

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 5 June 2003

The **SPEAKER (Hon. I.P. Lewis)** took the chair at 10.30 a.m. and read prayers.

THEBARTON BIOSCIENCES PRECINCT

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite): I move:

That this house notes the government's intention to implement the previous former Liberal government's election policy to expand the Thebarton biosciences precinct by purchasing the 4.8 hectare site identified and initially negotiated by the previous government and calls on this government to reinstate the remainder of the former government's innovation policy and, in particular, the reinstatement of the \$40.5 million innovation fund for attracting biotech opportunities to South Australia.

It is with great pleasure that I move this motion, which notes the government's intention to implement the former Liberal government's election policy to expand the Thebarton biosciences precinct by purchasing the 4.8 hectare site identified and initially negotiated by the previous government; and calls on the government to reinstate the remainder of the former government's innovation policy and, in particular, to reinstate the former government's \$40.5 million innovation fund for attracting biotech opportunities to South Australia. It was with great pleasure, having had the honour of serving as minister for innovation in the former Liberal government, that I noted on 2 May the Minister for Science's media release, which announced that the Labor government would be spending \$6 million to help triple the size of South Australia's Thebarton biosciences precinct.

They had finally discovered the paperwork which we left behind for them in the department and quickly moved to purchase this site. Unfortunately, the announcement was made on 2 May 2003. The action was required in March 2002. However, we did eventually get there, albeit, it seems, at considerable additional expense. It was my understanding that the site was to cost considerably less than \$6 million. The government would be aware that, on a number of occasions, I asked questions in the house about this and urged it to move speedily. It did not, and I suspect that the taxpayer has paid a penalty as a consequence. That aside, it is a great relief that the government has had the wisdom to continue with the former government's initiative because it is a very important initiative. There is demand for these sites, and our Thebarton site could attract another \$60 million in capital investment during construction over the next five years.

But that aside, this development offers the prospect of more than 480 tertiary qualified jobs to be located at the site within five years, creating very exciting opportunities not only for some of our brightest science graduates but also for some of our brightest biotechnology companies. The land acquisition of 4.8 hectares at West Thebarton Road will be added to the current 2.2 hectare site established in 1999. I pay tribute to the efforts of the current Leader of the Opposition (Hon. Rob Kerin) who, as the former minister for primary industries, picked up biotechnology, created BioInnovation SA, and had the vision to drive forward the need for this initial 2.2 hectare site to be purchased to give a home to the Thebarton biosciences precinct.

Seven medical biosciences companies are already located at the site in four new facilities, representing a capital

investment of more than \$30 million. This will, in effect, triple its size. It will further complement the state's thriving biosciences community, which has over 50 companies employing 800 people and generating about \$100 million of revenue annually: 14 of those companies have been created in the last 18 months. I note that the government is continuing with the good work of the former government by intending to target the creation of 50 new biosciences companies and 2 500 jobs by 2010. Of course, the purchase of the land will also offer the prospect of further enhancing a strip of river frontage along the Torrens Linear Park, so it is good for the environment.

I note the government's intention now that it has finally made a decision to move fairly quickly to develop the site. Of course, I am also looking at our election announcement on 25 January 2002, titled 'Innovation: Smart Plan for the Future', which committed to the very same development and which, in terms of the facts and figures provided in the government's media release, has been used to substantiate and add weight to their announcement. It was one of a number of very exciting initiatives that the former Liberal government created out of nowhere to drive science technology and innovation forward in South Australia. Some of the achievements have been quite remarkable. I note that the initial announcement of the Minister for Science—and she is prone to this—about the precinct, I think it was on 2 May, virtually went unnoticed by the media and by the public, so she had the member for Norwood ask her a question on 12 May in the house to further highlight the advent of the purchase to South Australians.

The companies located on the site require a special mention. They include companies such as Medvet, Bresagen and Bionomics. The Thebarton biosciences precinct also includes that fabulous part of the University of Adelaide's sciences faculty which I visited recently and which is an absolutely outstanding example of how academia, entrepreneurs, innovators and small companies can come together to create energy which develops into jobs and growth for the state. Of course, companies such as Bionomics are pioneering at world-class level a number of new technologies in the biosciences, which offer the prospect of quite amazing returns to South Australia. Similarly, companies such as Bresagen have done a marvellous job for the state in attracting very substantial revenues, breaking new ground in growth hormones, exploring new fields of endeavour in reproductive biotechnology and looking at cell therapy, protein and pharmaceutical sciences. They are very dependent on the right legislative framework, both federal and state, within which they must operate to ensure that South Australia does not get left behind. As the motion suggests, much more needs to be done, but this government is failing to do it.

The point of my motion is to encourage the government to go forward not only with the Thebarton bioscience precinct (an initiative of the former government), but also to look at the other ideas, programs and initiatives that the former Liberal government had up—which the Hon. Rob Kerin and I were key in putting forward to cabinet, and which received the full and earnest support of all our cabinet colleagues in the former Liberal government—so that it can continue to break the new ground that we initiated.

On 7 May, I was very pleased to attend the event hosted by TGR Biosciences Pty Ltd at the Thebarton biosciences precinct which officially opened the Adelaide node of the Australian Proteome Analysis Facility. That is another example of a bioscience opportunity attracted to the Thebar-

ton biosciences precinct as a consequence of this fabulous initiative.

However, other opportunities need to be attracted to this state. The former government committed to and provided funds to attract the Australian Plant Functional Genomic Centre at Waite. We established a \$40.5 million innovation fund. The state government needs to put a few million dollars on the table if it is to attract equivalent funding from the commonwealth and the private sector. The former government did that, with a \$12 million investment from our \$40.5 million fund. The Labor government tried earnestly to cancel that proposition—to get rid of it and throw it in the bin—but it was unable to do so, because it was already too far down the track. However, they did take the remainder of the \$40.5 million fund and throw it away. The funds went back to the Treasurer, and into the Treasurer's big black pork barrel.

We now have the startling announcement in this budget that the government is to create a new fund, the Premier's Research and Innovation Fund, to support new bids for science projects and to leverage new commonwealth and industry funding. So, they are going to replace our \$40.5 million fund, but with what? A \$1 million fund! So, our \$40.5 million fund has been replaced by a Labor Party \$1 million fund. Bravo! I look forward to the deluge of bids and investment that will be attracted to the state as a consequence of the minister's and the government's grand vision for the biosciences. It is not enough, and they need to do more.

I urge them to talk to us on this side of the house, and to their own departments, about some of the projects we had up and running. We were bidding for integrated bioscience laboratories; we were bidding for projects associated with the Adelaide Medical Research Institute; we were looking at biotechnology centres of excellence that are available to be bid for and attracted to the state, with the right encouragement and with the right investment; we were looking at primary industries opportunities and at resources and marine innovation; we were looking at initiatives in bio-innovation associated with the South Australian strategic research initiative; and we were looking at opportunities within the Department of Education, Training and Employment. We actually had a project up called an education round table, which was a great initiative of my colleague the member for Light. Those are some ideas that the government might like to use. There were also opportunities within water resources, within the integrated water strategy for metropolitan Adelaide, which represents a fabulous opportunity.

Worldwide, about 40 biotechnology clusters have emerged in which employment growth and investments have been substantial. For example, there are now more than 1 500 biotechnology companies in R&D investment of \$10 billion per year, whereas there were only 2 500 companies in the US in the public sector R&D spending of \$20 billion per year. Biotechnology has outgrown many traditional industries. Australia has slightly more than 35 biotechnology companies listed on the Australian Stock Exchange, and three are located in South Australia. The industry raised about \$900 million in capital in 2000, and has raised much more since.

In terms of cluster development, Adelaide is comparable to Munich in Germany. Both cities are about the same size, have a strong university research and defence industry component, and a strong industrial and agricultural R&D heritage. In 1997, Munich had about 15 companies in biotechnology and related areas, with 350 employees. In

2001, 130 companies with more than 2 500 employees had been established in the industry. It is considered that Adelaide has the potential to achieve comparable development in the next five to 10 years, with the right encouragement. South Australia has a number of scientists and areas of scientific excellence that are truly competitive, both nationally and internationally. However, South Australia does not have the depth; that is, the large groups of researchers delivering scientific excellence in areas of competitive advantage such as those emerging in Victoria and already present in advanced biotechnology clusters internationally.

The former government created BioInnovation SA, that fabulous initiative to help develop, connect and interrelate biotechnology stakeholders in the state and get them all pulling on the same rope and working in the same direction. We believed that the areas of plant science, and functional genomics with applications to human health and nutrition are the key areas in which through strategic investments the necessary depth to be competitive can be achieved.

This government needs to go beyond what the former government had already set in train. The paltry contributions identified in this budget will not be enough. The Thebarton biosciences precinct—that continuation of our idea—is a good start, but I urge the minister and the government to do more. The way for South Australia to get ahead and to provide the opportunities for our young people is to use our brain power, innovation and creativity to succeed. The government must do more.

Mr SNELLING secured the adjournment of the debate.

LIDLAW, Hon. DIANA

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite): I move:

That this house:

- (a) notes the retirement of the Hon. Diana Laidlaw MLC on 6 June after 21 years of service to the people and the Parliament of South Australia;
- (b) congratulates the honourable member on her outstanding achievements as Minister for the Arts, Minister for Transport and Urban Planning and Minister for the Status of Women for the period from 1993 to 2002; and
- (c) recognises her status as the longest serving minister for the arts and transport in the history of the state and wishes her well in her retirement in the years ahead.

It is with great pleasure that, as the shadow minister for the arts on this side of the house, I stand to congratulate the Hon. Diana Laidlaw on all she has achieved. Of course, she has achieved outcomes far beyond the arts, and I will speak briefly on those. She stands as a credit to this parliament, and she will be remembered well not only by the Liberal Party but by the parliament for all that she has done.

It is most appropriate as I speak that I look at the tapestry on the wall of the House of Assembly which celebrates the granting of the right to vote to women in South Australia in 1894. We were one of the first places to do so, and I think the first place in the world to give women the right to stand as members of parliament. Of course, those tapestries, championed by Diana Laidlaw, stand here today to remind us all of the important role played by women and it is a role that is still unfolding. I will speak briefly to that.

Members would be aware that the Hon. Diana Vivienne Laidlaw entered the Legislative Council for the Liberal Party on 6 November 1982. She has performed a number of extremely important roles in the party: as minister for transport from 14 December 1993 to 20 October 1997; as

minister for the arts and the status of women from 14 December 1993 until 5 March 2002; and as minister for transport and urban planning from 20 October 1997 to 5 March 2002. She was appointed to Executive Council on 19 December 1997 until 5 March 2002, but before that served in the shadow ministry when this party was in opposition. From 1986 to 14 December 1993 she was shadow minister for community welfare and for the status of women, but she also served from 26 May 1992 until 14 December 1993 in areas of transport, marine, the arts and local government relations.

