

SOUTH AUSTRALIA

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

(HANSARD)

**First Session of the Fifty-First Parliament
(2006)**

The Fiftieth Parliament of South Australia having been prorogued until 4 May 2006, and the House of Assembly having been dissolved on 20 February, general elections were held on 18 March. By proclamation dated 6 April, the new Parliament was summoned to meet on 27 April, and the First Session began on that date.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 27 April 2006

The House met at 11 a.m. pursuant to proclamation.

The Clerk (Mr D.A. Bridges) read the proclamation summoning parliament.

GOVERNOR'S COMMISSION

At 11.05 a.m., in compliance with summons, the house proceeded to the Legislative Council, where a commission was read appointing the Hon. John Jeremy Doyle, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of South Australia, and the Hon. Margaret Jean Nyland, a judge of the Supreme Court, to be commissioners for the opening of parliament.

MEMBERS, SWEARING IN

The house being again in its own chamber, at 11.14 a.m. His Honour Mr Justice Doyle (Chief Justice) attended and produced a commission from Her Excellency the Governor appointing him to be a commissioner to administer to members of the House of Assembly the oath of allegiance or the affirmation in lieu thereof required by the Constitution Act. The commission was read by the Clerk, who then produced writs for the election of 47 members of the House of Assembly.

The oath of allegiance required by law (or the affirmation) was administered and subscribed to by members.

The commissioner retired.

SPEAKER, ELECTION

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Premier): I remind the house that it is now necessary to proceed to the election of a Speaker. I move:

That the member for Playford take the chair of the house as Speaker.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Leader of the Opposition): I second the motion.

The CLERK: Does the honourable member accept the nomination?

Mr SNELLING (Playford): I accept the nomination and submit myself to the will of the house.

The CLERK: Are there any further nominations? There being no further nominations, I declare the honourable member for Playford duly elected as Speaker of the House of Assembly.

Honourable members: Hear, hear!

Mr Snelling was escorted to the dais by the mover and seconder of the motion.

The SPEAKER (Hon. J.J. Snelling): This is not an occasion for a lengthy speech, but I should like to make a solemn undertaking that I will strive to protect the hard-won rights and privileges of the house and to deal fairly with all members. For those people who do not understand today's ceremonies, they may seem quaint and even anachronistic. People who understand the Westminster system better understand that Speakers were reluctant to accept the office because it involved great responsibilities that could cost one one's life. These rituals remind us that we are but the custodians of the sturdiest, most resilient and adaptable of all parliamentary traditions: the great guarantor of our liberties. Our duty is to hand them on, in tact, to those who will follow us.

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Premier): I congratulate the new Speaker. We look forward to the delicacy and sense of duty that you bring to this great office, and I am sure that all members of the house congratulate you. I inform the house that Her Excellency the Governor will be pleased to have the Speaker presented to her at 12.15 p.m. today.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Leader of the Opposition): Mr Speaker, on behalf of the opposition, I place on the record our congratulations to you on your election to the office of Speaker. We acknowledge that you have the skills (indeed, we think, the personality) to be a very good Speaker. We recognise that you are firmly committed to running the house fairly and upholding the traditions and rights of the house, and we certainly congratulate you on becoming the Speaker. I should advise the house, and declare my interest, that the Speaker and I once placed in the same cricket team. I do wish the Speaker better luck with the standing orders than with his catching!

The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher): I congratulate you, sir, on the position that you now hold. It is a great honour to be elected as Speaker, and I am sure that the member for Stuart would concur in that. It is a great privilege and great honour and I am sure that you will serve the parliament well.

[Sitting suspended from 11.41 to 12.05 p.m.]

The SPEAKER: It is now my intention to proceed to Government House to present myself as Speaker to Her Excellency the Governor, and I invite all members to accompany me.

At 12.08 p.m., accompanied by the deputation of members, the Speaker proceeded to Government House.

[Sitting suspended from 12.08 to 2.15 p.m.]

SUMMONS TO COUNCIL CHAMBER

A summons was received from Her Excellency the Governor desiring the attendance of the house in the Legislative Council chamber, whither the Speaker and honourable members proceeded.

The house having returned to its own chamber, the Speaker resumed the chair at 2.55 p.m. and read prayers.

SENATE VACANCY

Her Excellency the Governor, by message, informed the House of Assembly that the President of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Australia, in accordance with section 21 of the Commonwealth Constitution, has notified her that, in consequence of the resignation on 15 March 2006 of Senator the Hon. Robert Murray Hill, a vacancy has happened in the representation of this state in the Senate. The Governor is advised that, by such vacancy having happened, the place of a senator has become vacant before the expiration of his term within the meaning of section 15 of the constitution, and that such place must be filled by the houses of parliament, sitting and voting together, choosing a person to hold it in accordance with the provisions of the said section.

The SPEAKER: I inform the assembly that I have conferred with the honourable President of the Legislative Council and arranged to call a joint meeting of the two houses for the purposes of complying with section 15 of the Commonwealth of Australia Constitution Act on Thursday 4 May at 10 a.m.

SUPPLY BILL

Her Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended the appropriation of such amounts of money as may be required for the purposes mentioned in the bill.

COMMISSION OF OATHS

The SPEAKER: I have to report that I have received from Her Excellency the Governor a commission under the hand of Her Excellency and the public seal of the state empowering me to administer the oath of allegiance or to receive the affirmation necessary to be taken by members of the House of Assembly.

CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES, ELECTION

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

That Ms M.G. Thompson be appointed Chairman of Committees of the Whole House during the present parliament.

The SPEAKER: Is that motion seconded?

Honourable members: Yes, sir.

Motion carried.

GOVERNOR'S SPEECH

The SPEAKER: I have to report that in accordance with a summons from Her Excellency the Governor the House attended this day in the Legislative Council chamber where Her Excellency was pleased to make a speech to both houses of parliament. I have obtained a copy which I now lay on the table.

Ordered to be published.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Speaker—

Police Complaints Authority—Annual Report for 2004-05
Report of Committees which have been received and published pursuant to section 17(7) of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991:

Public Works Committee—

231st Report—Millbrook Reservoir Safety Upgrade
232nd Report—Flinders Medical Centre Northern Car Park

233rd Report—Glenelg Tramway Extension to the Adelaide Railway Station

234th Report—Middle River Water Treatment Plant Miex Retrofit

235th Report—Kulpara to Port Wakefield Road Reconstruction

236th Report—Henley High School Redevelopment Stage 1

237th Report—Mawson lakes School Stage 2

238th Report—Ingham's Enterprises Further Processing Plant

239th Report—Eyre Peninsula Grain Logistics Rail Network Upgrade

Pursuant to Section 131 of the Local Government Act 1999 the following annual reports of Local Councils:

Adelaide City Council—Report 2004-05

Adelaide Hills Council—Report 2004-05

Alexandrina Council—Report 2004-05

Berri Barmera Council—Report 2004-05

Burnside, City of—Report 2004-05

Campbelltown City Council—Report 2004-05

Charles Sturt, City of—Report 2004-05

Clare and Gilbert Valleys Council—Report 2004-05

Flinders Ranges Council—Report 2004-05

Gawler, Town of—Report 2004-05

Goyder, Regional Council of—Report 2004-05

Holdfast Bay, City of—Report 2004-05

Kimba, District Council of—Report 2004-05

Loxton Waikerie, District Council of—Report 2004-05

Mallala, District Council of—Report 2004-05

Mid Murray Council—Report 2004-05

Mount Barker, District Council of—Report 2004-05
 Mount Remarkable, District Council of—Report 2004-05
 Murray Bridge, Rural City of—Report 2004-05
 Naracoorte Lucindale Council—Report 2004-05
 Northern Areas Council—Report 2004-05
 Norwood, Payneham & St Peters, City of—Report 2004-05
 Onkaparinga, City of—Report 2004-05
 Peterborough, District Council of—Report 2004-05
 Port Adelaide Enfield, City of—Report 2004-05
 Port Augusta City Council—Report 2004-05
 Port Lincoln, City of—Report 2004-05
 Port Pirie Regional Council—Report 2004-05
 Playford, City of—Report 2004-05
 Robe, District Council of—Report 2004-05
 Salisbury, City of—Report 2004-05
 Southern Mallee District Council—Report 2004-05
 Tea Tree Gully, City of—Report 2004-05
 Tumby Bay, District Council of—Report 2004-05
 Unley, City of—Report 2004-05
 Wakefield Regional Council—Report 2004-05
 Walkerville, Town of—Report 2004-05
 Wattle Range Council—Report 2004-05
 West Torrens, City of—Report 2004-05
 Yorke Peninsula, District Council of—Report 2004-05.

FUNDING, COMMONWEALTH

A petition signed by 240 residents of South Australia, requesting the house to urge the Minister for Education and Children's Services to reject the conditions attached to the new commonwealth funding granted via the Government Schools Assistance (Learning Together Achievement through Choice and Opportunity) Act 2004 requiring the use of traditional grading, was presented by Mr Hanna.

Petition received.

TOBACCO PRODUCTS

A petition signed by 100 medical students of the Flinders University of South Australia, requesting the house to urge the government to act to remove DJ Mix cigarettes from sale; prevent the manufacture and packaging of tobacco products that target minors or gender specific markets and increase the penalties for selling tobacco products to minors, was presented by Mr Hanna.

Petition received.

