of the sitting when we return to parliament. I would remind members, however, that this is a matter of privilege and that they need to be extremely careful and not make any public statements in relation to this, because it could be a matter of privilege. So, I would warn you to be very careful about that. I would ask that the member for Davenport pass on to me any material that he wishes, and I have something like six or eight weeks to carefully consider my decision.

ADJOURNMENT DEBATE

LEUKAEMIA FOUNDATION

Ms SANDERSON (Adelaide) (16:47): A few weeks ago I had the pleasure of opening the Leukaemia Foundation's patient education day. Leukaemias, lymphomas, myelomas and related blood disorders can develop in anyone of any age at any time. Leukaemia is the number one childhood cancer in Australia but is most common in adults. With few clearly identified risk factors and often no real warning, the impact of a diagnosis is immense and usually immediate for both the patients and their families.

In acute or aggressive cases, the patient typically requires immediate and intensive treatment, often within 24 hours of diagnosis, to ensure the best possible outcomes. On average, treatment can range from six months to one year and even longer. In reality, this means leaving work, school and family commitments, with often little or no notice at all, to commence treatment.

Combined with costly medical bills and loss of income, many families find themselves in difficult financial circumstances whilst coping with the shock and emotional turmoil associated with

the diagnosis. It is during these times that the Leukaemia Foundation can step in to support the patient and their family so that they can concentrate on what is most important—getting well.

The Leukaemia Foundation of Australia has a South Australian patient care village, and I will give you some background information. On average, 16 South Australians are diagnosed each week with a form of blood cancer, and more than 2,500 South Australians are currently living with blood cancer, leukaemia, lymphoma or multiple myeloma. South Australia has the highest rates of leukaemia and myeloma in Australia.

The Leukaemia Foundation's two core activities involve identifying and funding the most promising blood cancer research programs and also providing practical care to blood cancer patients and their families. The Leukaemia Foundation funds cutting edge research into better treatments and cures through its national research program, dedicating $3.5 million to research in the 2008-09 year.

The Foundation also funds research grants, scholarships and fellowships for talented young researchers to promote innovative research into the causes, diagnosis and treatment of these cancers and related disorders. Research is making a real difference in our lifetime. Twenty years ago, children with acute lymphoblastic leukaemia had a 30 per cent chance of survival, and now they have an 80 per cent chance of survival, but there is still a long way to go, with the survival rates in adults still just over 40 per cent.

The practical support provided by the Leukaemia Foundation comes in the form of transport to and from their place of treatment, education, financial assistance and accommodation. A blood cancer diagnosis usually has a profound effect on the individual and their family, especially for people from regional or remote communities. A patient can be diagnosed and on a plane to Adelaide on the same day, uprooting the person from their family, their friends, their work and their home.

Currently, the Leukaemia Foundation provides a home to these individuals and their family or carer. The purpose of providing the accommodation is to minimise the trauma associated with the upheaval of relocation and to give the patient every opportunity to concentrate solely on their treatment. In Adelaide, the Leukaemia Foundation owns two properties in which it provides accommodation to patients and carers. The average length of stay in the apartments is 15 weeks but can be as long as two years.

The accommodation is principally used by patients who permanently reside more than 100 kilometres from the Adelaide GPO—people from places such as Mount Gambier, Port Lincoln, Whyalla, the Riverland, mining and other remote communities, and also interstate locations, including Darwin, Alice Springs and Broken Hill. Awareness of the project is high in these communities, and they have been the principal supporters of the project to date. The accommodation is provided at absolutely no cost to the patient or their carer. Demand for these apartments is high, with the demand approximately double that of what is currently available.

To overcome the accommodation shortage, the Leukaemia Foundation is constructing a new, dedicated accommodation village that includes 14 two and three bedroom self-contained units and recreation and patient care support facilities. The South Australian state government has granted a 7,000 square metre parcel of land located in the federal seat of Adelaide at the Hampstead rehabilitation site in Northfield. Council approval was given in April 2010, and it is expected that construction will commence towards the end of the year.

When completed (expected to be late 2011), the Leukaemia Foundation will have a state-of-the-art facility that will allow residents to concentrate solely on their blood cancer treatment. The facility will cost approximately $10 million. The Leukaemia Foundation has received $1.5 million in donations for the project and has existing residential accommodation assets of $2.5 million which will sold, meaning $6 million is required for the project to become fully funded.

CEDUNA STREETSCAPE

Mrs VLAHOS (Taylor) (16:52): I rise to speak about a recent trip that I had the good fortune to make to Ceduna. A few weeks ago I went to Ceduna to represent minister Holloway in opening stage 3 of the Ceduna main street streetscape. This is an important thing for the community of Ceduna, which is rapidly growing and expected in 10 years' time to double in size. It is now about 3,500 people and is expected to go to 7,000. It is a community undergoing rapid change and an exciting place to visit, and I recommend it highly to anyone who is able to visit the member for Flinders' seat. The streetscape at the head of the jetty is a very nice environment now,

thanks to the state government's Better Places Development Fund, and this streetscape has gone out over a period of about seven to eight years.