Members may not be aware that she was vice president of the Sturt Football Club and, as the member for Waite whose electorate includes a good slice of the Sturt Football Club's district, I am very proud to note that fact. Diana was born on 2 September 1951, so she is but a baby. Prior to entering parliament, in 1971-72 she trained with Potter Partners in stockbroking, was a research assistant to three federal ministers and was a ministerial assistant to the Hon. Murray Hill. She was educated at the Presbyterian Girls College at Wakefield College in the UK. Members may not know that she has a Cordon Bleu certificate and at Flinders University completed a BA in politics, history and fine arts in 1975. Diana was a member of the Liberal Party from 1969 onwards and has made a fabulous contribution to the party.

Since being a minister, more than \$70 million was spent on capital works and a further \$55 million committed in 2003 under her guidance. That commitment met the 1993-97 arts policy undertakings to redevelop all the states' cultural institutions along North Terrace and is a testimony to her achievements. For years to come, despite the basket case that this former Liberal government inherited from the Labor Party in 1993, despite the \$10 billion of debt, despite the recurrent deficit of \$300 million per annum, Diana managed to find and argue through cabinet for the money to rebuild the Art Gallery, the State Library, the Museum and the Festival Centre—those four great iconic institutions of the arts in this state. The house has been rebuilt.

There is now scope for the arts budget to focus on the people most in need: artists themselves and arts agencies. It is a great tragedy that this budget fails to do so. It is a credit to Diana that she made that fabulous achievement of rebuilding those four institutions, with \$20 million spent on the South Australian Museum alone. The Festival Centre is now opened up for the world to see—no more dark pokey corners, but sweeping lawn and views. The Art Gallery collection flourished under her guidance as minister. The west wing extensions doubled the size of the gallery which opened in March 1996, and the new west wing, as well as including collection display space and a very large underground temporary exhibitions gallery, now houses the Bookshop Cafe, function hire rooms and a lecture theatre. It has been an amazing accomplishment by this minister. Let us not forget the fabulous *Ring Cycle*—an idea of Diana's that generated \$10 million for economic development for the state.

Let us not forget, either, the Riverbank development and the Queens Theatre. She wanted it under the arts and it has been done—another Liberal policy that Labor has taken up. She wanted the theatre to have folding seating that would be adaptable to the very productions that play there. I see it as being a centre point of the next festival.

The Windmill Theatre is the national theatre for children and families based in Adelaide, but being talked about all over the world. It was with great pleasure that I attended the Helpmann Awards recently in Sydney to see Windmill win

two separate awards for South Australia—another creation of Diana's. I have a motion on the *Notice Paper* on the Southern Cross replica, so I will not dwell on it, but the preservation of it was another great achievement. The Pichi Richi railway was saved by Diana.

Let us move on from the arts. Passenger transport was not the only issue for her. PortsCorp was created and the Southern Expressway was promised by a Liberal government and built under Diana's guidance. Further achievements include the following roads: Kimba to Cleve; Hawker to Orroroo; Elliston to Lock; Brinkworth to Blyth; tourist roads on Kangaroo Island and in the Flinders Ranges; Port Lincoln Highway; and, Wallaroo to Kadina. She instigated passing lanes on the Noarlunga to Victor Harbor road; road widening from Glenburnie to the Victorian border; and, a replacement bridge at Chain of Ponds—it goes on and it goes on.

As minister for transport she oversaw the upgrade of Portrush Road, the Heysen tunnels and changes to road train arrangements that used to stop at Port Augusta to uncouple their loads and move down to Adelaide. When Diana introduced changes into the old transport practices, that was one of the major changes. It was not uncommon to find Diana, her ministerial vehicle pulled over to the side of the road, standing on the footstep of a B-double having a yarn and a fag with the driver—it has been reported to me on a couple of occasions—and passing the time of day. Diana had a remarkable ability to establish rapport with just about anybody. Buses, trains, trucks, cars and planes—she was involved in the lot. Diana was always there for members of her own back bench and for members of the opposition back bench when in government, looking to solve problems in local electorates.

She was involved in the Brighton jetty and the repair thereof. She was involved in a range of issues to do with passenger transport, including the creation of the Passenger Transport Board, now to be dismantled by this government. She had an ability to get on long with unions. She established a wonderful rapport with the transport unions and turned what could have been confrontation into cooperation. Apart from the arts, transport, women and planning, there was even time to plan South Australia's first mausoleum—a \$3 million state of the art mausoleum to be built at Enfield Memorial Park. The Women's Information Service went from strength to strength—where does it end?

In her maiden speech Diana made some most interesting remarks. She talked about profit not being a dirty word and the need for the parliament to understand that private enterprise and individual effort were at the core of growth and the future for the state. She explained why she stood as a Liberal, because she believed above all:

... in the individual, in diversity, in tolerance and in caring about my fellow human beings, I could be a Liberal only. The Liberal tradition is based fundamentally on the recognition of the inherent dignity of the individual and respect for his or her inherent role. Liberalism asserts that solutions to human problems are within the human ken. It asserts a faith about our ability to survive and to progress to build a society which is encouraging and bold, rewarding and innovative and the excellent equally manages to protect the weak, help the infirm, care for the sick and aid the needy. As a Liberal my aim is to see a more equal society not by penalising the successful but rather by encouraging more success for all.

She concluded her address by saying:

Mr President, it is our responsibility, as elected representatives, to address ourselves to such complex problems as unemployment among our youth and the effects of technological change on our economy and our society. We were not sent here to scratch each

other's eyes out, no matter how much some might enjoy that sort of thing, but to serve constructively the people who sent us here.

Those are very relevant words. As I scanned some of the media coverage that Di has managed to achieve over the years (and it was extensive), it included coverage about bikeways, the O-Bahn, women's issues, extensions to the Art Gallery, leading delegations to China, bus services and an endless raft of other matters. I found some personal articles about Di as an individual, and it was here that I had a couple of chuckles, particularly over one on 20 July 1989 in the local media (and it was obviously about whether people should be married or single). The article stated:

'No regrets,' are Ms Laidlaw's thoughts about not marrying.

The article continues:

Years ago I contemplated it. I was very keen on one occasion, but he didn't share my wish to marry, and I am very pleased he didn't. I have developed far more than the individual concerned.

She then went on to explain how she had to tell her grandmother that she had other ambitions. Fortunately, by the time Diana was 33, her grandmother had accepted that her lifestyle was to be different and that her life was to take a path of public service.

Diana was a hardworking minister. Both as a backbencher and as a fellow minister, I always found her a pleasure to work with. She had an open ear, an enthusiasm that was inspiring, and a manner that was appealing and effective. I will certainly miss her companionship as a colleague, as I know will many other members. She stands as a great ambassador for the Liberal Party and for the parliament. Diana had a softness about her, but also a toughness that was admirable. She is testimony to the fact that women can be a fabulous success for the state and that members of parliament can aspire to and achieve great things.

Diana will be a hard act to follow for all who attempt to fill her shoes, as I am presently discovering as shadow minister for the arts. She may be small in stature, but she has very big shoes to fill.

Time expired.

The Hon. D.C. KOTZ (Newland): I rise to support most strongly the motion moved by the member for Waite. I certainly support all the words of the motion, and I believe that I speak on behalf of the many Liberal women who are currently in this parliament and who have passed through it in the years that Diana has been a member.

As we have heard, Diana came into the parliament in 1982. I came in 1989 and, at that time, Diana and Jennifer Cashmore were the only two other Liberal women in this parliament. I think that I can say quite fairly and justly that, with the Hon. Diana Laidlaw holding the portfolio of (both in shadow ministry and in government ministry) the status of women, she certainly was one of the mainstays of putting women's status on the social and professional map of South Australia in terms of the support she has given across the board to all women from all walks of life. I suggest that many women now in this parliament have benefited from Diana's aims to raise the status of women, including the ability to remove some of the obstacles that have kept women out of parliament for many years.

She played a most strong and passionate role as a minister in government. As the member for Waite has rightly said, Diana was certainly a very compassionate woman who had many concerns for the people of South Australia, but she was also a very tough and strong lady when it came to determin-

ing that those passions should not just be talked about but, indeed, should be turned into implementations that affected the lives of people in South Australia.

I remember hearing about an incident in which a train had hit the Bakewell Bridge at about 3 o'clock in the morning. That did not stop Diana Laidlaw from getting dressed and going down to the site to ensure that everything was going to be fine. Of course, at that time of the morning and with torrential rain, everything was not going to be fine. Unfortunately, with the torrential rain, the track had slipped under a freight train, so it was quite a disaster. However, by 4.30 a.m., a plan had been put in place to divert traffic, start work on the bridge, change train timetables, re-route buses, and alert taxi companies, radio stations, courier companies, the airport and the train terminal, and anyone else who was up at that time of day was also told of the plans to ensure that people got to work and school with as little fuss as possible. That was the type of action that Diana took in terms of her responsibility, her professionalism and how she dealt with her portfolios in giving service to this state.

Staff have told stories about Diana's compassion and, while Diana held the transport portfolio, when she came into the office after almost every long weekend or holiday season she had the same concern about lives lost on the roads, about those who were injured, and about what their families must be feeling. It was always a very sad time for her, particularly if the figures were up, but a less sad time if the figures were down. However, she certainly took it very personally, which was part of the most professional manner that Diana always displayed.

In the early days (and I am referring to 14 years ago, when I first came into this parliament) women still seemed to receive responsibilities that dealt only with other women; therefore, the status of women portfolio was always considered to be a rather minor one. Certainly, women were never expected to be able to take hold of a strong portfolio, such as transport and urban planning. Again, Diana well and truly helped to turn around any misgivings and misconceptions in that regard, dealing with areas involving massive infrastructure, such as trucks, B-doubles, trains, marine areas—

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Light may wish to acknowledge the chair and speak to someone in the gallery, but not from within the chamber. The honourable member for Newland has the call.

The Hon. D.C. KOTZ: I acknowledge the service that the Hon. Diana Laidlaw has given to this state over 21 years. I know that she will be missed in many areas and by many of the friends she has made over the years. I have a great admiration for Diana Laidlaw and for the work that she has done for the state, the Liberal Party, and the ministry. I was very pleased to serve as a minister with Diana. The number of achievements that she was part of within a Liberal government are certainly now on the record for all to see. I wish her well in her retirement.

Ms BEDFORD (Florey): I support this motion without any hesitation and I concur in all the remarks made by members of the opposition on the lifelong work of the retiring member in the other place, the Hon. Diana Laidlaw. I have had the opportunity to work with Diana on only one occasion, on my private member's bill, which has recently been passed, extending equal rights in superannuation, but it was not only through work on that bill that I became aware of her passion for social justice issues. Her immense knowledge of the

parliamentary system and government meant that her advice was invaluable, and I am grateful that I did have the opportunity, albeit only briefly, to work with her and to learn from her.

In that time I gained a small insight into her sense of humour and her enormous knowledge of the arts and women's issues and her interest in wine, and I regret that her departure will perhaps prevent me from working as closely with her again on the reform agenda that I know has been so dear to her heart. I wish her well in her retirement from this parliament, but I suspect that her retirement from this place will only mean that she will be busy in other areas. I look forward to hearing her name because I am sure that she will continue to be involved in her beloved party's activities, and perhaps guiding its policy settings. I wish her well in her retirement.