GOVERNMENT, MINISTERIAL CHANGES

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Premier): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I wish to advise the house of the ministerial and administrative changes made as a result of the government's victory at the recent state election and its return to office with a strengthened mandate. Cabinet has welcomed three new ministers, and the responsibilities of most of the re-elected ministers have been rearranged to ensure that they focus (with the rest of the community) on the path for South Australia laid out in South Australia's Strategic Plan. Four new substantive ministerial portfolios have been created to reflect the new government's renewed commitment to growing the state's prosperity, attaining sustainability and tackling the challenge of climate change; improving the well being of our citizens; fostering creativity and innovation; building and strengthening our communities; and expanding opportunities for all South Australians. Few administrative

changes were required to support these new arrangements: no new departments have been created and staff movements have been kept to a minimum.

On 23 March I was sworn into the new office of Minister for Sustainability and Climate Change, acknowledging that leadership in tackling climate change must be accepted at the highest level of the government. Climate change is one of the greatest threats facing our planet. There needs to be strong action if we are to achieve the challenging targets set out in the strategic plan. I will be directly supported in my new role by staff transferred from the Department for Environment and Heritage to a new Division of Sustainability and Climate Change, which has been created in the Department of the Premier and Cabinet.

I will retain responsibility for the government's social inclusion agenda, remaining as Minister for Social Inclusion. Support for this role has been strengthened by this morning's appointment of Monsignor David Cappo to the new position of Commissioner for Social Inclusion. Supported by the Department of the Premier and Cabinet's Social Inclusion Unit, the new commissioner will work closely with the Minister for Mental Health (Hon. Gail Gago) to continue the work we have already begun to improve mental health services. Monsignor Cappo will continue his membership on the Executive Committee of Cabinet.

The major advances made over the past four years in areas such as reducing rough sleeping and improving school retention attest to the commitment of this government to social justice and the dedication of Monsignor Cappo. He has not been afraid to challenge the government and the community of South Australia on the hard issues we all face.

Creation of the new office of Minister for the City of Adelaide and the appointment of the member for Adelaide as the first holder of that office signals the government's commitment to revitalising the central business district. The minister will be responsible for maintaining and strengthening the crucial relationship between the state government and the Adelaide City Council and will focus on joint efforts to attract more investment into the city. Responsibility for the ministerial powers and functions in Part 2 of the City of Adelaide Act 1998 has been transferred to the Minister for the City of Adelaide.

The heart of the government's second-term agenda is the goal of increasing economic prosperity. The Treasurer has accepted the key role of Minister for Industry and Trade with the member for Chaffey appointed as Minister Assisting the Minister for Industry and Trade, combining this new role with her continuing regional development and small business responsibilities. The Treasurer's former responsibility as Minister for Police has been transferred to the Leader of the Government in the Legislative Council. The Hon. Paul Holloway retains ministerial responsibility for South Australia's burgeoning resources industry.

The Hon. Carmel Zollo has become South Australia's first dedicated Minister for Road Safety in addition to her continuing responsibilities as Minister for Correctional Services and Minister for Emergency Services. Working closely with the Road Safety Advisory Council, the new minister will bring road safety issues directly to the cabinet table and will ensure that there is proper coordination of our efforts to reduce the terrible impact of road trauma on our community. Our Strategic Plan commits the community to the goal of reducing road fatalities in South Australia by 40 per cent by 2010.

In other areas, the member for Lee has accepted responsibility for the operations of Forestry SA and the Lotteries Commission as the new Minister for Administrative Services and Government Enterprises; and the member for Cheltenham has been given the extra portfolio of Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation, in addition to his new role as Minister Assisting the Premier in Cabinet Business and Public Sector Management. In his new role, the member for Cheltenham will play a key role in public sector management and reform. He will assist me to ensure that cabinet is strategically focused and able to set clear directions that a modern, efficient and responsive public sector can follow to serve all South Australians and help us to achieve the goals that we have set for ourselves in the years ahead.

As mentioned, three new ministers have joined the cabinet and accepted challenging new roles. The member for Wright has succeeded me in the office of Minister for Volunteers and has also been appointed as Minister for State/Local Government Relations, Minister for the Status of Women and Minister for Consumer Affairs, and to the new office of Minister Assisting in Early Childhood Development. The member for Colton will combine the portfolio of Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education with those of Minister for Youth and Minister for Gambling. The Hon. Gail Gago has been sworn in as Minister for Environment and Conservation, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse and as the new Minister Assisting the Minister for Health.

STATE FINANCES

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Treasurer): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: May I congratulate you, sir, on your achievement of becoming Speaker of the house. I look forward to observing all your rulings, as you would expect. Strong financial management is the hallmark of the Rann Labor government. Over the past four years the government has rebuilt the state's finances and regained our AAA credit rating. We have increased funding in health, education and policing and are investing over a billion dollars a year in infrastructure. We have delivered a comprehensive package of tax cuts that will deliver \$1.5 billion of tax relief by 2010. We have done all this and maintained strong budget surpluses.

The Rann government will build on this record over the next four years. Our achievements over the last term have been due to the discipline that the government has shown with its budgeting. In our first two budgets we asked agencies to review their program expenditure and to list savings that could be reinvested in health, education and law and order. In our first budget, this exercise provided nearly a billion dollars of program savings over four years and over \$500 million over four years in our second budget. The government will be taking a similar approach in this budget. We are asking government agencies to review their program expenditure so that we can deliver additional resources to front line services for all South Australians. The amount we are seeking to identify is approximately 3 per cent to 4 per cent of agency expenditure. This is a prudent and responsible process for a government to undertake: it would be lazy not to constantly try to find ways of spending taxpayers' money more efficiently.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: This process is all the more timely, given the recent slowing of GST revenue from the commonwealth. Helping us in the task is former commonwealth Treasury official, Mr Greg Smith. He will be working with chief executive officers, the Department of Treasury and Finance and me as Treasurer over the coming weeks. The 2006 budget will be handed down in September. It will be a document that will continue to provide funding for the government's priorities of health, education, and law and order, but it will also recognise the challenges ahead and provision for them. The 2006-07 budget will maintain strong surpluses over the forward years. I look forward to bringing this budget to the house in September.

QUESTION TIME

STATE BUDGET

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Leader of the Opposition): When did the Treasurer first become aware of significant budget problems and that public sector spending had to be cut by an extra \$300 million? Just days after the recent state election, the government announced that public sector spending had to be cut by an extra \$300 million—a cut from \$100 million to \$400 million.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Treasurer): With great pleasure I answer that question by saying a couple of very important points. I have just given to the house a ministerial statement that made it very clear that the government must work very hard to provision for the—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I am happy to give the answer should the house like it. If the house does not want an answer, I am happy to move to the next question.

Mr Williams interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Treasurer has the call; members on my left are to hear it.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Thank you, sir. The budget pressures on this government—and on future state governments—will be of significant complexity and challenge for whoever is in office. The ageing of our community and the pressures on service delivery, particularly in health, disabilities and social services, are such that every state government—Labor or Liberal—from this day forward will struggle each and every year to meet those demands and to provide budget surpluses. I do not resile from the hard work that is required. I do not resile from the fact that the pressures, which are contained and ever present in the state, are growing at such a rate that it is an extremely difficult job.

In relation to the timing of advice given to the government, I am happy to answer that question. Any incoming government is given the latest financial update. We released the mid-year—

Dr McFetridge: You kept it secret from yourself!

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Tragically, that indicates the naivety and lack of understanding by the member for Morphett of the caretaker principles of government. During caretaker mode governments are not briefed on finer details, such as those to which I am referring.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Members on my left have asked the question. The Treasurer is responding to it.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Clearly, this is the new aggressive, arrogant opposition.

The SPEAKER: Order! I will not have the Treasurer speaking over me, either. The Treasurer has the call.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: In my ministerial statement I alluded to the advice given to the government. A new government has an opportunity in the first budget for the next four budgets to provide for the health requirements of this state. A monthly monitoring report was delivered to the Department of Treasury and Finance. We have monthly monitoring, which was handed to Treasury during the caretaker period. That report indicated that the Department of Health had advised the Under Treasurer and Treasury that a further pressure has built up since the mid-year review—since the last monitoring report I had before caretaker mode—

Ms Chapman: Since February?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Yes, it was the monthly February monitoring report. That said that a further pressure had come in, through health, that we have to provision for. As members opposite who have been cabinet ministers know, those types of pressures are ever-present and appear quite often. But I then took the opportunity to accept advice that this is an opportunity to go further than just that particular health pressure—that is, we can provision more capacity within our budget to meet the pressures that will be ever-present over the next four years.

I will say this: it is not about the advice that I get from the department of Treasury during a caretaker period and when we resume as the new government. That is only part of the picture. The picture is a very simple one, and it is what Peter Costello is grappling with in his budget. It is what Peter Costello and I have had a number of discussions about as recently as the Treasurers' conference only a few weeks ago. It is this: the cost of health care and the cost of providing services to our ageing and frail community is growing at a percentage point well in excess of CPI growth. And I can say this confidently: members opposite, if they should ever reach office, will have no different a problem. It will be only a greater problem, and governments consistently will have to make priority changes year in, year out. In this budget I am ensuring that we do the hard work to provision capacity for the next three or four years to make achievable the task of delivering more spending on health, more spending on education and more spending on police.

SAFER COMMUNITIES

Ms SIMMONS (Morialta): My question is to the Attorney-General. Can the Attorney-General inform the house about how the government is addressing the safer communities objectives of South Australia's Strategic Plan?