The City Council of Ceduna and its CE, Trevor, made me feel very welcome in the town on the day, and I thank them and their works manager, Grant, for escorting me around the town and showing me their treatment centre, their plans for the desalination plant (which will be green powered and very good for the community) and also the residential developments booming in the area due to the aquaculture industry and rutile and gypsum that come into the port of Ceduna. I also recognise that the council intends to pursue another stage in the streetscape, and I look forward to returning to Ceduna to see that fourth stage of the streetscape. I will speak about the Ceduna hospital on another day.

PATIENT ASSISTANCE TRANSPORT SCHEME

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (16:54): I would like to say a few brief words about the Patient Assistance Transport Scheme (PATS), which is an important issue for not only the electorate of Stuart but also electorates all over regional South Australia, including your electorate of Giles, Madam Speaker.

Essentially, the PAT Scheme is to help country patients to seek the care of medical specialists more than 100 kilometres away from their home. It is important that they get that support because, as the Minister for Health mentioned yesterday, it is not possible to provide specialist care in every location in South Australia and it is probably more difficult in regional areas—we understand that—but it is important to help people from regions to get to that care.

As the scheme stands at the moment, claimants are required to make a personal contribution of $30 which is subtracted from eligible travel assistance. In relation to travel, assistance is generally limited to public transport fares or an allowance for the use of private vehicles. Reimbursement for private car costs is based on an allowance of 16¢ per kilometre. Interestingly, 16¢ per kilometre is nowhere near the 71¢ or 73¢ that the ATO deems to be a fair rate, and certainly the state government reimburses its employees at that rate. Air travel costs may be reimbursed where medically endorsed. Taxi fares, hire cars, parking fees, and so on are also very important.

They are the sorts of things that are in the scheme at the moment. Please don't get me wrong: every person in regional South Australia is pleased to have that support. There is no doubt about that. It is better than nothing. However, it is a long way from covering the fair, reasonable costs that people incur at a difficult time in their life.

Understanding this, the Liberal Party in the lead-up to the last election made a promise to the public of South Australia that, if elected, the Liberal Party would put an extra $1 million per year towards this scheme to support people from regional South Australia. That would have gone a long way towards improving the reimbursements people receive when they seek this care. Members should bear in mind that this is not elective care or run-of-the-mill medical care; this is medically necessary specialist care more than 100 kilometres away from home.

Understanding that, the Liberal Party was prepared to put money towards this. It was one of the few election promises we made in relation to supporting regional people in a medical way. We made this promise with PATS. We also committed to having an MRI machine put at Port Augusta Hospital to support all the Upper Spencer Gulf, the Outback and a lot of the Mid North and West Coast areas. We also proposed that we would put chemotherapy services at the Port Augusta Hospital.

Of those three promises, the first two were not matched by the government. The third one was—and I am pleased to acknowledge that. We are waiting for the implementation of that matching promise. Improvement of the PAT Scheme and the MRI machine were not matched by the government, and we are still waiting for the fulfilment of the promise to put chemotherapy services at the Port Augusta Hospital. While we await the fulfilment of that promise, people throughout the electorate of Stuart and all the way from Mount Gambier to Port Lincoln to Ceduna need this support.

I would like to dwell on one thing for a minute or so. I have been approached by people in my electorate who are currently travelling from Port Augusta to Port Pirie for chemotherapy. Again, this is a difficult issue. Regardless of political persuasion, I am sure all members would understand how challenging and difficult this is. No-one undertakes chemotherapy for fun. They only do it when they have to.

Often it is every day for a week, two weeks or three weeks, then there is a break. It often happens regularly, so people travelling every day from Port Augusta to Port Pirie—85 kilometres away—are not eligible for this support. That is a real drain for them. They have to travel back and forth for perhaps five consecutive days, then they have a weekend off, then another five days, and they miss out on this support.

[Sitting extended beyond 17:00 on motion of the Hon. J.D. Hill]

While we wait for the chemotherapy service at Port Augusta to be introduced, which we certainly welcome and look forward to, in addition to people's health being disadvantaged, they are financially disadvantaged. I would just like to compare the PAT Scheme that we have in South Australia to similar schemes interstate. I am very sad to report that we do not fare well in that comparison.

Looking at South Australia compared to other states, we require that support is given only when the specialist care is more than 100 kilometres away from the patient—so, a 200 kilometre round trip—and that is one of the worst in the nation compared to all other states. With regard to the cent per kilometre reimbursement, they are all very similar. Ours is 16¢ a kilometre, and that sits in the middle of the pack, it is fair to say.

With regard to an accommodation subsidy, South Australian patients receive $30 per night reimbursement and, again, that is the worst in the nation. With regard to a private accommodation subsidy, if a patient travels more than 100 kilometres but stays with family or friends they receive no reimbursement whatsoever, and in other states they do. Again, we are at the bottom of the pack there.