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY (Light): I have much pleasure in supporting the motion of the member for Waite and to celebrate 21 years of hard work by the Hon. Diana Laidlaw in the upper house of the parliament of South Australia. When we all enter this place, I am sure that pretty well everybody has an idea that they want to make a difference. When their parliamentary career is finished, having spent time in this place and having served the community as we do, we want to be able to look back and say, 'That was an area where I had an input; it made some difference to the constituents in my electorate and to the people of this state, and I can look back on that with some pride and the satisfaction of a job well done.' Let me say that the Hon. Diana Laidlaw can look back on her 21 years in the parliament of South Australia and say it has been a job well done.

There has been no-one more passionate than Diana for her portfolios of transport, planning, the status of women and the arts. I know of no-one more passionate than she over the time that she was a shadow minister and in her time as minister in wanting to drive those portfolios forward, in getting outcomes, in achieving goals and in ensuring that we ended up with a better transport system, a better planning system, the arts being pushed as a focus for South Australia and in ensuring that women are encouraged to achieve their potential in whatever field they wish to enter, and that should be the case.

The member for Waite has recounted a number of the successes of the Hon. Diana Laidlaw during her time in parliament, so I will not go back over them, but I will pick out a couple of extremely important measures that she has driven quite strongly, both through cabinet and also in the community, to ensure that we have ended up with a better transport system than when she came to this place.

The Heysen tunnels had been talked about for years, as had the Mount Barker Road, the accidents that occurred on that road, and what could be done. Many people talked about a tunnel through the Hills, but no-one had actually achieved it until the Hon. Diana Laidlaw became minister. It was a \$100 million project to undertake that job, and we have only to look at the benefits that has delivered to the drivers of South Australia, particularly the heavy transport industry. Not a week would go past when we did not have a problem with a semitrailer coming down Mount Barker Road. Now it is a very rare event for a semitrailer to run into a problem as it traverses the freeway coming into Adelaide. That was a fantastic achievement, under a Liberal government and under the direction of the Hon. Diana Laidlaw.

The Southern Expressway is one of the other major projects that was undertaken in her time as minister. When I talk to people from the southern suburbs about the reduction in travelling time from the southern suburbs to the centre of Adelaide, I realise that it is a significant achievement. Again, it was a landmark project that occurred under the direction of the Hon. Diana Laidlaw.

In a local context, I am sure that the member for Schubert would support my comments about Gomersal Road. I imagine that members in this house have heard about Gomersal Road for 20 years, and it was under the direction of the Hon. Diana Laidlaw as minister for transport that the sealing of Gomersal Road was achieved. When I approached her about looking at the road network of the Barossa, a Barossa tourism road strategy was undertaken, and we have seen the upgrading of the Barossa Valley Way and Gomersal Road. Negotiations were undertaken with Orlando, so now all the trucks that used to come through Murray Street in Gawler from the wineries use Gomersal Road. That has had a major impact on heavy vehicle traffic through Murray Street in Gawler, given that it created a bottleneck there. It is a completely different place in which to drive and shop in the main street of Gawler because of the decision to seal Gomersal Road. I thank her for that because it has made a distinct difference to Gawler.

The third river crossing of the Port River is now a project that this government is continuing, but it was instigated by Diana when minister for transport. I am sure that that will make a huge difference to Port Adelaide and transport through Port Adelaide, enabling the business centre of Port Adelaide to be returned to the people and to ensure that the amount of heavy truck traffic that goes through there is reduced to a minimum. That project will also be another one where a huge difference is made.

I am sure that Diana has been the only minister to obtain her bus licence, and I think that showed the commitment of the honourable member to her portfolio. Not only has—

Ms Breuer: Can she drive a semitrailer or a road train?

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY: She might; I don't know. I have not asked her that. Not only did she want to understand the conditions that bus drivers were confronting, but she wanted to be able to do it herself so she could see it first-hand. That was great commitment to her portfolio. When I speak with people who are in the road transport industry, particularly in heavy vehicle transport, they all say what a wonderful rapport they had with Diana in the time that she was minister. She was open to suggestions from the heavy vehicle industry, she attended many conferences over a long time both as shadow and as minister, and they valued that commitment from her and also her loyalty to their industry.

Another change that occurred under the Hon. Diana Laidlaw, as Minister for Transport, of course, was the contracting out of our bus services in metropolitan Adelaide. This one event has saved the public some \$7 million per year, and it was something that had not been done, or even attempted, by any other transport minister in the history of this state. It was not easy, but Diana stuck to her guns, and it is now a success. In addition, when Diana took over the portfolio, we had a public transport system that was experiencing a decline in patronage and, in her last year as minister, we have seen a 3 per cent increase in public transport patronage. I know that that has been because of Diana's commitment to the portfolio to improve the level of service available to the people of metropolitan Adelaide and to

ensure that a program of schedules was devised that suited people and was convenient for them to use.

Diana, of course, visited many cities around the world in her capacity as minister for planning, and brought those ideas back to Adelaide. I have appreciated her advice and her help in the time that I have been the shadow minister for transport and planning. I extend to Diana my best wishes for the future. I am sure that we will still hear of Diana around the place. I wish her well in her wine industry undertaking. I am sure that she will still be a passionate supporter of the arts. She has made a difference to South Australia.

Ms BREUER (Giles): I want to speak only briefly on this motion, but I cannot let the opportunity pass without endorsing the sentiments that have been expressed. I am very happy to support this motion. We will be sorry to see the Hon. Diana Laidlaw leave this place. I have, perhaps, known of her, and known her, for longer than any other member of this place, because for many years she was a regular visitor to Whyalla. Although she knew that I was on the opposite side of the fence, she always acknowledged me if I ever went anywhere and she was there, and she certainly supported me with respect to some of the women's issues that were to the forefront in Whyalla. I have been very active in women's issues in Whyalla for many years, and Diana always acknowledged that whenever she visited our city. I was very happy to join her in Adelaide.

Apart from Diana's politics, she is a really good person. It is a pity about her politics: if she was on our side, just look at what she could have achieved! But she certainly has contributed to the role of women in this state, in particular, and she has been a role model, I think, for many young women—and even for me, particularly when I first considered entering politics. Diana and I are the same age, and our generation of women were expected to work for a few years, then get married and stay in the kitchen and have children. Neither of us really did it—I did have children, but I certainly did not stay in the kitchen and, certainly, Diana did not. We were somewhat different. It was a hurdle to overcome for my generation of women, and Diana was always at the forefront. I think many young women in South Australia would see her as a role model.

I also must acknowledge the assistance that Diana has given me on the ERD Committee over the last 14 or 15 months. She was a very active member of our committee and always provided good support. It has been interesting in recent times with the member for West Torrens on our committee, but it has been a really good committee, and Diana's background and knowledge, particularly with respect to planning issues, has been invaluable to the committee. We will certainly miss her.

I think that every woman in South Australia—and every young woman, in particular—should acknowledge the role that Diana has played in bringing women to the forefront. I asked her the other day whether she believed in affirmative action in politics because, certainly, we on our side owe a lot to affirmative action. She was very dodgy about it, so I will not draw her on that one. But, certainly, Diana has played a role with respect to the number of women on the other side who have entered, and are entering, Liberal—conservative—politics. Diana dug her heels in and said, 'I want a woman to replace me,' and she made it happen. I thank the Hon. Diana Laidlaw very much. We acknowledge the role that she has played over the years, and wish her well in the future.

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop): It is with great pleasure that I rise in support of this motion to acknowledge the contribution that the Hon. Diana Laidlaw has made, in another place, to South Australia. Having listened to what has been said this morning, obviously, she has touched many South Australians over a very wide area. I would like to say a few things about the relationship that I have had with the Hon. Diana Laidlaw since I have been the member for MacKillop.

Two words come to mind when I think about Diana Laidlaw the person. The first is professionalism; the second is passion. Put together, those two words mean that she is a person who has been managing considerable parts of this state for a long time and who has an enormous capacity for work, and that is shown by her achievements. I will not list all the things that have been mentioned by other members, but her achievements have been fantastic. I recently heard a story that Di hopped on a bus and the bus driver announced that the former transport minister was on the bus, and that she was the best transport minister that this state had ever had. I think that stands as a testament to the way in which she has touched so many people.

I think one of the reasons for Di's successes is that, as a minister, she ran an extremely successful portfolio committee. She did not bring matters to the parliamentary Liberal Party room, or to the parliament, without canvassing them very widely, and considering them very seriously and in depth with her colleagues in the Liberal Party, at least, and people from industry. I worked on her portfolio committees over a number of years, and I saw how some ministers could be very successful in progressing their agendas. She certainly worked that very well. It would be a good piece of advice for any minister, or any aspiring minister, to take a leaf out of Diana's book, because it was a way of making sure that one could progress the agenda, even though compromise often happened.

Diana can only be described as a straight shooter. If you went to her with a problem and it was her opinion that you were way off the mark and that what you were asking for was unachievable or nonsensical, she did not beat about the bush: she told you. So, you did not spend months and months flogging dead horses with Di; you knew straight up that it was time to step aside and try something else. On the other hand, if you went to Di with an issue or an idea that was not necessarily supported by any of her advisers or her department but could convince her that it had some merit, she would go away and have the work done and prove the case either for or against it. Many times I have taken ideas to Di, not necessarily expecting success, but at least knowing that she would have a look at it and weigh it up on its merits and, as a result, success was achieved a number of times. Again, I think it would be a good piece of advice to ministers to take a leaf out of her book.

I very rarely received a letter in response to a written inquiry from Diana's office which did not have her handwriting all over it—drawings in the margin, arrows, underlining of words, correction of grammar. It is very rare to receive a letter like that from a minister's office. Everyone knew that Di was a very hands-on minister and was right across and on top of her portfolio and the people with whom she was working in the departments and in her ministerial office. I can assure Di that that was appreciated by me and, I dare say, by members on both sides of the house who received letters from her. We knew that she was taking a serious interest in the matters we were raising with her.

As I said, a number of speakers have talked about some of Di's major achievements, and I will just add a couple of things to that. The Recreational Boating Facilities Fund, I believe, was established under Di's leadership, and that has made a huge difference, certainly, in my electorate and, I am sure, in a lot of other coastal regions of South Australia because we have some real money to put into recreational boating facilities. As I say, that has made a big difference to recreational fishers, in particular.

I mention the rural arterial roads program. The idea was that we should set up a program to seal all rural arterial roads across the state to give some benefits to rural people who, quite often, have to travel many miles on unsealed roads. It is unfortunate that that program, since the change of government, has somewhat faltered, but already it has delivered huge benefits to rural people, and particularly those people in isolated areas. When I say 'isolated areas', I am not talking about the Far North: I am talking about heavily populated parts of the state and the connecting roads between those various areas.

One road that certainly comes to mind is the Burra-Morgan Road, and I know that, again, the member for Schubert has been mentioned. He must have had a considerable influence with Di Laidlaw because the Burra-Morgan Road was another of his pet subjects, and that road was sealed a couple of years ago under that particular road funding program. One of my pet subjects with Di Laidlaw when she was the Minister for Transport was a set of passing lanes on the Coorong Road. I am delighted that, only recently, a set of passing lanes—one in each direction—has been completed along the Coorong between Meningie and Kingston.