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON (Attorney-General): That is a good question from that side of the house, and I thank the member for Morialta for the question. Target 2.8 of South Australia's Strategic Plan is aimed at reducing crime rates in South Australia to below the national average within 10 years. Although the Rann Labor government is naturally pleased that crime has fallen in South Australia by 13 per cent since 2003 (and that is according to the 2003-04 and 2004-05 police annual reports), we acknowledge that there is still much more work to do. For example, the Labor government has been most concerned about public disquiet regarding

incidents where groups of uninvited guests attending private functions cause disturbances and, on occasion, assaults. I will introduce legislation next week so that home owners, or other persons in authority, can require uninvited persons to leave the premises and not return and, if necessary, use force to remove them.

Another Labor initiative is aimed at a continuing crime downward trend in South Australia, and that is the Repay SA plan, under which we will expand community work order programs by boosting the number of low risk and first time offenders working to benefit the public. The government has already established a pilot program for graffiti removal through the Christies Beach Magistrates Court and will soon be extending the program to the north-eastern suburbs, and I am grateful for the support of the members for Newland, Playford, Hartley and Morialta for the expansion of this project.

I am also pleased to say that Labor will introduce new legislation aimed at rock throwers. Rock throwers who hurt or, indeed, kill the drivers or occupiers of vehicles are already subject to prosecution for other serious offences (such as endangering life, causing grievous bodily harm, manslaughter, or even murder) that carry maximum penalties ranging from 15 years to life imprisonment. We will create a new offence of throwing a missile at a moving vehicle, even if there is no damage or consequences. That offence will attract a maximum penalty of five years' imprisonment.

Yet another part of the Rann government's bid for crime rates to fall even further in our second term is to fast track repeat offenders through the criminal justice system. The experience in Britain indicates that one in every 10 offenders has three or more convictions, and that they are responsible for half of all crime. The British experience suggests that having cases fast tracked through the system potentially means that additional offences committed by repeat offenders can be prevented. The government will work with police, prosecution and the courts to introduce practices and procedures and, if necessary, legislation to enable the fast tracking of proceedings against habitual criminals.

STATE BUDGET

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Leader of the Opposition): If the Treasurer was not aware before the election of budget problems requiring spending cuts, as claimed in his previous answer, why then did he admit to *The Australian* newspaper that he considered hiring federal treasury officer Greg Smith before the election? *The Australian* newspaper reported on 8 April 2006, 'Foley admitted he first considered hiring Smith before the election.'

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Treasurer): Absolutely, sir, because in my—

The Hon. I.F. Evans: Because you didn't know there was a problem.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Because, sir, in the election campaign I announced that to pay for our election promises we were going to have an efficiency dividend and we were going to have cuts across the public sector. To do that—

The Hon. I.F. Evans interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Unlike the opposition, we did not go the electorate with a policy to sack 3 000 public servants in one year.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: That's right; 4 000 in one year.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: We decided, Mr Speaker, that—
Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I suggest the Treasurer return to his answer rather than engage with the interjections of the opposition.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Thank you, sir. My intention, with the experience of the first budget, was that it would be very good with our election promises to bring a very, very qualified senior bureaucrat from Canberra to do an exercise, more forensic and more detailed, than I had done previously. That is what I learned from doing the exercise initially, and I thought it was a good idea, and I still think it is a good idea. I think I said in my previous answer that it was a February monitoring report. The advice that I am given is that the monitoring report from the health department received by Treasury was the January monitoring report, received in February (during the caretaker period), which indicated that hospital activity was in excess of what they had advised us for the mid-year budget review. Remember, sir, in the mid-budget review in January we provisioned an additional—

Ms Chapman: Everything was great then.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Treasurer has the call.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I have not had the opportunity, I might add, to congratulate the member for Bragg on becoming the deputy leader—one stop short for the chosen one, but only time will tell. The January monitoring report from health was received in February, which indicated that the provisioning that we had made in the mid-year review for an additional \$67 million for hospital activity would not be sufficient, and that is what I said. The great pressure, dilemma, challenge of public financing is that the health needs of our state are such and have such momentum—

The Hon. I.F. Evans interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I do not think the Leader of the Opposition is fully across his brief on this one. The capacity that I am building is over the next four years. Hospital activity level has a compounding effect, so what you required for one year has to be compounded into future out years as activity levels grow. What you need for the 2006-07 year is somewhat less than what you need four years down the track. That is what I am provisioning for. As I have said publicly before, it is just not taking the opportunity for provision for health. I have taken advice from Treasury and, on my own experience, it would be prudent for us to provision for a number of areas of government activity. Whether or not it is needed is yet to be seen. But I say this, and I make no apology for it: it is better budget management to provision for possible outcomes, and it is prudent budget management to give your government the capacity to meet what may be challenges in the years ahead, even if at this stage we are not certain that they will arrive. So, I am going to a position with the budget that simply says that we have increased hospital activity—

The Hon. I.F. Evans interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Caretaker period.

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: If the Leader of the Opposition is suggesting that I breached caretaker convention, he is sadly wrong.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The deputy leader has had a fair go.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Sorry? Caretaker convention says you don't hide from the public?

The SPEAKER: I suggest the Treasurer gets on with his answer to the question.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I have no intention of breaching caretaker provisions. What I am provisioning for in this budget goes beyond health. It is about a general capacity building in the public finances of this state to give us capacity in future budgets to allocate new money to priority areas in health, education and policing.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I don't see the point that the deputy leader is trying to make. I have been upfront from day one. We were advised of—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, members on my left! Members, when the Speaker calls the house to order, the house becomes silent.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Sir, I'm—

The SPEAKER: The Deputy Premier can wait for the Speaker to finish, as well. When the Speaker calls the house to order, the house comes into silence. Please respect that, otherwise question time just becomes anarchy. The Deputy Premier has the call. He will answer the question.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I act on advice and I deal with that advice professionally and according to caretaker conventions, and what I have done in this exercise is no more than what a Treasurer doing his or her job properly should do and that is to take the advice that, yes, another weight of health pressure has come through but that it is also prudent, up and beyond election promises, to build further capacity to provision for what may be pressures that eventuate. Those pressures may not eventuate and that will then give the government at that particular time in the budget cycle further capacity to spend elsewhere. The member for Bragg says that it is a war chest. I heard that all the way up to the election that we had some secret war chest. The Liberals outspent us by a huge amount. There was no war chest. This is a prudent, conservative government. I make no apology that it is the right thing to do to demand that public servants look at ways in which we can reallocate spending within government. I finish on this note: I am proud of the record of this government. We have delivered four budgets, four surpluses and AAA credit rating, as compared to the Liberals' four budgets, four deficits and \$1.5 billion of debt.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Premier is now debating the question.

HOSPITALS, FLINDERS MEDICAL CENTRE

Ms FOX (Bright): My question is to the Minister for Health. Given the Flinders Medical Centre is crucial in the delivery of health services to the residents of the south of Adelaide, what steps is the government taking to improve facilities there?

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Minister for Health): I thank the member for Bright for her question. I congratulate her on her victory and for her great interest in health issues in the southern suburbs.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. HILL: A 15 per cent swing, I understand. Very good, yes. Thank you, Mr Speaker, and congratulations to you as well. Members will have heard Her Excellency announce, during her remarks earlier today, the government's

intention to refurbish the Flinders Medical Centre and, in fact, we are committing \$145 million to redevelop Flinders. The scope of the \$92 million first phase of this redevelopment will include expansion and redesign of the emergency department, development of the medical assessment short stay units, expansion and refurbishment of the existing operating theatre suites, establishment of a combined day procedure unit and day surgery admission unit, and expansion of the existing intensive care unit. A further \$53 million stage 2 will be conducted over approximately seven years and this will incorporate upgrading of ward accommodation, engineering plant and systems, and refurbishment of medical imaging and other clinical facilities. A project team to plan the redevelopment will soon be appointed.

I can also inform the house that the government is currently building new car parking at Flinders Medical Centre to cope with increasing demand. Recently, 87 car parks have been built at the southern end of the centre, another 51 places are due for completion next month, and tenders have now closed for the building of another 570-space car park at the northern end of the hospital. The project includes widening the service road near the centre, providing two entry gates into the new car park, and establishing an alternative exit route. Together, these car parks will replace temporary parking on the university oval and provide an additional 278 extra car parks. It is expected that this project will be completed by the end of the year, and these new spaces will make life a lot easier for patients, visitors and staff.

Both of these projects represent this government's commitment to rebuilding our hospital system, and to building a 21st century hospital system for South Australia.

ICT SYSTEMS

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Leader of the Opposition):

When did the Minister for Infrastructure first become aware of the claimed \$30 million per year saving from the new tendering process for the IT systems?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Minister for Infrastructure):

I would not mind a little more information in regard to which saving the Leader of the Opposition is referring—and I congratulate the Leader of the Opposition on his promotion. If he is talking about something which emerged during the caretaker period it would not have been advised to me until now; he probably needs to be a little more specific. I do not think he is aware of the sheer scale of ICT procurement—\$30 million savings in the long term in this area is, I think, quite a modest target and we are always looking for that when we are talking about hundreds of millions of dollars. If the Leader of the Opposition could be a little more specific I would be more than happy to tell him.

CHILDREN IN CARE

Ms THOMPSON (Reynell): Can the Minister for Families and Communities inform the house what measures the state government is taking to address the needs of children in care?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Minister for Families and Communities): I thank the honourable member for her question and congratulate her on her staggering victory in the seat of Reynell. I also acknowledge that she has had a regular and ongoing interest in this important area of endeavour. Children in our state care are, of course, one of our greatest priorities; they are some of the most vulnerable people in the

community, having come into care because their own parents have been unable to care for them, and so the state has a special responsibility.