With regard to an escort subsidy or some sort of carer (which people would understand may well be very important, certainly not in every case), South Australia is the worst. We are the only state that does not provide any subsidy or financial support for a carer to accompany a person more than 100 kilometres to seek specialist-required medical care.

With regard to the personal contribution that is required, there is a $30 subsidy. This is with regard to the deduction from the travel allowance and, again, we are the worst. Some states do not require any personal contribution; there is no deduction from the accumulated cent per kilometre allowance. Again, we are one of the worst. With regard to a taxi subsidy, we do not get one in South Australia. It is a great shame; other states do.

With regard to a public transport subsidy, in South Australia we do not get one; other states do. With regard to an air subsidy, in South Australia we do not get one and other states do. I need just to clarify those last few. In other states it is automatic. In South Australia it is not automatic; it has to be applied for. I urge the government to look at this PAT Scheme very seriously.

I know that chemotherapy is coming to some other cities, and, as I said, I congratulate the government on matching the Liberals' election promise and installing that in Port Augusta. However, once that is there, there will still be a need for people to go to other specialists a long way from home, and the system that we have in South Australia just does not compare to the system that is in other states.

I urge the minister and I urge the government to revise this system to the benefit of patients, of very sick people, who need this care. The minister yesterday in his address in parliament outlined some improvements and some achievements that he believes have been made in South Australia, but I must highlight the fact that many of those announcements are more than two years old.

Again, it highlights how important this Patient Assistance Transport Scheme is, because things are not getting better. When we have someone come out in July this year, 2010, and the minister takes credit for announcements that were made more than two years ago—June or May, I think it was, 2008—and they are still not in place, it highlights how very important improving and upgrading this scheme is for the people of Stuart and the people of regional South Australia in general.

A lot of improvements could be made. We could certainly look at reducing the kilometre distance so that people who are travelling, perhaps, 50 kilometres from home—remember, a 100 kilometre round trip—could be receiving this benefit. We are the worst in certainly four out of five key areas, and in other areas applications have to be made rather than receiving automatic

support from the government. I urge the government: please look at improving this scheme on behalf of people all throughout regional South Australia.

CAMPBELLTOWN ROTARY CLUB

Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (17:04): I wish to use the small amount of time remaining in this adjournment debate to comment briefly on the Campbelltown Rotary Club. In my maiden speech, I said that there is no activity of government that could not be better undertaken by volunteers who are willing and able, and the Campbelltown Rotary Club is a fine example of that. I should acknowledge that it is a club of which I am a member.

I acknowledge the awarding of Paul Harris fellowships to two of the club's members, Mr Fred Cetta and Dr Milton Lewis at its recent changeover dinner, which I was pleased to attend. Fred Cetta is well-known in the Campbelltown community for his fine work as a philanthropist, a successful businessman and a steady and ready contributor to the local community. His constant financial support for local charity work, local community groups and local sporting groups is well acknowledged in the Campbelltown community, and it is only fitting that he was awarded a Paul Harris fellowship this year. Dr Milton Lewis has been a Rotarian for 36 years, starting with two years in Papua New Guinea where he was working as a doctor. He joined Campbelltown Rotary Club in 1976 and has been constantly working hard to build community in our area. I congratulate them both.

I congratulate Scott Nicholls, Reg Neale, Margaret Northcote and Frank Orlando for the work they did over the past 12 months, and the incoming committee consisting of president, Neville Andrews; vice-president, Haran Howard; secretary, Mary Vincent; and treasurer, Ian Dunlop for the strong work that I am sure they will do in the 12 months to come.

Campbelltown Rotary Club donates tens of thousands of dollars each year to international organisations such as the Polio Plus Rotary group which is fighting polio across the world and which has had such successful results. We also support a number of students coming to Australia every year. We provide significant funds for other youth to develop their skills through programs like Youth Parliament last week, the Rotary Youth Leadership Awards and the East Torrens Primary School gets significant charitable work from the Rotary club, and, in fact, a young person at the Magill Training Centre is developing new skills through riding and working in horse sheds supported by the Rotary club.

Internationally, the Rotary club's contribution to ShelterBox has assisted in providing relief for many people in disaster situations. Interstate, throughout the bushfires of last year, the Campbelltown Rotary Club made a great contribution. In raising money through the activities of the club, even in its fundraising the Rotary club is building community on the first Saturday of every month through its shed sale and through its work at Carnevale, and many events organised in the Campbelltown community.

I commend the Rotary club for its work. I commend Milton Lewis and Fred Cetta for their Paul Harris fellowships, and I think that, in such an august house as this House of Assembly, it is appropriate to acknowledge that work.

MEMBER'S REMARKS

Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (17:08): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr GARDNER: Yesterday in the house I said:

> I urge the government to consider the position I put to the Minister for Transport in correspondence about three months ago and I have yet to receive a response.

My office has just advised me via email that I received a response on Tuesday, which had not been brought to my attention.

At 17:08 the house adjourned until Tuesday 14 September 2010 at 11:00.