I do hope that I can convince the current minister and successive ministers for transport that that program needs to be carried forth on that road because it is very important. If we talk about road safety, the programs that Di Laidlaw instituted in upgrading our roads—things like shoulder sealing, passing lanes and sealing rural arterial roads—have added immensely to the safety level of people going about their daily business in country South Australia.

Obviously, we had our differences. I can recall on several occasions receiving what could only be described as a tongue-lashing from Di. One was very early in my experience in this place and it was over an amendment, which was successfully carried through the house, to make some changes to the school zones. The amendment meant that Di's department was going to be picking up the bill for changing the school zones. I think that it was some hundreds of thousands of dollars, or maybe even a little more, which the parliament successfully shifted from local government to the state government. I got into a little bit of hot water over that one. We often had quite fiery discussions on the subject of open road speed limits in South Australia.

I do not think that any member would be surprised to know that, in certain areas, I support the member for Stuart in his call for increasing open road speed limits. Di would never have any of that and made her thoughts well known. I raise this because her professionalism showed through. You could have a row with Di over an issue such as that one minute and, when the subject changed, when you were discussing a different issue, there were no bad feelings: you went on and the next issue was discussed and taken on its merits. That was one of the reasons why I have no hesitation in saying that Di Laidlaw has always showed extreme professionalism.

I attended many meetings with her and with local government representatives from the various councils in my electorate. She always worked extremely well with the local councils. On many occasions she was able to broker win-win decisions between her departments and local councils, and I have no hesitation in saying that not only am I expressing my wishes for Di's future but, I am sure, the people in my electorate, and particularly those in local government, would wish me to pass on their best wishes to Di Laidlaw as she retires from the other place.

I fully support the motion and wish Di Laidlaw all the best in any future endeavours which she undertakes.

The Hon. S.W. KEY (Minister for Social Justice): I am very pleased to support this motion from the member for Waite. I must say that this is probably an historic occasion in that, normally, I would not support motions from the member for Waite. This is probably the most sensible—

Ms Bedford: And probably the only one.

The Hon. S.W. KEY: And probably the only one, as my colleague reminds me, that I would wish to support. But there is always hope in the future, member for Waite, after this amazing precedent. I am very pleased to support this motion because, as I said, I have known the Hon. Diana Laidlaw for some 24 years. As a result of our different jobs, and also our same views on many subjects, the Hon. Diana Laidlaw and I have worked together. Our various work seems to have corresponded very well. I first met Diana Laidlaw when I was the Director of the Working Women's Centre.

Along with a number of Labor and Liberal women members of parliament, Diana worked on the early anti-sexual harassment campaign. We managed not only to name sexual harassment but, eventually, we were successful in acknowledging that sexual harassment was unwelcome sexual attention and that it not only needed to be identified but also we needed to make sure that people did not practise sexual harassment. While I cannot claim that our campaign ensured that there is no sexual harassment in the workplace, or anywhere else, there is a very strong awareness and commitment now to making sure that sexual harassment is not perpetrated.

Indeed, the Hon. Diana Laidlaw was involved in that campaign, particularly with regard to employment. Many members in this place, particularly the women members, will understand the debilitating effect sexual harassment can have on their future, their career and also their wellbeing. When I went to work at the United Trades and Labor Council as an industrial officer, again, the Hon. Diana Laidlaw made it her business to find out what the unions thought about issues relating to women. She also made it her business to find out what we were doing with regard to parental leave, child care and having an equal opportunity basis for women in the paid work force.

I do not know Diana's views with respect to trade unions but, certainly, she had no problem talking to trade union women, in particular, but also other officials in the union movement about those very important issues. Probably the most comical relationship I had with the Hon. Diana Laidlaw was when I worked as a senior industrial advocate for—

The SPEAKER: Order! Would the member for Unley take a seat rather than stand with his back to the chair. He may choose to sit with the colleagues with whom he is having a conversation.

The Hon. S.W. KEY: —the Transport Workers Union. Again, I was very keen to make sure that women workers in

the transport area received not only recognition but also that health and safety measures would be put in place as well as various supports for women in the transport industry. I am pleased to say that, as minister for the status of women and minister for transport, the Hon. Diana Laidlaw supported the campaign, particularly for women who worked as courier drivers. I think that the work we did at that stage culminated in the Transport Workers Union receiving the first Augusta Zadow recognition.

In this respect, I must also pay testament to my colleague the member for Reynell, Gay Thompson. While the Augusta Zadow Award is a very small award and probably not very well known, it encourages women to take up projects, particularly in the area of health and safety. However, in this case, it was recognition for the very good work that was being done in the area of health and safety for women in the transport industry.

Diana has the distinction of getting on very well with the Transport Workers Union, the Public Transport Union and what was called the ATMOEA, which preceded the Public Transport Union and, I believe, the Australian Railways Union as well. So, she has a good knowledge of their history and the various characters who have been involved in those unions.

While her ability to have a bus driver's licence was very much applauded by the Transport Workers Union, unfortunately I think the Hon. Diana Laidlaw suffered from the same fate as I (and I will stand corrected if I am wrong) in not being able to back a semitrailer or drive a road train. These were considered to be essential skills if you were to hold your own in the transport industry. However, I have to tell the house that a number of my colleagues in the Transport Workers Union could not do that, either, so I thought it was a bit rich that both the Hon. Diana Laidlaw and I were put in the category of perhaps not quite fitting in because of the need to have those particular skills. They are skills, and I do not take anything from them, but I think they were a bit over-emphasised.

Since coming into this house, I have been very impressed with the support that I have received from women in this place—including the staff, obviously, but particularly the members here and in the other place. Part of the reason for that I think is that there has been a culture which we newer members of parliament have inherited and which centred around the Hon. Diana Laidlaw, the Hon. Carolyn Pickles and the Hon. Sandra Kanck. I believe that, preceding that, the Hon. Anne Levy was also keen to ensure that there was a network of feeling and support for each other, certainly in the Legislative Council and, since I have been here, in the House of Assembly in the last parliament and also this parliament. I am not saying that we agree on everything—quite often, we do not agree on anything, depending on the point of view of the particular member—but I think there has been a common bond, and the Hon. Diana Laidlaw has had a major share in establishing that.

I have never had a discussion with the Hon. Diana Laidlaw about football, so I have no idea whether or not she supports a particular team. I agree, to a certain extent, with the comments of the member for Giles that, for a Liberal, we think she is pretty good! So I cannot talk about other things on which we may differ such as football—unless, of course, she is a Port Power supporter—but, needless to say, I have worked with Diana on a number of issues, mainly to do with women and transport. And, since being here and having the honour in the previous parliament of being a shadow minister,

I have had the opportunity to work with her on the issue of urban development and planning.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Unley is out of order again. He may choose to sit with honourable members to chat with them, but it is disrespectful to the chair for any honourable member to turn their back to the chair and simply proceed as though it did not exist. The minister has the call.

The Hon. S.W. KEY: Thank you, sir. So, I had the opportunity to work with the Hon. Diana Laidlaw with regard to urban development and planning, and also through my membership of the Environment, Resources and Development Committee. I thank her not only for her generosity in being prepared to brief me as a shadow minister but also for taking up the arguments that I put to her.

I cannot really comment about the Hon. Diana Laidlaw's work as a transport minister in the time that I have been in this place but, if one listened to the Appropriation Bill speeches over the last couple of days, one would think that all those roads that she was responsible for establishing are crumbling, so I think there is a bit of a question mark about her ability to build those roads. But I will let her take that on board.

One of the testaments to her, I think, is that when you get in a taxi the taxi drivers do not grumble about the Hon. Diana Laidlaw as they do about other previous transport ministers. Time expired.

Mrs HALL (Morialta): I would like to make a few brief points to endorse very happily the many tributes and accolades that have already been given to the Hon. Diana Laidlaw. At a person level, I have known Diana for probably more decades than either of us would like to acknowledge, but my original friendship and political interest in and involvement with Diana began many decades ago when we were both working within the Liberal Party organisation, particularly with a focus on raising the importance of the status of women. I well remember Diana's insistence, enthusiasm and sheer determination to ensure that the Liberal Party provided appropriate policy direction and the required number of brochures about how that affected women of the party and women of the state.

What has not been mentioned today is one of the very early initiatives in women's communication, and that was a newsletter that she established called *Equal Opportunities*. She was an absolutely formidable editor and contributed to the distribution of that newsletter, and it is my view that it was the forerunner to many of the fine publications that continued to come out of her department when she was minister.

Her well-known passion and support for the arts has already been mentioned by a number of previous speakers. What has not been specifically raised is her devotion to jewellery shops and the very specific pieces of jewellery that she wears—much to the absolute envy, I suspect, of a number of her friends and colleagues, because she has great taste in jewellery.

But it was only recently that I learnt about her absolute passion for and dedication to wonderful textiles, and I am sure the Hon. Diana Laidlaw will be very happy to give everyone in this house the address and the name of the new textile gallery in, I think—

Ms Chapman: Tarts.

Mrs HALL: Tarts, in Adelaide Arcade. The arts industry should acknowledge her as the most extraordinary ambassador that this state has seen.

Diana's reforms in the transport system of this state have been well articulated this morning, and I think it is appropriate to acknowledge the member for Waite for moving this motion to enable everyone who has had a long or short association with Diana, either in a personal or a political sense, to pay her the tribute that she deserves.

The member for Newland talked about some of Diana's relationships, activities and reforms among the women of the Liberal Party, and I thank her for that. The member for Light talked about the difference that Diana has made not only to this parliament but also to many organisations across the state.

I want to mention a couple of topics that have not been touched on so far. As a previous tourism minister, I worked in partnership with Di to achieve a number of things, of which I am sure we are both very proud, particularly in the areas of rural roads and tourism roads, air strips, airports, jetties, boats, and cycling (she has a passion for bikes), and her involvement and passion for selected major events.

Some of us with a perverse sense of humour might care to think about what history would have made of the fact that one of Diana's favourite positions in an acting minister capacity was that of the acting minister for health, and I recall on two occasions that two fairly senior bureaucrats tried to lobby a number of ministers so that Di did not get to be the acting minister for health. I am told that there was not a document that came to the department that she did not read and notate and, quite often, require further action to be taken. I have often pondered what differences there might have been if she had ever held that portfolio.

I will conclude my brief remarks by saying that it has been a privilege to work with Diana Laidlaw as a Liberal colleague, and I am sure that history will continue to say very good things about the work she has done. As the member for Light said, she has made a difference and, on a personal level, I wish Diana Laidlaw good wishes and good fortune in her retirement. Knowing Diana, as many of us do, I have absolutely no doubt that she will be busier in retirement than during the 21 years she has spent in this parliament.

Mr BRINDAL (Unley): I rise to contribute to this extraordinary debate. I say extraordinary, because in 14 years I do not think I have heard anyone eulogised so eloquently other than upon their death, and Diana Laidlaw is certainly not dead. Indeed, if we follow the logic in an article in the *Advertiser* this morning by another venerable colleague of ours, Diana retires barely as she reaches a majority in this place and would be considered by some to be relatively young.