I am pleased to inform the house that over the life of the last government \$80 million of additional expenditure was contributed to this important area, and this has been applied in a number of important ways. Just last week I formally launched a charter for the rights of children and young people in care, and it was a source of immense pride to see the young people who had formerly been in care, to consult with them and their colleagues and to work together to design a charter which shows them what they are entitled to expect while in care and, crucially, shows them where they can go if things are not right.

That work has been supervised by the Office of the Guardian, another creation of this government, which is an independent statutory office that has been working closely with children and young people in care to ensure that their circumstances are monitored and that also leads important initiatives such as the charter.

We have also created a new rapid response system, which means that children and young people in care go to the front of every queue. That means that they are entitled to expect from the state that the state treats them as would a parent, and we make every endeavour to do that. It is a coordinated whole of government approach to ensure that children and young people in care have priority access to health, housing and welfare services.

An important new initiative has also been the creation of a services bank. That services bank will be supervised by the Guardian, and she will go out and ask a whole range of people, including private sector operators, non-government organisations, and the Australian government, to offer what they can to put into this service bank so that we can provide a little bit extra for children and young people in our care—just the sort of thing that one would imagine a parent would do, doing that little bit extra for their own children. Moreover, we have substantially improved the regularity of reviews of children and young people in our care. We are now up to something like 99 per cent of reviews being conducted on time. There is obviously a small way to go but that annual review process is a critical way for us to track the well-being of the young people in our care.

We have created 10 new transitional accommodation houses, the most recent of which were opened a couple of months ago in Woodcroft, and those transitional accommodation houses provide a vital link in stabilising young people who come into care in difficult circumstances before we can place them in a more stable arrangement with a foster carer. In the area of foster care, after years of neglect, we have undertaken some significant steps to improve this crucial area, including the establishment of a foster care recruitment service—a \$75 one-off payment to help with the initial care responsibilities for people coming into care, and also indexing carers' payments for the third consecutive year.

Finally, and most crucially, those children in the past who have been let down, and those children in state care who have been subjected to sexual abuse, have the opportunity to participate in a process of healing and acknowledgment before the Mullighan inquiry. That inquiry continues its valuable work, and we look forward to receiving the recommendations of that inquiry to make sure that this never happens again.

ICT SYSTEMS

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Leader of the Opposition): When did the Treasurer first become aware of the claimed \$30 million per year saving from the new tendering process for IT systems?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Treasurer): I am happy to answer the question—

The SPEAKER: Order! One small thing, Treasurer. While his enthusiasm to get up and answer the question is admirable, it works better if he waits for the call of the Speaker before he rises to answer the question.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Thank you for your advice, Mr Speaker.

Mr Goldsworthy interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: The Under Treasurer, who is one of the senior public servants overseeing the ICT contract, advises me—I do not have the exact date here with me—that, prior to caretaker, the likely savings—and I would hope a minimum through the new re-tendering—is around \$30 million—I think, and I hope that is a minimum. It will also be a challenge for the budget bottom line to achieve all of those savings. One of the great problems that you find in government is not simply identifying the savings but actually getting those savings back from the agencies to consolidated account for redistribution to other priority areas. That is one of the great challenges we face consistently when achieving savings in government.

One of the reasons I asked Greg Smith to assist us is that I want some advice from an experienced person such as Greg Smith on how we can identify whole-of-government savings and actually get them back to the budget bottom line for further redistribution within government. ICT savings is but one example. The Under Treasurer provides advice, as is the regular norm, on a whole series of government financial matters. That information was made available to me. If the question is, ‘Why didn’t I tell the opposition about that?’, it is because I chose to keep that information for government, and if the Leader of the Opposition wants to be critical of me for not making him aware of it so that he could factor that into his savings, well, I will cop that criticism.

I hope that the ICT re-tendering process that we are going through now will achieve savings in excess of \$30 million. The Minister for Infrastructure has overseen the contractual and operational side of things, and the government thinks there is huge scope for a lot greater savings in ICT in government, because one of the difficult control areas of government—and I think this is so for any major organisation—is how to control IT expenditure. We have not had common usage across government, and we are changing that. We have to reinvest in equipment and technology, which has not been properly invested in in previous years. The new ICT tendering arrangements give us great scope to achieve significant savings, so I was more than comfortable with putting that figure in the budget. However, it will be a very hard task for us to make sure that we get all those contractual savings back into consolidated revenue and the bottomline.

INDUSTRY DEVELOPMENT

Mr BIGNELL (Mawson): My question is to the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education. What action is the government taking to address the challenge of

skilling South Australians to maximise the benefits of our success in winning major industry development projects?

The Hon. P. CAICA (Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education): Mr Speaker, I congratulate you on your elevation to the position of Speaker and wish you well. Through you, sir, I thank the member for Mawson for his question and also congratulate him on his outstanding victory. Today there are record numbers of South Australians in apprenticeships and traineeships: 33 700 young South Australians as at September 2005. We have a strong labour market and record low levels of unemployment such that skills shortages in key areas have developed over time.

We are faced with a critical challenge for the decade ahead. The anticipated retirement of many of our current work force—we only have to look at the other side—and the demands created by our success in winning major projects such as the air warfare destroyers contract, the new army battalion, and the expansion of the Olympic Dam mine, require the rapid development of our skilled work force.

This challenge also gives us opportunities to lay the foundation for continued strong economic development in South Australia well into the future and to provide exciting career pathways for our youth. We must train more people quickly and strategically. Training outcomes need to be better aligned to the needs of industry. In this regard, the roles of the Training and Skills Commission, Industry Skills Boards and my department (the Department of Further Education, Employment, Science and Technology) will be critical to our strategic planning. To help address this challenge the government is funding at least 2 000 training positions (apprenticeships and traineeships combined) that align with the needs of key growth sectors, existing skills shortages, and the particular needs of regions in our state. Over four years, \$16 million will be provided.

The 2 000 extra training positions will be in addition to the 600 new training positions previously announced for the mineral resources and heavy engineering industries. Targeted areas to reduce skills shortages include training for trade skills and qualifications in: mechanical and fabrication engineering, including welding, toolmaking, sheet metal and fitters; automotive trades; electrical and electronic trades; construction and plant operators; locomotive drivers; sales and service workers; road transport drivers; community health service workers, including childcare, aged care and disability; manufacturing leadership and organisation; middle management and supervisory positions; and primary and environmental industries.

Potential exists for increased industry contributions to the training challenges our state faces to maximise the benefits for workers and our economy. The government will work to make our training system more flexible. We need to recognise the competencies people achieve, not just the length of time they serve in training. Recognition of prior learning enables speedier progress to achieving qualifications and jobs. Reforming occupational licensing to fast track newly qualified workers into industry will be considered.

Strategies for implementing the government’s election commitment to additional apprenticeships and traineeships include: school-based new apprenticeships; prevocational programs targeted at specific industry needs; youth learning and work programs; competency-based recognition for mature-age apprentices; and indigenous employment programs, including prevocational and apprenticeship programs. By developing our most valuable resource, the

work force, we can lay an even stronger foundation for a prosperous future for all South Australians.

ICT SYSTEMS

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Leader of the Opposition): My question is to the Treasurer. Was Treasury aware prior to 25 January 2006, when the mid-year budget review was released, of the claimed savings of \$30 million per year from the new tendering process for IT systems and, if so, why were these savings not included in the forward estimates for the mid-year budget review?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Treasurer): I do not believe that that advice had been sufficiently—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for MacKillop has had a fair go.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: A very arrogant opposition, Mr Speaker; very jumpy. My recollection is that those numbers were not sufficiently arrived at then, for a very simple reason.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Do members opposite want an answer or do they just want to badger me, because, quite frankly, I can sit down and read the *Financial Review* or I can give information to the house?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Treasurer has the call. Members on my left are to cease interjecting and the Treasurer is to ignore any interjections they make.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: The savings are a result of contracts being let. My guess—and I will get this checked—is that the letting of a number of those contracts would not have been at a point that would have enabled those numbers to be put into the mid-year review. Some were let—

The Hon. P.F. Conlon interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY:—and some were still being let, as the minister says, late in January, and I guess there are still more to be let. I am advised by my office that the advice I was given over the phone—in fact, the Minister for Infrastructure took the call that the minute from the Under Treasurer alluding to these likely savings, these possible savings, was received by me on 15 February, five days before we went into caretaker mode.

ROADS, PORT WAKEFIELD

Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder): Is the Minister for Transport aware that the traffic problems that occurred over Easter at the Port Wakefield intersection are a regular occurrence due to the high volume of regular traffic, and what action is the government proposing to improve that section of road? The minister stated on ABC radio on 18 April that the traffic chaos was ‘simply Easter traffic’. Constituents have raised with me their concerns that the minister was unaware of the year-round problems that exist there. For his information, the Yorke Peninsula region in 2004 had 530 000 visitors who spent some 1.9 million nights in the area and, on top of that, we have the usual high volume of users such as freight companies and other business operators.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Minister for Transport): I can assure the member for Goyder—and I congratulate him on his election—that I know the intersection very well. I have spent many quality hours in Port Vincent. I have slaughtered a lot of whiting out of Port Vincent and, when the weather is

bad, I know the inside of the Ventnor Hotel—waiting only for a break in the weather, of course! So, I do know the intersection, and it is simply specious to suggest that the ordinary operation of the intersection is anything like it is after the Easter long weekend. I will come to the shadow Minister for Transport in a moment, because he has had something to say about this relatively recently, too.

The truth is that the most addressable bottleneck in that area, if I can put it that way, would of course be a bypass of the city of Wakefield since, once clearing the intersection, the traffic again bottlenecks through a 60k then 50k zone, from memory. That is, of course, the most national of national roads. Despite that, we have taken the lead. The honourable member may be aware that we have had some public meetings up there talking about that. There are other developments in the town of Port Wakefield that may lead to further consideration in the future. It would require Auslink funding.

Despite the implications of the shadow spokesperson for transport, there is no way the government will be picking up federal responsibilities: that would be foolish. We will be examining that matter at the next Auslink reset to see what the circumstances are. The shadow minister for transport, after the Easter weekend, said that we have not been doing enough: we should be doing something about it. Obviously, he discovered this intersection only this Easter because, of course, during the election campaign we had endless promises on roads from the opposition. It was building roads everywhere. People were going to come from all over Australia to Mount Gambier to see the roads! The opposition intended to spend so much money that it would have been a tourist attraction. It was going to duplicate the Victor Harbor Road for next to nothing.

The Hon. I.F. Evans interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: We will get the Leader of the Opposition to build the roads for us. The opposition did not promise a bypass of Port Wakefield. Somewhere between the election campaign and Easter, the shadow spokesperson discovered the need for a bypass. Well, that is not how we plan roads and it is not how we will be doing it in the future. We will be doing it in the intelligent way which I explained to you, Mr Speaker.

PUBLIC TRANSPORT, MURRAY BRIDGE

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond): My question is to the Minister for Transport. Why is public transport in Murray Bridge not attracting the same government subsidies as other comparable regional centres in the state, such as Mount Gambier? Regional bus services in the regional centre of Mount Gambier are being fully subsidised by the government whereas services in other regional centres, such as Murray Bridge, have been scaled back considerably to dial-a-ride arrangements that do not suit users of public transport. Murray Bridge demographics include a substantial number of aged and welfare-dependent households—the primary users of public transport.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Minister for Transport): I give an extra special heartfelt congratulations to the member for Hammond on his election.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: A rare consensus in the house! The premise to the question is simply wrong. The history of this matter is that a group of councils that style themselves ‘provincial cities’ unilaterally took action to withdraw funding for their responsibility for transport in their cities.

We—being the good government we are—stepped in to hold that up in a number of cities. We examined the best outcome for those cities in terms of transport. I am very confident that, as the dial-a-ride is trialled and used in Murray Bridge, it will be more popular than the previous system. That has been our experience where it has been used before. The member for Light—the former mayor of Gawler—can attest to the fact that the dial-a-ride service introduced in Gawler is very popular. I am very confident. I suggest that the member for Hammond ask the question again in six months, and we will see what the people of Murray Bridge think about it. I think it will be more popular than the previous system.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Mitchell has the call.

SENIORS CARD

Mr HANNA (Mitchell): Mr Speaker, I congratulate you on your election to Speaker. My question is to the Minister for Ageing. What measures has the minister taken to ensure that his department never again sells private information of its clients; and does the US marketing company that bought the Seniors Card database still have the right to use the information until the contract runs out? In late February it was reported in the media that the minister's department sold the names and addresses of 120 000 South Australians aged over 60 from the Seniors Card database to a US company for \$30 000. These citizens subsequently received literature from this company trying to sell health products and services.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Minister for Ageing): I congratulate the member on his re-election. It is important to not believe everything you read, and I thank the honourable member for the opportunity to correct the public record because, indeed, the information that has been the subject of these mail-outs was never sold to a private company in the US, or anywhere else. In fact, the arrangements, to the extent that they exist (and I do not seek to say that they are perfect), were introduced by the previous government—that is, the former Liberal government. The way those arrangements operate is this: there is an opportunity for a person who receives a Seniors Card to indicate whether they wish to receive certain material by way of mail-out. In the past, the arrangement was that if you did not tick the box you received the material. Incidentally, on coming to government, we changed it so you had to make a positive decision in favour of that. I think that may have been introduced by the former minister for ageing, the member for Ashford.

People now choose to opt to receive information from this mailing list. The arrangement is that there is a separate contracted mailing house that holds that information, so people's private addresses do not in fact go to the people who are flogging whatever it is they are seeking to sell. The information is held by a third party mailing house and is secure, so there is no sense in which that data is sold. What is sold is the use of it and, as I said, that was an arrangement put in place—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: It was an arrangement put in place by the previous Liberal government.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Well, let us clarify that as well. In the early days of the Labor government, without reference to the former minister, a public servant renewed the

arrangement and, the first time it was drawn to a minister's attention, concerns were raised about it. So, instead of making arrangements for it to be rolled over for a further three years, it was allowed to continue because we did not want the scheme to collapse while we reviewed it, and that is the phase we are in at the moment. Unfortunately, our concerns were well-founded because, during this period of review, it transpired that material that was meant to be warranted as quality material was found to be of dubious quality. I do not want to prejudice the state's position in relation to our legal arrangements with this party, but let us say for the sake of argument that it was dubious, and certainly it was represented that some cures for medical conditions were promoted as something the state government was endorsing.

Fortunately, most people saw this for what it was and either binned it or regarded it as material that they would not act upon, but we could not take the risk that there were not some vulnerable people who might have thought of this material as something they should have regard to and potentially disregard their doctor's advice, so we took the additional precaution of ensuring that a mail-out went to each person saying that this was not government-endorsed material and that you should be consulting your own doctor if you have any medical issues.

So, that is the history of this matter. I welcome the opportunity given by the member for Mitchell to clarify it. Of course, those arrangements are under review and certainly we put a stop to any mail-outs of that type that occurred.

BROWNHILL AND KESWICK CREEKS FLOOD MITIGATION STUDY

Mr PISONI (Unley): Thank you, Mr Speaker, and I congratulate you on your election today. My question is to the minister—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. Foley: What was that Gunny—an improvement?

The Hon. G.M. Gunn: An improvement on the last one.

Members interjecting:

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

Mr PISONI: Thank you to the member for Stuart. My question is to the Minister for Infrastructure. Does the minister agree that building flow control dams upstream on Brownhill Creek would be an effective flood mitigation measure for those living adjacent to those creeks within my seat of Unley and, if so, what is the time frame for construction of the flow control dams? My constituents are affected by the delay in solving the flooding issues within Unley. The Brownhill Creek flood study, which has been circulated at community meetings by government representatives, suggests that building flood control dams upstream on Brownhill Creek would be the most effective plan for flood mitigation.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Minister for Infrastructure): I congratulate the member for Unley. I do not feel the same way about it as the member for Stuart. I do not know whether I should defend the former member for Unley; it is not in my nature, but it was an interesting observation. The truth about that and all stormwater works in South Australia is that there has been in the past, I think, an under-investment in infrastructure. That is something that was recognised by this government. Also recognised by this government is that the structure for making those investments in stormwater infrastructure, being largely based on councils and their

responsibilities, has been inadequate to address the need for investment.

The arrangement this government came to late last year and finalised just before the election with the Local Government Association has been described not only by us but by them as both historic and overdue. It has received glowing praise from the president of the LGA. It will create an authority which will allow a proper and planned investment in stormwater infrastructure. It is not going to be my role to decide from here what is and is not best for managing stormwater in a particular catchment. That will be the role of the authority, and that is something we want. We want local governments to play the leading role in it. We want them to be able to manage their stormwater investment. We want to create, and we will create, an authority for them to do it.

It should sit ill in the mouth of the opposition to criticise this. It has been a brave move, an historic move, by this government. It has been overdue, but it is brave for us because we are wading into responsibilities, in some cases, which are not ours. But we have taken this step to create an authority to allow councils to get together to address it in a planned fashion and to bring ahead investment, that is, the authority can borrow against guaranteed revenues. One of the things that we have done is to guarantee the revenues from the state government to the authority over a long period of time so it can borrow against those revenues and bring stormwater investment on. It is an excellent thing.

What buoys me up most with it is that the council—the only council as far as I can ascertain—that appears to be opposing and criticising it is the Burnside council. I suspect that Burnside, in some language somewhere in the world, has the meaning of recalcitrant because that is the Burnside council. I am more assured than ever that we are taking the right approach by the criticism of the Burnside council. All I know is that the vast bulk of councils in South Australia and the Local Government Association have welcomed this with a warm enthusiasm, and that is rare in relationships between the two levels of government.

RAPID BAY JETTY

Mr PENGILLY (Finniss): Thank you, Mr Speaker, and let me also congratulate—

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: Is he better than the other one, Gunny?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Finniss.

Mr PENGILLY: Let me also congratulate you, Mr Speaker, on your appointment. My question is to the Minister for Infrastructure. Will the minister advise the house of the scheduled start and completion dates for the upgrading and reopening of the Rapid Bay jetty? During the recent state election campaign, an announcement was made that the Rapid Bay jetty would receive funding to upgrade and reopen this major tourism drawcard on the Fleurieu Peninsula. This jetty drew around 18 000 recreational fishers and divers when opened, including, possibly, the minister, and was a major economic catalyst in the district, impacting on a considerable number of local small businesses.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Minister for Infrastructure): I congratulate the member for Finniss on his fighting win in the seat—somewhat of a struggle against the daughter of Des Corcoran, I think. He did well to hold her out as it turned out. But he is here and that is what counts. Isn't that right, Graham? That's all that counts. They pay you the same no

matter how much you win by. I can advise the member for Finniss that it would be possible to commence some work now, but the fear is that that would be seen as pre-empting the solution by what is quite a diverse group of interests in the jetty. We have said that we are going to all of those interest groups, and one of our very best bureaucrats in government, Rod Hook, is dealing with that to find a solution that accommodates all of them. The truth is that this jetty is of very keen interest to the diving community and it has very strong environmental values. The Hon. John Hill frequently used to speak to me about the leafy sea dragon, as I am sure will the Hon. Gail Gago. It is simply not true that I used to use them for bait; that rumour was made up by someone else. Of course, fishermen also have a keen interest.