Nevertheless, the tribute I wish to pay to Diana—and, hopefully, unlike any other that has been paid—is that I can honestly say, with the greatest respect to the Hon. Diana Laidlaw, that one of the things that most impressed me about her in a 14-year working relationship is that her gender, while obviously noticeable to the eye, never intruded upon her working relationship. I say that because the greatest compliment I can give any other person is to regard them as an equal without worrying whether they be male or female, and Diana Laidlaw, by any stretch of the imagination, was the peer and often the better of many people who have served in this house. It was not Diana Laidlaw's gender that made her good: it was her capacity to serve this parliament. That is why Diana Laidlaw commands the respect of both houses of this parliament. That she is undoubtedly a female absolutely affirms that women—

The Hon. S.W. Key: How do you know?

Mr BRINDAL:—well, I do have eyes—are the equal of men in this place, and should be here in better numbers than they are represented. Diana Laidlaw is a symbol of the fact that women are often the betters of men when it comes to political ability.

Members interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: I have to say to some of the women chortling opposite that ability is spread: men and women have differing abilities, and many women do not have the capacity of the Hon. Diana Laidlaw. What has most impressed me about the retiring former minister is that she is one of the people in this place who truly understands liberalism. Some members may recall when I was speaking in tribute to the late Hon. Murray Hill that I said of him not only that he was a member of the Liberal Party but also that in that conservative Liberal Party he was a true liberal. I know that the Hon. Diana Laidlaw had much to do with him, and has always consistently followed his thinking in a truly liberal tradition.

I do not think I have to remind honourable members of the many battles she has fought not only in the course of her gender but also causes for disadvantaged people—causes that are seen to be truly liberal causes. We have had our differences over the years on many policy issues, but I have never had any doubt that, if it was an issue that required the support of a liberal—someone who understood liberalism in the true sense of the word—you would hardly ever have to ask Diana: her help was always there. If the cause was just and right not only would she support it but she would do so absolutely fearlessly. There are people in our party room who have had great cause to think about their votes on certain matters because, if they have voted in certain ways on certain matters and the Hon. Diana Laidlaw has not agreed with their thinking, she has not been afraid to say so.

I conclude by saying that it is often said of people that an object in your life 'is to live respected and to die regretted'. Diana Laidlaw certainly is not at that point in her life, but I think that, in terms of her political career, no-one in this house would deny that, for 21 years, Diana has graced this place, has been respected in this place, and that her leaving this place, while it does not mark her death, marks her lack of involvement in an active way with the legislature of South Australia. So, she has participated in here respected, and she does leave here regretted. I hope that, when the rest of us come to retire, we can have said of us part of what is said of Diana Laidlaw.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens): I am honoured to rise in this place to pay tribute to a woman for whom I have a great deal of respect, admiration and, indeed, whom I will miss. The Hon. Diana Laidlaw, in all seriousness, has done her party a great service. Much to the chagrin of this side of the house, she has been an effective minister, she has fought valiantly for her interests within the Liberal Party, she has often taken stands of principle against those of her colleagues, which is to be commended, but she has done something even greater for the Liberal Party—and I mean this in the kindest way: she is leaving. She is leaving, because she believes that she has served her time in this place and she wants to see new blood brought into the Liberal Party. Many of us want to stay here for as long as we can. However, the Hon. Diana Laidlaw has done her duty for her party and her state, she has served her party well, and she has now decided to move on. She believes that the one thing that will ensure the survival of the Liberal Party is renewal.

I am sure that the Hon. Diana Laidlaw has other interests outside of politics: God help her if she does not, but I am sure she does. I think it is a mark of her character that she is prepared to walk away from this place after her achievements. Many of us in this place tend to cling on for dear life as long as we can, doing anything we can to stay here, and there are those of us who decide, 'Maybe the world has more to offer than just this chamber.' I believe it is a sign of her strength of character that she is prepared to walk away.

I think that there are other members in this place who should make that decision in the best interests of their party, but that is for them to decide to follow the example of the Hon. Diana Laidlaw. Diana Laidlaw has been the Liberal Party's light on the hill, towards whom members opposite, at least, should always focus and whose example of self-sacrifice in putting the Liberal Party ahead of personal interest they should follow. These are principles that we take for granted in the Labor Party but, alas, it is lacking in the Liberal Party.

I disagreed many times with the Hon. Diana Vivienne Laidlaw, as the then minister for transport in the last parliament, but I never once thought that she acted out of malice. I never once thought she acted because she intended to harm a worker or an industry: she did what she thought was best for the taxi industry. Some comments were made that I regret, and maybe even in a quiet moment, when she is alone and as time goes on, the former minister may regret some comments that were made about the taxi industry. Ultimately, she is respected amongst taxi drivers because, whatever her policy outcomes were, she was doing what she thought was in the best interests of South Australia and for taxi drivers. She is a character and a personality in the parliament and will be missed. I know that I immediately felt a warmness for and took a liking to the minister when I walked in.

Mr Brindal: You take a warmness and liking to too many people.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: Now you sound like my mother! The Liberal Party should not mourn her loss but celebrate her achievements, and the honourable member should be an example to other members in the Liberal Party of how to work in a bipartisan way and how to talk to all industry groups. Diana Laidlaw was often on a first name basis with union secretaries, and discussed things that affected workers quite fairly and did not take a confrontational view to everything she did. It was not always about Labor and Liberal, but often about what was in the best interests of the workers and industry, and for that I congratulate her and wish her well on her bike tour of Europe. Hopefully, I will be driving a car around Europe, and if I drive past I will beep and say hello.

Mrs REDMOND (Heysen): It is always a pleasure to follow the member for West Torrens. I wish to speak about three Ps that spring to mind with Diana. First, she is a pioneer and, although as the member for Waite said, this parliament was the second place in the world to give women the right to vote and the first to give women the right to stand for parliament, it took us 65 years to get the lovely lady, now showing on the wall in this place, elected. In a real sense Diana is one of the real pioneers of women coming into parliament, and it is a delight to me as a new female member of parliament to have had the privilege of working with her, albeit for a relatively short period of time. When Di first came in they were still dealing with the issue of providing toilets for women. We now comprise almost one third of the

members of this august place, and that number will no doubt continue to increase until we bear the same relationship in terms of numbers as we do in the general population.

It is also a shame that this item did not come on as the first item this morning, simply because I observed in the gallery earlier the young girls from grade 6 at Seymour College. Diana went to Presbyterian Girls School, which is now known as Seymour College, and I am sure it would have been a great pleasure for them to be in the parliament to hear what one of their former students had gone on to achieve as a pioneer in this place.

The second P is that Diana has always been passionate, and in this respect I refer to her passion for all the portfolios she has held, notably arts and transport; that is of common knowledge around this place and in the general community. Last night I ran into Rod Payze, who was in this place with another hat on, that of the SANFL, having been a former head of the Department of Transport. He held Diana in high regard, as did the recently retired CEO, Trevor Argent, with whom I have regular contact. She was passionate about a number of things, and other speakers have listed a number of things she achieved in the Art Gallery, not only in the building structure but also in acquisitions in the gallery during her time as minister. The Library, the Museum and the Festival Centre have been considerable achievements.

From my own view, in Heysen it is a great joy to me that we have the Heysen Tunnels, and Diana, along with the federal government, played a great part in seeing the achievement of those tunnels, which provide a wonderful entry to the district of Heysen. She was also involved in extending our bus services—people up there are very keen to use buses—and got us better buses that go further into the hills, and that was a great thing for the people in Heysen.

In terms of the third P, Diana was always prepared. It is astounding that I came into this place not knowing a lot about a number of the other people who were formerly ministers in the Liberal government, but I knew a fair bit about Diana, as she was so well known for going into cabinet and always being thoroughly prepared and passionate about what she was seeking and, hence, being prepared was able to achieve a lot. She had the answers to the questions when she went in there and was able sometimes to convince people who might otherwise have brought down her plans to go along with them.

She has been a wonderful role model for many of us coming into this place. I am sorry I will not have longer to serve with Diana—it has been a short 15 months. She has been a mentor to many women on both sides of the house and has made it a point always not to restrict her dealings to just those of her own party. Rather, she has been a support and help to women both inside and outside the house in achieving things for women generally, particularly for women parliamentarians. Diana is only a young woman (she is not very much older than I), and will therefore have another life when she leaves this place. I have no doubt she will fill it with passion and enthusiasm and make a profound impact on whatever she does in the field she goes into after this.

I simply say congratulations to Diana. She has done the job for 21 years, done it well, with insight, understanding, compassion and passion. Congratulations and a job well done. As someone in the gallery said, when we were discussing it before, these speeches will be very useful in 50 years or more when Diana passes and we have to do eulogies: those of us who are still here will be able to get out these speeches and reminisce about Diana.

Mr MEIER (Goyder): It is a pleasure for me to speak to this motion today. I am one of those who came into this parliament at the same time as Diana. There was also Rob Lucas, Peter Dunn (the former president of the Legislative Council), Stephen Baker (former treasurer of this state) and I. It has been a real pleasure to work with Diana. So much has been said, and in the 10 minutes allocated to me I will be lucky to touch on 10 per cent of what I would like to say. Thank you, Diana, for what you have done for this parliament and for South Australia, particularly South Australia. It is a real pleasure to have served with you. You have been a really hard worker and got things done. One hopes that one could say that of all members when their time comes to retire or be replaced. Without question it could be said of Diana.

I saw very clearly the value of having someone like Diana Laidlaw as a minister in the Legislative Council, where she could give full attention to her ministerial portfolio, literally 24 hours a day, seven days a week, 365 days a year, without having to worry so much about electorate matters. Transport, planning and the status of women and all her portfolios were the great beneficiaries as a result of that, and again we thank her.

I had many different highlights with Diana. I thank her with respect to the rural arterial roads sealing program over 10 years. I was lucky to represent the areas of Blyth and Brinkworth when the Liberal Party first took government and two roads were sealed, namely, from Snowtown to Brinkworth and from Blyth to Brinkworth. That left my electorate and went to the Hon. Rob Kerin, so the rest of the state has benefited.

However, before we came to power, one thing that was highlighted was the proposed sealing of the road from Kadina to Wallaroo. I have talked before in this house about the debt we inherited, but now is not the time to highlight that issue. However, I well remember lobbying for that road, because no money had been allocated for it. About two or three weeks before the election, Diana indicated to me, 'I'm sorry; there won't be any money for your road, because you know as well as we do that there's no money in Treasury.' I said that I did not know whether I could win the election, even though it was supposedly a safe seat.

I well remember the day of the budget when Diana came into the room, just touched me on the shoulder and said, 'I've managed to allocate \$1 million to get that started.' That was the best thing that ever happened, because otherwise it would have been some years before the Kadina to Wallaroo road could be sealed. Whilst it had been proposed by the Bannon government for four years, that government had not provided one cent. At long last we had some money allocated. I will never forget that, and I am sure that all the people of Yorke Peninsula are appreciative, as are the tens of thousands of people who visit the area.