The possible solution will be different for each of those groups and it will also be expensive. We are working with those groups at present and, as soon as we can resolve with those groups the best outcome, we will commence work. I will say, though, that it is a pretty expensive obligation on the state government for a jetty. Sometimes you wonder about the history of how these things end up as the taxpayers' responsibility, but they do. We spend taxpayers' money and we do that as wisely as possible. We will talk to all of those groups and arrive at the best solution for all of them. I am sure that it will not make everyone happy, but that's not my specialty anyway.

BROWNHILL AND KESWICK CREEKS FLOOD MITIGATION STUDY

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite): My question is to the Minister for Infrastructure. Given his earlier answer to the member for Unley, how does the government intend to deal with Burnside Council's decision to dissociate itself from the state/local government stormwater management agreement? Is the minister aware of any other councils that have similar concerns about the government's plans?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Minister for Infrastructure): If you want to know how many councils have concerns, plenty of councils want governments to pay more and for them to pay less; that is the nature of the relationship between the two levels of government. How will we deal with Burnside council? We said at the outset that if the majority of councils want to do this—and they certainly do—we will proceed with it. The parliament will deal with this matter. Some councils would like a better arrangement than others, but the vast bulk of councils are strongly supportive. The LGA is strongly supportive. As I said, it was warmly embraced by the LGA and the bulk of councils and, under those circumstances, we will proceed. I think that Burnside council will come to its senses at some point, but I must place on the record that I am very glad that the majority of South Australian councils do not have the attitude of the Burnside council.

RODEOS

The Hon. G.M. GUNN (Stuart): My question is to the Attorney-General.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the member for Stuart. I will protect him.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: My question is to the Attorney-General, and I know how pleased he is to see me, even though he sent one of his staff up to campaign against me.

Will the Attorney-General consider changing the law following the criminal conviction of the Marrabel Rodeo Secretary, Mr Andrew Allchurch, for allegedly breaching the rodeo code of practice when Mr Allchurch, a volunteer, was not actually involved in the alleged incident which took place? It has been widely reported in the newspapers that the RSPCA indicated that it was pleased with the prosecution. This particular decision of the courts to convict Mr Allchurch is a miscarriage of justice and it now calls into question all volunteers running rodeos and other sporting events including gymkhanas.

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Minister for Health): I am happy to take this question and refer it to my colleague in another place, the Hon. Gail Gago. The Marrabel Rodeo was obviously a matter of great contention during the recent election campaigns. I had an anti-rodeo candidate in my seat and she came eighth—in fact, she received fewer votes than the person who was running on an anti-paedophile campaign and all he did was have signs in front of his house. The anti-rodeo person had signs all over the place and she also had a person dressed as a horse and neighing in front of my office on a regular basis. I wanted to take out a bucket of water and some carrots, but my staff would not let me.

In relation to this matter, there are laws in this place about animal cruelty and about the behaviour of people who operate rodeos. It seems to me that they are quite reasonable and sensible laws, and if people break them then they have to go through the process. At the moment the government is reviewing the legislation relating to the RSPCA and I am certain that that review will come to a rapid conclusion. However, I will make sure that the Minister for Environment and Conservation is aware of the issue raised by the member for Stuart.

EUROPEAN GREEN CRAB

Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder): I will be brief, given the time. Will the Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries advise what the government is doing to stop the spread of European green crab, which was found at Edithburg recently?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries has the call.

The Hon. R.J. McEWEN (Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries): I will bring back an extensive answer to that question to the house as soon as possible.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

STANDING ORDERS SUSPENSION

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

That standing orders be and remain so far suspended as to enable the introduction of government bills prior to the Address in Reply being adopted.

Motion carried.

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

The time for moving the adjournment of the house be extended beyond 5 p.m.

Motion carried.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

FLOODING, WATERFALL GULLY

Ms CHAPMAN (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Sir, I join with other members of the house in extending my congratulations to you on your appointment as Speaker and look forward to your wise advice and direction in this house in the forthcoming term.

On 24 November last year I reported to the house a serious flooding in the Waterfall Gully area within the electorate of Bragg. On that occasion I advised that there had been what was described as a possible one in 500 year flood on 7 and 8 November—in fact, it has subsequently been described as a one in 1 000 year flood. A direct consequence of the excessive downpour over that period was that some 20 000 tonnes of rock and silt was ultimately deposited in the dam beneath the waterfall at Waterfall Gully, there was a consequent build up of silt in the creek system flowing down from that and some 500 homes were flooded and affected.

On that occasion, I raised the question with the house, and particularly sought some response in relation to this matter from the Premier and also from the Minister for Transport in relation to what was going to be done about it. Since that time, in essence, reports have been undertaken by engineers—by both the government and the Burnside council—in relation to the source of the problem, and both reports have confirmed that the collapse of Wilson's Bog, which is situated within the parkland area and, therefore, under the direct jurisdiction of the Department of Environment and Heritage, of which, I flagged to the parliament in November, was going to be responsible for the clean up of this mess. The three main areas of concern were, and remain: the removal of the 20 000-odd tonnes of rock and silt in the dam; secondly, the removal of silt and build-up of debris in the creek that flows down from the dam; and, thirdly, who was going to repair the damage?

I commend the Burnside council, notwithstanding that the government of the time. Indeed, after the visit of the Premier and the Minister for Transport to the affected area, within a very short time after that period, their response was, 'Hasn't the Burnside council got a lot to answer for?' Well, we now know the truth of the matter, and the legal obligation, and the mention of responsibility in relation to its direct legal responsibility of the parkland, of which the offending rock came from: the transport road, which is the direct responsibility of Transport SA; and, indeed, the creek line which is a waterway under the direct jurisdiction of the state government.

The rocks have been cleaned out—they had to concede that that had to be done. No money has been paid to the householders in respect of damage to property other than a \$700 payment under a community benefit. They are receiving quotes of \$15 000 to \$30 000 for the rebuilding of retaining walls. Clearly, there are areas that are underinsured, and there is significant damage past the insured area, so we need some serious assistance in this area. From January, requests have been sent to the government by residents in this area to seek some assistance. We know from reports that have been prepared that the cost of damage is some \$850 000. Who is going to pay for this? Clearly the government has a responsi-

bility in this area. To date, claims have been put in by residents to the state government for compensation, with no response other than an acknowledgment of their statement. Madam Deputy Speaker—and congratulations to you also on your appointment—the government's statement and, particularly, the Minister for Transport's statement as announced in the press this week, stating that this is just Burnside being Burnside when they seek some financial assistance, and even threaten litigation, is a scandalous comment in relation to a council which has acted to protect and to help in an immediate emergency clean up, in the light of, at the same time, when the Gawler River burst the farmers at Virginia were offered between \$7 000 and \$10 000 payments for a contribution for the damage which they clearly sustained. On the information that I have, some \$300 000 to \$400 000 was paid to the council of the new member here—that is, the now member for Light, but then as mayor of the Gawler council, for no doubt necessary repairs, and yet not one dollar paid to the council of Burnside.

Time expired.

MOBILE PHONE TOWERS

Ms CICCARELLO (Norwood): Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker, and I would like to congratulate you for your elevation to the position. I rise to speak on a matter of public importance which is having a significant impact on our community, that is, the Howard government's totally ineffective telecommunications legislation which has allowed Hutchison 3G to turn suburban stobie poles into supersized mobile phone towers with no regard to community or environmental concerns. On 6 April this year, Hutchison 3G won an appeal in the High Court against the Mitcham council in a decision which has far reaching ramifications for South Australia and its residents. The High Court ruled that stobie poles are not and do not become facilities for the purposes of the Commonwealth Telecommunications Act 1997, notwithstanding the installation on them of Hutchison's facilities, that these new super-sized stobie poles do not, therefore, become towers; that Hutchison erected low-impact facilities on these stobie poles; and that, therefore, development approval from state and local authorities was not required.

This decision now creates a highly undesirable situation where, presumably, any telecommunications company can enter into an arrangement with an organisation such as ETSA and transform any existing stobie pole into a bigger, taller, wider pole equipped with its own transmission facilities. As a new supersized structure is now judged to be technically and entirely low impact, there is no need for a telecommunications company to seek development approval from either state or local authorities. This means there is nothing to stop a telco from turning the stobie pole directly outside your home into a supersized mobile phone tower with no limitation as to its size or appearance.

This situation is the direct result of a loophole in the Howard government's totally unsatisfactory legislation regarding installation of these towers and its definitions of 'facilities' and 'low impact'. The Howard government's policy on mobile phone towers, now decided and endorsed by the High Court, makes a mockery of community consultation and turns the concept of good planning and visual amenity on its ear. I am not saying for one moment that we should not have mobile phone towers—they are an essential part of modern technology—but this new High Court sanctioned system of ad hoc installation with no regard to

environmental and community concerns is just plain wrong. We must look at suitable sites which complement this new technology with more suitable and visually aesthetic features; we must consider collocating telecommunications companies on the same site; and we must always look at canvassing community and environmental concerns when building a new structure which is clearly not low impact even though the legislation suggests that it is.