However, there were issues in relation to not only the allocation of money but also the little additions that were needed. That road took about three years longer to complete than could have been the case. It cost about \$2 million or \$3 million more because we needed extra drainage, replacement of water pipes, and underground cabling. I remember the minister saying that she had not budgeted for those items. I said, 'I realise that, but it's going to be a makeshift job. It will only be half completed. Can we extend it for another year or two and allocate a bit more in the following years?' The minister was very helpful and, whilst it took a few more years, we got it done, and it is now an excellent road.

I now turn to the Port Wakefield intersection, just north of Port Wakefield. It was said that Diana was one to consult with the people, and there was no question that that happened. We had meetings in Port Wakefield, as well as other meetings. Whilst views were expressed about the sensibleness of the new intersection, because it was commonwealth money that was being provided we had no option but to go ahead. However, it was only after it was constructed that the problems started. I cannot go into all the detail, but I well remember various suggestions being made by the RAA.

Diana visited the intersection on two, perhaps three, occasions. On one visit, I remember that she stood at the intersection whilst vehicles drove past. Diana opened the door of one semitrailer, jumped onto the passenger seat and said, 'Excuse me, driver. What do you think of this intersection?' I hoped that no-one else came along, or there would have been a catastrophe, but no other vehicles were around. That driver said, 'I think it's excellent. It's the best thing that's happened here.' It was interesting that a semitrailer driver should say that it was the best thing that had happened and yet car drivers were having accidents. Diana saw to it that the whole area was raised a metre or two, which, together with some flashing yellow lights, helped to solve the problems. I do not think that we have had a serious accident there since.

There are also many other road examples. It is wonderful to see the passing lanes on the coast road, the planning stages of which were commenced under our government and now are continued by this government. Without Diana, that may not have happened. I well remember the briefing in our portfolio committee, when she briefed the members on what they and South Australia would receive. She saw that I had a glum look on my face and said, 'Aren't you happy, John?' Even though I had received this road, that road and the other, I said, 'But the passing lanes!' She threw her books down and said, 'Goodness! I give you all that and you're still not happy.' I said, 'It's not that I'm not happy, it's just that I thought we had an understanding that those passing lanes would commence.' Diana replied, 'Well, I don't know!' About a quarter of an hour later, Diana came back to me and said that she had money in the budget to get the design work started, which was so essential because accidents were starting to happen. This incident shows how departmental officers can sometimes present obstacles, but I say a big thank you to Diana.

The Yorke Peninsula train would not have happened without Diana Laidlaw. She opened up the department to the YP rail people and to myself. We were able to make telephone calls, and she was always happy to try to sort things out. There were myriad problems, and I had no idea how hard it would be to get a tourist train going. I was delighted that she could attend the opening (after public liability issues had stopped it for nine months) by the Lions Club of Yorke Peninsula, which now runs it.

Diana has visited my electorate on many occasions. Usually, when I organise such a visit it is a very tight schedule, which Diana knows well (and I forgot about the cigarette breaks that she needed occasionally). On one occasion, just before Christmas, we had got through most of the day when we arrived at Kadina, where there was a Christmas fair. Diana said, 'John, I'm going in to have a look at this.' I told her that she had about five minutes before the next appointment. We went into Kadina Town Hall, where there were myriad stalls. I thought, 'John, you should never have let her in.' After about five minutes, I said, 'Diana, it's

time to go,' and she was not even a tenth of the way around the hall. She said nothing, so I let her go.

After another five minutes, when we were five minutes late, I tried to say something. When we were about 10 minutes late I said, 'Diana, we must leave.' She really told me off, saying, 'John Meier, you go to the next appointment, and I'll stay here, looking at the arts and crafts, thank you very much.' I did not want to go the next appointment alone; I was bringing Diana. However, it all worked out well, and we were still talking by the end of the day. In fact, the people at the arts and crafts fair still talk about Diana's wonderful visit when she bought Christmas presents left, right and centre and showed a real interest in arts—and, of course, we did get to the next appointment!

It has been an experience for me to learn so much from Diana. Whether it be in planning, the status of women, or any other area, she did a fantastic job, and I thank her for that. She had excellent staff to help her whom she seemed to find every time. I think that she revolutionised departments to allow them to talk directly with members of parliament and others, and I hope that that will continue. I wish Diana all the very best in her retirement years.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Minister for Urban Development and Planning): I was not prepared to speak today but, upon seeing the Hon. Diana Laidlaw in the chamber and being aware of the motion, I think that it is important that I add a few remarks.

I did not have the pleasure of working closely with the Hon. Diana Laidlaw, having not been a member of this place until the last election. However, I have come to know her work because of my present role as Minister for Urban Development and Planning. I want to make a few remarks about her role as minister for planning, and I particularly want to put on record what I see as her important and valuable contribution to the maintenance of what I think most people in South Australia have come to understand is one of the best planning systems in this country.

We have always had strong bipartisan support for a high quality planning system, and there has always been a notion that the state government, in particular, would play a very strong leadership role in metropolitan planning, recognising, of course, the important role of local communities. Upon looking at the material that was put in place by the former minister in this area, I was impressed that she sought to strive for a community focus on the way in which the planning system operates.

I will now refer to a few specific initiatives that I know are particularly associated with her period as minister for planning. The first is the urban growth boundary and the way in which that essentially frames the metropolitan area of Adelaide and the important role that that will play in the future in defining the long-term shape and character of this city. The Hon. Diana Laidlaw sought to elevate the status of that important public policy tool and give it much more prominence than it earlier enjoyed, and on that she should be congratulated.

The second initiative, which is similar, is the coast park plan. That is a magnificent concept of linking each of the coastal regions from Largs through to the southern beaches with one single linear park. That was a difficult task for her, trying to negotiate with a range of councils to find that path from one end of the metropolitan area to the other, but she did it with great skill and it is an initiative that the current government will build on. The honourable member also took

up the initiative to protect significant trees within the community, responding to community concerns about the way in which our urban environment was changing.

The Hon. Diana Laidlaw also grappled with the difficult issues of improving the development assessment system to ensure that local communities focused more on the development of policy and less on the end point, the development assessment process, when really a lot of the battles are won and lost by that stage. That is also something that we join with her in and congratulate her on.

I know that planning was not the easiest of her portfolio responsibilities, and I must tell a bit of a story out of school. There was a leak in Diana's former ministerial office, and information was supplied to me that certain dockets in the planning system could only be processed through the former minister for planning's office if they were eased through with copious quantities of chocolate frogs. I can appreciate that. Indeed, on occasions I have called for something much stronger to get through some of those planning dockets!

It is not an easy portfolio. It involves ameliorating conflicting interests. In essence, it is about conflicting land uses, and on her part that involved using her skills as a mediator in working through what can be quite a minefield of different interests—communities, local councils and government agencies—as all those conflicting aims and aspirations have to be resolved to find a solution at a local level.

I also pay tribute to the honourable member for the appointment of Neil Savery as the head of Planning SA. When I came to office, we had a brief meeting in the early days of my ministry, and she impressed upon me that she was very proud of that appointment. I have come to know Neil Savery as a loyal public servant whose expertise and dedication have made the process of driving forward an important planning agenda and the maintenance of a strong planning system a crucial part of our work.

In conclusion, I apologise that I do not know more about the Hon. Diana Laidlaw's contribution to the planning system in this state. Off the top of my head, I draw to the attention of the house those things that struck me as some of the more important of her achievements, and I am sure there are many more. I congratulate her on the contribution she has made to the state of South Australia and on her wonderful career, and I wish her all the best in her retirement.

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg): It is impossible to traverse in a few short minutes the contribution made by the Hon. Diana Laidlaw in 21 years of service to this parliament. I compliment the mover of this carefully presented motion, which gives both recognition to and congratulates her on her achievement as the longest serving minister for the arts and transport in the history of this state. I note the contributions made by other members which cover a number of her achievements.

I have had only 16 months of overlap in a parliamentary relationship with the honourable member, but my first association with Diana was back when she worked for the late Hon. Murray Hill, which is about 30 years plus, which is not really an admission that I like to make, but it has been a wonderful association. With respect to her parliamentary contribution, and in particular as minister, I can recap many of the comments that have been made about Diana.

In the arts, as I am sure in others, she is frequently described as the best arts minister we have ever had; in women, as a very powerful advocate and persuasive in

reform; in transport, there have been many, but the one I remember most vividly is, 'Yeah, the minister, yeah, she's not a bad chick.'; and in planning, 'She's just bloody difficult.'

When we reflect on the contribution that Diana has made in those portfolios and look around South Australia, it is not difficult to appreciate why she has been duly recognised here today, and by so many. Many monuments are great testament to her, and they will be of great benefit to this state.

In complimenting the honourable member on her contribution, I thank her for the advice that she has given me. I am proud to say that I am following her as the opposition spokesperson on the status of women. In that portfolio, her achievements are long, but I appreciate the advice that she has given me in the transition period and I thank her for that.

As a member of the Liberal Party, it is very difficult to go past the Laidlaw name without recognising the contribution that has been made. Diana is a member of the Laidlaw family (the Hon. Don Laidlaw is well known to many in this chamber and in this parliament), and the Perry family, on her mother's side, which has equally made a longstanding and significant contribution to this state. Overall, the contribution to governance and the wealth of this state by Diana's family has been extraordinary. To the Liberal Party it is no less.

There is no question that Diana has participated in, strengthened and advanced the Liberal Party in the South Australian division, and I acknowledge that I had the pleasure of working with her during the 1993 election campaign. She was of particular assistance during that campaign period which, as we know, was stunningly successful, and I appreciate the contribution that Diana made at that time. I particularly remember that, in that campaign, the very first announcement that was made related to live music. Ironically, one of the first pieces of legislation that I had to deal with in coming to this chamber related to live music, in a different sense. Approximately 10 years ago, before she took on the responsibility as a minister, Diana was a strong advocate for youth and their involvement in live performing arts, to name just one of the many areas in which she was a passionate advocate.

I also acknowledge her dedication to ensuring that history is recorded. Not only in the Liberal Party has she been active in that role in relation to publications, but in ensuring that the history of the achievement of women in political life, in particular, is properly recorded, and she has also done so in this parliament. The tapestry is hanging in this chamber. The publication of a pamphlet recording the history of women in this parliament has also been extraordinary. I think that we should be appreciative of that, and I know that future generations will benefit from it.

I conclude by saying to the Hon. Diana Laidlaw that, as South Australians and as members of parliament, we have greatly appreciated her contribution to our state and to our parliament. Diana has a great zest for life. Doubtless, she will go on to try to quench her insatiable appetite for challenge in whatever she undertakes in the future. She has shown her capacity to be dedicated and hard working and, if I could think of one word in relation to everything that she undertakes, is it 'achievement'. I have always found Diana to be both courageous and courteous. I thank her for her extraordinary contribution and I wish her well.

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH (Minister for Tourism): I rise to add a different perspective to the descriptions of the achievements of the Hon. Diana Laidlaw. I speak as

someone who worked, perhaps, differently and more closely with her than many people in this parliament. I say that as a former lord mayor, who had an opportunity to work with someone who showed passion, enthusiasm, persistence and commonsense. I think one of the most important roles that people in public life can play is to show commonsense and to be an advocate for reason when, often, there are forces trying to move in opposite directions. In all my dealings with the Hon. Diana Laidlaw over those years, she has shown a degree of commonsense that was driven by outcomes rather than always process, and also in finding a solution to a problem as she faced it that day. As a member of a local government body, I was fortunate to have an electorate that coincided with her areas of responsibility and interest. I often jokingly said that she was the minister for everything that counted and, certainly, in terms of a capital city, planning, arts and transport are the most issues that can make or break a city.

That is not to say that her interest in women's issues was not also important. She played a very significant role in funding surveys—for instance, to look at safety and the way in which women use the city, how that was impacted on by transport and planning, and how it had an effect on business activity and shopping. Some of the key changes she made in the city were some of the creative changes over and above even the main core issues in her portfolio. In the city, she worked on the West End project and was part of the arts revitalisation of the city. She not only put her enthusiasm behind these projects but she also encouraged and helped many arts bodies to move into Hindley Street in order to revive it economically and socially, and to make it a safe and vibrant part of the city once again. That change has certainly occurred, both as a result of the city council's efforts and also particularly with her efforts as the minister for the arts in moving so many arts bodies to invest in and put time into the West End of the city. She has played an extraordinarily important part in that respect.

In terms of youth affairs, as minister for transport, she supported the skate park, when others in her party would not support it. She also has been particularly active in the arts in bringing to fruition the *Ring* cycle, the Festival of Ideas, City as a Stage, and a whole range of activities that have enhanced the reputation of the city.

I have often jokingly said that, when she is old (and I suspect in 40 years' time), I envisage her sitting on a chaise lounge in her retirement village with a glass in one hand and a cigarette in the other—because she is absolutely incorrigible in her addiction to smoking. When she sits there with her cigarette, she will probably look back on a long history in public life. Unlike many of us, there will be concrete images that she can look at. She will be able to see the changes to North Terrace—the Art Gallery (which has extensions which are probably the most attractive urban design contribution by government to our city over the last 100 years; the best designed and most meticulously executed piece of public infrastructure) and, of course, she will look at the library and the museum. She will also look at the Southern Expressway and the tunnels; a whole range of areas where she has played a key role. I wish her well in that bathchair, with her cigarette and her glass of wine, because she has done a lot for this state, and I have been very pleased to work with her.

Mr VENNING (Schubert): I rise to support this motion. I note that the former minister is no longer in the chamber. I am sort of pleased that she is not, because one can get rather

passionate and emotional at moments like this. I wish to express my congratulations and best wishes to this honourable lady. In my 13 years here, she has been of great assistance to me, both personally and professionally—and, more particularly to the people in my electorate (formerly Custance, now Schubert) and to country people generally.

I speak mainly of the Hon. Diana Laidlaw in her capacity as the longest serving minister for transport, which I have had the most to do with, but I also acknowledge her interest in history and, of course, the arts and the status of women.

Two of my greatest victories in my electorate that I promised people I would deliver, and which I did deliver, were roads. The first of the two roads was the famous Morgan to Burra road—a \$19.7 million project, which was delivered with conviction. I will never forget, when I was pushing strongly to have this road sealed when we came into power (the previous minister was Frank Blevins), that I thought of this gimmick of riding my bicycle from Morgan to Burra, which I did on the unsealed road. I was joined by none other than the Hon. Diana Laidlaw. I thought that she would get to the outskirts of Burra and down the hill around a bit, and that would be it. But that was not the case. She rode her bike almost 50 kilometres over some of the roughest road in the state. It was just amazing.

There is one incident that I will never forget. It was coming up to the morning tea break, and a local gentleman (a Matt Reilly by name) was hiding behind a bush. He had a snake, which he had just exterminated and tied on a piece of string. As the Hon. Di Laidlaw rode up on her bicycle, he pulled the snake across the road on the string. I will never forget the reaction, and the noise. I have a mental picture of it that I cannot explain and do justice to. But the road was delivered, at a cost of \$19.7 million, and it has made so much difference. It ought to be called the Laidlaw Highway because, without the involvement of the Hon. Diana Laidlaw, it would not have happened.

The other road is the infamous Gomersal Road, a \$7 million project, which now means so much to the Barossa Valley, because it has opened it up. That has been a long project. My predecessor in the Barossa was Bruce Eastick. He said to me, 'Lad, if you can deliver fresh water and this road, your time here would have been worth while.' We delivered the fresh, clean, filtered water but the road was a little more difficult. But the Hon. Diana Laidlaw delivered. What a fantastic road it is.

I will never forget that, during the lobbying process, a Mr Roger Meeks from Orlando Wyndham (the Australian General Manager) came to see Diana. As we were finishing the meeting, Mr Meeks said, 'Minister, I think you're bluffing.' Sir, you can imagine the response to that. The meeting came to a rapid close. While we were going down in the lift, Diana jumped in, and we sorted it out. It all ended very peacefully, and I know that Orlando Wyndham is very pleased; and indeed the people of the Barossa are just ecstatic at having this road. Again, it was due to the former minister's involvement.

Another smaller road that has not attracted much attention is the Blyth to Brinkworth road. The minister came to me in a real hurry and said, 'Quick, Ivan, I have \$3 million of unspent money here. Do you have a project?' I said that I knew of one, and that was this road. She said, 'Done.' Some 1½ hours later, the decision was made, and the road was finished in three weeks—seven kilometres of bitumen road. It was a fantastic route, particularly for the locals, who are very supportive.

I believe that Diana was a politician above all others who consulted, who asked and who joined the workers, the organisers and the management. She sought advice to help make up her mind. Once made, look out! She always delivered the goods. She had the most effective backbench committee of any I have ever attended. It was always well attended purely because we felt they were always very interesting. She took input from all of us and she regularly challenged us all. I will try to conclude my speech quickly, but I note a few points, dealing, first, with the ERD Committee, which I chaired. Diana was minister for planning and her input was most invaluable. Also, members of the South Australian Vintage Car Enthusiasts (of which I am a member) wish it to be known how grateful they are for her efforts.

We have the best historic car registration scheme in Australia. It is the envy of all the states, and it is now being emulated by others. The club thanks her for her commonsense approach and for a scheme that serves both the enthusiasts and the law. I also say thank you from the truckies of our country for the passing lanes. I could talk about so many issues with which this minister involved herself. Personally, I have enjoyed my parliamentary career and this lady has been a large part of it. I certainly will miss her. She will always be welcome not only in the Barossa but, certainly, in the Venning home.

Ms CICCARELLO (Norwood): I would like to add my congratulations to the Hon. Diana Laidlaw on her 21 years in the other place. I first met Diana in 1980 when I had just returned from Italy. There had been a serious earthquake in Irpinia. I was then employed by the then minister for local government, Murray Hill, and Diana was his ministerial adviser. I must say that I was very impressed on first meeting her because, having just returned from Rome (where I had been studying fashion design and pattern making for four years), Diana was one of the more elegant people I had seen in South Australia, and her style certainly has not changed over the years.

She was immaculately dressed then and the chunky jewellery was certainly a feature of her wardrobe. I also have to thank, as I did in the eulogy for Murray Hill, the Hon. Diana Laidlaw for having enabled me to pursue my career in politics. After I left local government I was offered a job at the State Library and, when I was elected Mayor of Norwood, Diana was minister for local government and minister for the arts. In order to do a good job as mayor, I wanted to do it on a full-time basis, so I put in a request to be able to have leave without pay from the State Library. I explained my reasons to her.

Being a woman and the first woman who had been elected to that position in Norwood, I wanted to ensure that I could do the job as well as I could. Diana did agree to allow me to have leave without pay, and that leave was extended over a number of years. I think that she might have been under some pressure from her colleagues when I became the preselected candidate for Norwood and when I put in my final request for leave without pay. However, she agreed, and I can only thank her for that. We had many discussions over many issues and Diana certainly supported many of the things I have been passionate about, including cycling and planning.

We did have some disagreements through members of her transport department, and the member for Heysen mentioned Rod Payze and Trevor Argent. The discussions were mostly about Portrush Road and what was going to happen to it. I think, probably, the solution we have now is better than the

one proposed initially. Diana has always been passionate about her portfolios. I know that the two gentlemen to whom I have referred always talked about her dedication and the fact that she was a workaholic and that there was never anything that passed her desk that she did not read.

The CEO of the Norwood council, Mario Barone, who was also my CEO at the time, had been the presiding member of DEPAC and DAC, and I am sure that he would want me to pass on his congratulations to Diana. Also, when we spoke of planning issues, he was always very complimentary about Diana and her contribution in that area. I think that she has been a great example to people in this state. I know that, at times, she has been frustrated: some of the issues she had hoped would be passed in this place were not passed, and she was upset with some of her colleagues. However, the measure of the woman is that she was prepared to stand up for what she believed in and to push it to the hilt. She always did it with grace.

Someone mentioned Diana's interest in football. She is a Sturt supporter and we did get together when Norwood and Sturt were looking to amalgamate and join the AFL, but that did not happen either. I wish Diana all the best in her retirement and I am very sure that she will continue to support those things about which she has been passionate.

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW (Bright): I, too, rise to support the passage of this motion, but I do so with mixed feelings because, while on the one hand I agree with all those things that have been said today, I am saddened that the passage of this motion also means that Di Laidlaw is leaving the parliament. I am somewhat saddened about that because her contribution to the parliament as a legislator, as a representative leader in our community and as a minister has been absolutely first class. I believe that the credit that has been given to her by both sides of the chamber is, indeed, a reflection of that.

I had the privilege of serving in cabinet with Di Laidlaw and seeing her go full throttle on a number of issues. All my ministerial colleagues at the time would agree with me that no minister, but no minister, had the ability to attract money to their portfolio as the Hon. Di Laidlaw had. I have often privately joked with her and said that, in many respects, her methods have been somewhat unorthodox but, by heck, mighty effective in enabling her to obtain the funding to deliver what she put forward for her portfolios. She has approached her duties with energy, enthusiasm, vibrancy and determination.

That sort of level of commitment is not very often seen, even in the business of politics. Diana's arts portfolio was not just an administrative responsibility: it was her passion. I do not believe that the state has ever had a better arts minister who has delivered so much to the development of arts in our state. I know that Di regards it as somewhat of a tribute to herself that she has actually been able to get me to become a strong fan of the Adelaide Symphony Orchestra. I am sure there was some collaboration between Di and my wife, who has always been a strong fan, but they have made me an appreciator, and Di is quite confident that, over time, she can increase my artistic appreciation in many other areas. For that, I also thank her, because she has given me an enjoyment that I might not otherwise have had.

Di has often been called 'Lady Di' because of her educated and eloquent speaking voice, and that has often been misunderstood by some members in the community who believe that she was born with a silver spoon in her mouth.

Di Laidlaw is no silver-spooner, and those of us who know her well know that she had a very difficult upbringing. Her mother died when she was at a very young age and Di Laidlaw took on the responsibility of assisting her father in caring for younger siblings. That is a huge responsibility, and I believe that the mature way in which she approached that task at such a young age developed that grit and determination that we have seen here.