Senator Alston (then minister for communications) said in 1997 that the very reason the installation of low impact facilities would not require consultation with the community was that they would be subject to extensive criteria and would have minimal impact on the visual amenity of the environment. What a joke! It is an acute embarrassment for the Howard government that a telecommunications company can so easily evade the intent of supposedly comprehensive federal legislation by simply utilising existing stobie poles to achieve the effect of supersized mobile phone towers. The Liberals themselves did not seem happy with their own government's policies. The federal member for Boothby (Andrew Southcott MP) said in response to the High Court decision that he 'was appalled' and wanted to stop this practice. He said:

I'm meeting with Helen Coonan. I've already spoken with her office [Senator Coonan's] about this. . . we will look at ways we can respond to close off this loophole.

This is quite funny as Mr Southcott also put out a press release in 2004 saying exactly the same thing.

This is just another example of populist and half-hearted rhetoric from a member of a government which has been in Canberra for 10 years and which set these rules in the first place. I am quite sure, now that the headlines and commentary have died down on this issue, that the federal government will simply turn a blind eye and focus once again on working out how to further destroy the lives and morale of Australian workers. It is now time for the Howard government to stop talking about this issue and act. It must immediately amend its flawed and ineffective legislation so that the Adelaide landscape is not permanently blighted by ugly and oversized mobile phone towers.

TRANSPORT, TRAMS

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite): I want to talk about trams and the government's priorities in regard to transport infrastructure, focusing on its curious decision to spend so much of taxpayers' money on a tram upgrade and revitalisation through the City of Adelaide. We on this side are not necessarily opposed to trams in principle, but we see this as a curious priority given some of the other priorities which have been alluded to during question time today. There are concerns that this project will cause a level of chaos and disorder in traffic within the city for the business community and residents; there are concerns about the cost and cost blowouts; there are concerns about the consultation process that has been used to this point: where it sits in the overall scheme of government priorities, the suitability of the trams that have been selected and the process used to purchase them; and, frankly, there are concerns about where we go from here.

The opposition has made the point previously that there are issues to do with the number of people the new trams can carry compared to those carried on the previous trams. There are 64 seats in the new trams, where at peak times in the old trams two were joined together to provide 128 seats. There

is concern that this will result in the need for more trips up and down the line and that this subsequent increase in the number of trips will mean that boom gates on north and south roads will come up and down more often, adding to growing congestion, and that commuters will have to stand for journeys. This is just one of the many issues that have come up in relation to this tram investment.

There is, of course, concern that it will change the character of King William Street. There is concern about 60 free-standing poles 30 metres apart down King William Street, and four platforms 38 metres long and 25 centimetres high for tram stops. That traffic will be cut from four lanes to three is of concern, and that some of the traffic queues will be longer at the North Terrace-King William Street intersection. There is a concern that pedestrian crossings at Adelaide Railway Station will be replaced with crossings at the end of the tram platform, and that up to 18 trees, four classed as significant, may need to be removed. I note that Adelaide City Council recently resolved to support the measure, by one vote, but if the consultation process had been conducted cogently up to this point we would not still be debating this issue. I will talk more about that later.

The tram tracks extension has been given the all clear now, I suppose, by the government, which will argue that it has a mandate to go ahead by the decision of the Adelaide Council to support it. However, there remains this lingering concern about whether this is the right way to spend our money. There will be concerns about right turns out of King William Street. Concerns have been raised, as I noted, about standing room, about the airconditioning capacity of the new trams, and about whether their purchase was rushed to meet the election deadline. We know that that was the case: the Public Works Committee confirmed it in its report.

I note that the media has reflected diverse community concern about this. Rex Jory's article in the *Advertiser* of 16 June 2005 asked the question: 'Does anyone care?' The *Sunday Mail* reported on 18 December, 'Trams: you say no.' It reported that, during a call-in, of 447 SMS responses on the issue, 362 had rejected it while 85 supported it; and of 96 letters and emails on the issue, 81 rejected it and 15 were in support. I know that the government will argue that it has a mandate, but there are these lingering concerns, notwithstanding the concern about a blowout in costs. Information has come to the opposition that up to \$10 million of the \$21 million project may have been underestimated for the reconnection and rearrangement of services under King William Street. It is a curious priority for the government.

I imagine that now we are going to get trams and that the focus will move to delivering the project on time, on budget and with the minimum of disruption to the community, but I want to make the point at the very outset of this parliament that the government really needs to rethink its infrastructure plans and get its priorities right.

Time expired.

ANDAMOOKA SCHOOL FIRES

Ms BREUER (Giles): It is with pleasure that I rise today. I did not realise how pleased I would be to be back, but today has been a bit of a buzz and I am pleased to be back here. Although I convinced myself there was life after politics, I am glad I did not have to find it. It is good to see many faces back and it is sad to see some faces not here. In particular, I am very sorry that the Hon. Terry Roberts is not with us today. He was a good friend of mine. I know we will get an

opportunity to speak about Terry, but I feel very sad that he is not here today. I am sure that his wife and family and former staff will be feeling it today on the first day of this new parliament.

I am a prophet of gloom today. I want to speak about the situation in Andamooka as a result of the recent tragedy of a fourth fire at the Andamooka school. I want members to think of the young people in Andamooka and how they are coping with the situation. There have been four fires in the past four months. Unfortunately, a couple of years ago there was a fire and part of the school burnt down. In the past four months there have been another four fires. The first fire destroyed a significant block of classrooms. That was very sad and it was bad luck, but it was attributed to an electrical fire. Another fire, which burnt down a community centre as well as classrooms, affected the people of Andamooka because they will miss their centre, as well as the classrooms situated there. Then there was a small fire, and by this stage people were saying, 'This is hilarious; we've had three fires.'

People were starting to get very nervous because the last fire virtually destroyed the town. The people of the town, particularly the young children at the school, were absolutely gutted by the fire. It is bad luck to have one fire; it is fairly bad luck to have two fires; it gets very suspicious when there are three fires; and when there are four fires everyone is saying, 'What's going on? Who is lighting these fires?' The consensus is—and the evidence appears to indicate—that these fires have been lit and that they have not been electrical fires as was originally thought. I do not know who started these fires, but I would suggest that she leave town—

Ms Bedford: She?

Ms BREUER: Or he, as the case may be. Whether justice catches up with him or her, I think a lot of people in Andamooka are very angry about this situation. I would suggest that they leave very quickly, if it is proven that the fires were deliberately lit. Can members imagine the trauma for young children when their school is burnt down four times? I have visited the town after each fire and seen the faces of these young children. I have seen the sadness in their faces and also noted their confusion about what is going on. They are now being housed at the Roxby Downs school. It is working reasonably well but, unfortunately, their future is up in the air because, until they find who is causing these fires, more buildings cannot be erected. The only thing left at the school is a toilet block. It is an absolute tragedy for the town and the people who have been fundraising as hard as they can. They just get some resources up there when they have another fire and they have to go again.

A fund has been set up for the school, and I urge members of this place and the South Australian community to contribute to it. They can send a donation to the Andamooka Fire Fund, PO Box 9, Andamooka Post Office. If they send it 'care of the post office, Andamooka', it will certainly get through to the fund. The department can replace many things but it cannot replace everything in the school and I know that any money would be gratefully accepted. The principal, Angela Turner, has been an absolute wonder. I feel sorry for her. She has had her heart broken many times. She has worked her butt off and I think she is just about at breaking point. She has done a wonderful job keeping that school community together.

Other members of the community, including Naomi Campbell (chair of the school council) and her partner Nigel Campbell (the local police officer and also head of the CFS), have been at each fire and worked hard afterwards. It is also

a great stress for them because they have a young child in the school. They have seen the tragedy in the community and they have worked very hard, and I pay tribute to them for the wonderful job they have done. Also, everyone in the community, particularly Pat Katnich, chair of the progress association, and Jean Lawrie, the secretary, has worked very hard. They deserve some help from the rest of us.

Time expired.

RODEOS

The Hon. G.M. GUNN (Stuart): I congratulate you, Madam Deputy Speaker, on your appointment and wish you well. I want to speak about the issue I raised during question time; that is, the difficulties people are facing because of the irresponsible actions of one or two extremists who have a dislike for rodeos. In my electorate, the Carrieton rodeo, which is one of the most successful in South Australia, raises money for the Royal Flying Doctor Service and to support the local community, including its little shop. There are also rodeos at Wilmington, Spalding, Marrabel and elsewhere in South Australia. For the benefit of these extremists, I point out that at the recent Royal Easter Show in Sydney 75 000 attended the rodeo. They came from all over the world. I do not know whether they have ever heard of the Calgary Stampede. These are internationally recognised events. The people running these events are—

The Hon. J.W. Weatherill: What sort of people are these extremists?

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: They are crazy. The woman they dumped in the trough at Marrabel I know appeared to be allergic to water, but they did drop her in and out of the trough.

Mrs Redmond interjecting:

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: Unfortunately not, but I understand that he got a considerable cheer for his actions. I am sorry I was not there, because I would have joined in the clapping.

The Hon. J.W. Weatherill: Could these extremists be communists?

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: These extremists are people who have no understanding of the real world and, in my constituency, the people running these rodeos are hard-working, responsible, decent, upright citizens who should not be called into question by irresponsible elements who have some particular bent which has nothing to do with reality. I say to the RSPCA that, if it is going to go out and criticise those people, as it has done, it is unfit to receive funding from—

The Hon. J.W. Weatherill: Some of your colleagues have supported no rodeos.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: I do not care what they do. I am sticking up for the people who put me in this place and for the people in Outback Australia and South Australia, because those small communities and the Royal Flying Doctor Service need this money. I do not know whether the minister is supporting this group, but I would not be surprised, by his attitude, that he might have a bit of an inkling. If the government of South Australia had any wit or wisdom, it should have intervened on behalf of the secretary of the Marrabel rodeo and taken his part, because it is a public disgrace that he has two criminal convictions for doing what is right, that is, running a rodeo. I say to the minister that, clearly, they want to have a foot in both camps—encourage the RSPCA, but also give a wink and a nod to the extremists in the department who are edging on these people. That is

what is happening, and I know that is what is happening because I have had a few telephone calls.

So, I say to the minister and the government: stand up for these hardworking people, otherwise you will not have the Marree picnic races, the Innamincka picnic races or races at Tarcoola or Roxby Downs. They are all run by volunteers, and the people who own and cart the horses do not want to see them injured or anything go wrong, because they want to use them a couple of weeks later.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: Well, you can tar and feather the extremists—that would not worry me. As far as I am concerned, the government should come clean and stand up for these volunteers, otherwise we will not have these large public events. I say to the minister and his colleagues: if you do not think they are important, go to the Carrieton rodeo. Thousands of people turn up. They come from all over South Australia.

Mr Pengilly: The Yankalilla rodeo.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: Yes, to Yankalilla, as the new member for Finnis indicates. The silence from the government is interesting. It is all right to talk about the lady who stood against the minister. I have seen that particular person with her videos, aided and abetted by Channel 7 which runs irresponsible articles not based on fact and truth, trying to downgrade these hardworking people who do such a great job raising funds for the Flying Doctor and supporting their community. This particular debate will be ongoing, and I will argue against any government money going to the RSPCA while it continues to adopt such a negative, nasty, short-sighted and irresponsible attitude in being pleased when law-abiding citizens have criminal convictions made against them improperly.

PARLIAMENTARY REFORM

Mr O'BRIEN (Napier): Some three years ago, in response to the recommendations of its modernisation committee, the House of Commons adopted the practice of sitting mornings and rising in the early evening. For some inexplicable reason, this simple reform, and others of equal commonsense, were unachievable in our last parliament, and the one before. We now commence a new parliament during which the issues of modernisation of procedures must be addressed. It is not my intention in the few minutes allocated to me to canvass the specifics of modernisation. I only wish to see the obvious reforms to the day-to-day operations of this house sorted out as quickly as possible so that we can get on with the real challenges that confront us, namely, the institutional and procedural changes that will be required when South Australia becomes a republican entity within the republic of Australia. This task ought not be carried out in isolation from the other states, and Queensland's Premier, Peter Beattie, has indicated as much.

Probably the most problematic issue is that of the Governor. Do we keep this position, and, if we do, is appointment by election or selection? Or can we at the state level dispense with the position altogether and roll most of the functions into the office of Premier? The absolute irrelevance of the monarchy is best illustrated by the very exercise in which this parliament is soon to be engaged—the Address in Reply. When the Address in Reply was first instituted, the monarch was the chief instrument of executive power. Ministers were hand picked by the monarch to assist the king or queen in the exercise of this function. George III,

for example, prior to meddling in the American War of Independence, virtually single-handedly reorganised the English army and navy to cope with the reduced demands of the peace, post the Seven Years War.

This was not a ceremonial monarch, nor was the monarch's opening address to the parliament a statement of the government's position—it was the monarch's position, determined in collaboration with his hand picked ministers. The Address in Reply had a purpose. It gave each member of the parliament the opportunity, under the protection of parliament, to agree or disagree publicly with the monarch. The Address in Reply speeches of 1776, for example, gave members of the House of Commons the opportunity to challenge the direction proposed by George III and Lord North in dealing with public disorder in the American colonies. Both men were severely criticised by the Whigs for what they (the Whigs) regarded as the unconstitutional exercise of executive power—no taxation without representation.

This was debate with a purpose, and the Address in Reply was the perfect vehicle. Incidentally, the house sat to the wee hours of the morning, and not much has changed in 1776, at least not in South Australia. The House of Commons, as I mentioned earlier, has consigned late night sitting to the dustbin of history. Now, when I say not much has changed, this does not apply to the role of the monarch and the purpose of the Address in Reply. The hands-on executive role of the monarch and the monarch's representative, the State Governor, has well and truly disappeared. They play no real role in government, and their opening addresses to the parliaments reflect this fact. Similarly, the Address in Reply no longer performs any real function since, hopefully, all of the issues have been thoroughly canvassed and voted upon by the wider electorate in the preceding election.

In our modern democratic society, the election campaign now performs the function that the monarch's opening address performed in the time of George III. The Address in Reply should gracefully disappear with the monarchical connection. There is a place for the maiden speech where new parliamentarians have the opportunity to set out their philosophy, aspirations and policy inclinations, but it should be done under the banner of 'maiden speech' rather than the ridiculous subterfuge of a reply to an address from the monarch's representative. And it would free up great many of us from the near compulsion of having to engage in this historically irrelevant act ourselves.

STANDING ORDERS COMMITTEE

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Minister for Transport): Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker, and I congratulate you on your appointment today. I move:

That Mrs Geraghty, the Hon. G.M. Gunn and Messrs O'Brien and Pisoni be appointed to act with Mr Speaker on the Standing Orders Committee.

Motion carried.

PUBLISHING COMMITTEE

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

That Ms Ciccarello, Messrs Koutsantonis, Pederick and Pengilly and Ms Thompson be appointed to the Publishing Committee.

Motion carried.

JOINT PARLIAMENTARY SERVICE COMMITTEE

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

That Mrs Geraghty and the Hon. G.M. Gunn be appointed to act with Mr Speaker on the Joint Parliamentary Service Committee, and that Ms Thompson be appointed the alternate member of the committee to Mr Speaker, Ms Breuer alternate member to Mrs Geraghty and Mr Venning alternate member to the Hon. G.M. Gunn, and that a message be sent to the Legislative Council transmitting the foregoing resolution.

Motion carried.

ECONOMIC AND FINANCE COMMITTEE

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

That Messrs Bignell, Goldsworthy, Griffiths, Koutsantonis, Piccolo, Rau and Williams be appointed to the Economic and Finance Committee.

Motion carried.

ENVIRONMENT AND RESOURCES COMMITTEE

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

That Ms Breuer, the Hon. R.B. Such and Mr Venning be appointed to the Environment and Resources Committee, and that a message be sent to the Legislative Council transmitting the foregoing resolution.

Motion carried.

LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE

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

That Ms Fox, Mrs Geraghty and Mrs Redmond be appointed to the Legislative Review Committee, and that a message be sent to the Legislative Council transmitting the foregoing resolution.

Motion carried.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE

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

That Ms Ciccarello, Messrs Hamilton-Smith, Kenyon and Pengilly and the Hon. P.L. White be appointed to the Public Works Committee.

Motion carried.

SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

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

That Mr Pederick, Ms Simmons and the Hon. P.L. White be appointed to the Social Development Committee, and that a message be sent to the Legislative Council transmitting the foregoing resolution.

Motion carried.

PARLIAMENTARY COMMITTEE ON OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY, REHABILITATION AND COMPENSATION

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

That Messrs Kenyon, Koutsantonis and Pisoni be appointed to the Parliamentary Committee on Occupational Safety, Rehabilitation and Compensation, and that a message be sent to the Legislative Council transmitting the foregoing resolution.

Motion carried.

STATUTORY OFFICERS COMMITTEE

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

That the Hons M.J. Atkinson and R.G. Kerin and Ms Simmons be appointed to the Statutory Officers Committee, and that a message be sent to the Legislative Council transmitting the foregoing resolution.

Motion carried.

NATURAL RESOURCES COMMITTEE

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

That the Hons G.M. Gunn and S.W. Key, Mr Rau and the Hon. L. Stevens be appointed to the Natural Resources Committee, and that a message be sent to the Legislative Council transmitting the foregoing resolution.

Motion carried.

ABORIGINAL LANDS PARLIAMENTARY STANDING COMMITTEE

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation): Thank you, Mr Speaker. It was remiss of me not to congratulate you before on your elevation to high office. I move:

That Ms Breuer and the Hon. L. Stevens, nominated by the minister, and Mr McFetridge, nominated by the Leader of the Opposition, be appointed to act with the minister on the Aboriginal Lands Parliamentary Standing Committee, and that a message be sent to the Legislative Council transmitting the foregoing resolution.

Motion carried.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Minister for Transport): I nominate the member for Bright to move an Address in Reply to the Governor's opening speech, and move:

That consideration of the Address in Reply be made an order of the day for Tuesday next.

Motion carried.

ADJOURNMENT

At 5.03 p.m. the house adjourned until Tuesday 2 May at 2 p.m.

Corrigenda

Page 4131, column 2—After line 2 insert 'Health, Department of (previously Human Services)—Report 2004-05'.

Page 4347, column 2—

Line 15, for 'Minister for' read 'Leader of'.

Line 31, for 'Hallett Cove' read 'Hove'.

Page 4348, column 1—

Lines 37 and 52, for 'Suzy' read 'Susie'.