Before I close my remarks, I place on the record my appreciation of the efforts of Di Laidlaw in improving particularly transport portfolio matters in my electorate. Whether it was road, rail or bus, Di Laidlaw had an enormous influence in my electorate. We now have better railway stations in the electorate of Bright, cleaner trains and more frequent services. We now have the Southern Expressway that would not be there were it not for her determination, and those plans were accompanied by plans for a veloway that I witnessed her push around the cabinet table. I do not believe any other minister could have achieved that through the cabinet process. There is also the coastal walking trail and bike trail (The Coastal Way) that is under construction along the coastal portion of my electorate at this time; and there are far better and cleaner bus services, including the experimental minibus service at Hallett Cove that has been well received by residents.

I pay tribute to the parliamentary ministerial service of Di Laidlaw. I will miss her presence in the parliament but, knowing Di Laidlaw, I am sure that her presence will be here, if not in the galleries certainly in the corridors, as she continues to use her energy to lobby members to vote on matters which she holds dear to her heart.

Mr SCALZI (Hartley): There is no greater tribute that can be paid to an individual member than to have contributions signed by so many people on both sides of the house, and no greater tribute than all the achievements that are recorded in all the portfolios of transport, arts and status of women on which members have commented.

I came to be a Liberal through the encouragement of Jennifer Cashmore. At a convention in 1985, my first resolution was strongly supported by Diana Laidlaw, and that certainly gave me encouragement. I think we can say that she has made an excellent contribution. She is passionate, always loyal, always open and always committed, and I am sure that in any area to which she devotes those qualities those with whom she works will be enriched. I wish her the very best in the pursuit of her passions outside this place. I have certainly enjoyed working with her; I have looked up to her; and I am glad that she was around when I became interested in politics.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite): I rise to close the debate and to thank members on both sides of the house who have contributed to it for their outstanding contributions. I think it is a testament to Diana's standing and her achievements that this debate has progressed from 10.45 this morning in private members' time until the lunch break and that it has been so widely contributed to by all members with open hearts and with genuine sentiments for her best wishes for the future.

Like all members, I thank her not only for her contribution as minister but also for the little things she did for me and for my electorate—the three railway stations at Belair, the Mitcham Main Street project, saving Brownhill from development; and her fantastic efforts in regard to the hills face zone. All those things simply echo the sentiments that

members have expressed in regard to the little ways in which Diana has helped each of them.

In her maiden speech, Diana made the following remarks:

Standing here today, I am conscious that I am only the fourth woman member to be elected to this chamber since its formation, that I am the only woman representing the Liberal Party in this chamber at the present time, and that of the 69 members in the two houses only six are women.

Diana, you leave the parliament in a far different shape today, women being much more extensively represented and the state of the parliament being so much more open.

On Sunday 31 January 1988 a light-hearted article appeared in the local media, I think the *Sunday Mail*, describing the state's most eligible single people. Diana Laidlaw was one of them, and this is what it said:

True blue Liberal Party MLC Di Laidlaw, in her early 30s, has an immaculate political and social pedigree. Her father, Don Laidlaw, was a member of the Legislative Council for seven years and her grandfather was Sir Frank Perry. She does not let her good manners interfere with a good parliamentary stoush. She is hard-working, strong-minded, vivacious, a good cook, and has a great interest in the arts. As shadow minister for community welfare, she is admired for her commitment to social welfare and to women's issues.

Diana, you are still respected and admired for that commitment. The parliament has wished you well in the years ahead. You have been a fantastic ambassador for the South Australian Parliament, and we wish you well in your ventures to follow.

The SPEAKER: Order! In only one particular is this debate in any way similar to a condolence motion, and that is in the context of the proceedings of this house. Quite clearly, Diana Laidlaw has a very long time to go; indeed, it is my belief that there is as much life to come as there has already been. I agree with the remarks made by all honourable members, and I add to them my observations. During the time that Diana Laidlaw has served the public of South Australia, she has been very passionate in the way she has committed herself to her work, and that passionate pursuit of her duty, as she saw it, has probably been exceeded only by her capacity for compassion in consideration of those less fortunate than herself in the work she set out to do and helped others do.

Another word I would use to describe her life and times and her public effort is, quite clearly, 'energy'—and a boundless amount of it. It clearly indicates that there will be as much contributed from her life in other ways as has already been contributed.

Of those portfolios for which Diana Laidlaw had responsibility—other than the anecdotes mentioned by other members—may I say on behalf of my own constituents that, where roads are concerned, had it not been for Diana, the road from Bow Hill to Murray Bridge would not have been sealed. Further, we would not have completed the Murray Valley Highway from the source at Omeo to the sea at Goolwa. Quaint though it was, my argument in favour of that project fell on deaf ears with so many ministers—and even with Diana—for so long. However, she at last agreed to it, and it was done, and she is to be congratulated for that.

I am not sure of the extent of her involvement in the decision to do that, or to complete the interchange with the South-Eastern Freeway at Monarto (which had been promised by the then commissioner of highways before I was even elected in 1979, and repeated by the commissioner of highways at that time) but it was finally completed, although

not with any funding from the transport department, and it is now open and operational. It was promised to be reviewed on traffic volume within 20 years of the commencement of use of that section, which had been prior to 1979.

Planning and planning law is another area in which history will be interested in the efforts of the former minister, although, quite clearly, the jury is still out on that matter. Posterity will determine whether or not the removal of residential zone 1 in the metropolitan area (largely through the efforts of Diana Laidlaw and the minister she served) has been a success.

I also feel that I need to draw attention to some recent misunderstanding. I have never been able to discover what it was about the way in which I said things that compelled Diana to misunderstand me. It is a fact that Diana was elected on the last occasion in 1997. The remarks I have made about the fact that she now departs the parliament are in no way directed at her personally. I have made the same remarks about others that do it through this 'party friendly' system of replacement in the Legislative Council, which is an absolute abuse of the public's democratic rights and interests in a modern democracy.

The Hon. Diana Laidlaw was—if I may paraphrase the kind of remark made by someone who is more important and eloquent than I—not only born to greatness but had it thrust upon her, because there was no other person at that time more likely to cope with the portfolios she accepted than Diana herself. I believe that any other person, especially at that time—somebody whom the public at that point had not yet accepted not only as a woman but also as someone dealing with engineers in the traffic and road construction industry—would have had an extremely difficult role to play.

I must also pay tribute to the work Diana Laidlaw did for music, particularly the performance of live music. Although only a modest contribution is made to the Australian Council for Country Music and its cause by comparison with what the Symphony Orchestra receives, it, nonetheless, has set off some very famous and enduring careers in country music; namely, Kym Warner, Becky Cole, Casey Chambers, Vanessa Lee Shirley, Jed Jarvis, Jake Nicolai and Travis List.

Altogether, Diana has enormous will, which she demonstrated during the more than 20 years that she has been in this place. It has never been more true to say of anyone than Diana that there was a steel—not iron—fist in an iron glove in the way she went about her work, and I commend her for that. I assure all honourable members that I will pass on to her, as a message from this house, the remarks made in the course of this debate about her efforts in the public interest in South Australia, as they appear in *Hansard*, and I thank all members for their contribution.

Motion carried.

[Sitting suspended from 1.02 to 2 p.m.]

HOSPITALS, NOARLUNGA

A petition signed by 1 208 residents of South Australia, requesting the house to urge the government to provide intensive care facilities at Noarlunga Hospital, was presented by Mr Brokenshire.

Petition received.

POLICE NUMBERS

A petition signed by 695 residents of South Australia, requesting the house to urge the government to continue to recruit extra police officers, over and above recruitment at attrition, in order to increase police officer numbers, was presented by Mr Brokenshire.

Petition received.

PAPER TABLED

The following paper was laid on the table:

By the Minister for Gambling (Hon. J.W. Weatherill)—

Independent Gambling Authority—Inquiry Concerning Advertising and Responsible Gambling Codes of Practice.

CHILD PROTECTION

The Hon. S.W. KEY (Minister for Social Justice): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. S.W. KEY: Over recent months there has been a great deal of discussion about the Layton child protection review and, in particular, whether adequate resources are provided to FAYS to not only maintain existing services but also to provide the new services recommended in the review. Robyn Layton released her child protection review report publicly in March and the government has invited comment on the recommendations, with a closing date of 31 July 2003. A number of government departments are also examining the recommendations and will be providing advice to the government on priorities for implementation.

Notwithstanding this ongoing process, the government has made an early and strong commitment to child protection reform in South Australia and was able to commit \$58.6 million over four years to strengthen our child protection system. These resources are going directly to early intervention programs, which support families at risk, child sex offenders within our prisons, school councillors, increased foster care subsidies and funds directed towards more diverse support services for children and young people requiring alternative care. Measures such as these will alleviate some of the pressures on FAYS staff.

The establishment of additional targeted support services will help divert families away from the child protection system. Strengthening alternative care will provide a greater number and better range of foster care places for children at risk, particularly the most complex cases, which create a difficult and stressful workload for FAYS staff. Although measures like this assist both the immediate pressures and long-term needs, the government is also determined to deal directly with the work pressures and resource demands within FAYS. It appears that budgeting processes and financial management in respect of FAYS has been deficient for a number of years. It also appears that resourcing decisions since 1993-94 have not taken appropriate account of workload increases faced by FAYS. The extent of any mismatch between resourcing levels and the demand for FAYS services needs to be identified.

The work practices of FAYS need to be reviewed to ensure that the best outcomes are being achieved from available resources. The need for additional funding will also need to be considered. The FAYS budget must be firmly based and any additional workload demands on FAYS must

be resourced on the basis of proper workload measurement systems. This is precisely what Robyn Layton has recommended in the child protection report. Today cabinet approved a proposal to conduct an audit investigation of FAYS. Department of Human Services and Treasury officials will undertake an examination of past budgeting processes and resource allocations. In addition, they will examine other financial and compliance issues relating to FAYS operations.

A comprehensive workload analysis will also be undertaken into FAYS. In particular, the government needs to know that the data being relied upon to make decisions about resource allocation in this critical area is accurate. In her report Robyn Layton recommends that an overall assessment of resources is required in order for FAYS to provide appropriate statutory and other services. She says:

The current ad hoc approach of requests to obtain extra resources is not adequate, and funding should be provided using an appropriate model.

Ms Layton also recommends:

Instead of a piecemeal approach to extra resources, DHS staff and senior Treasury, with cabinet approval, undertake a comprehensive budgetary and workload analysis of Family and Youth Services to determine current demand.

She continues as follows:

Such an analysis is to take into account socioeconomic and trend data, with a view to developing funding models based on agreed formulas.

That is outlined in recommendation 45 of the Layton review. The results of these investigations will provide the basis for the government to make soundly based decisions about future operations and resourcing of FAYS in order that the crucial demands from our community in these areas can be met. The issues will be faced up to and dealt with, rather than pushed under the carpet and allowed to worsen over time.

FACS is already holding discussions with staff over appropriate ways to measure workload and unmet demand. I expect that there will be an interim workload assessment tool in operation in July and that the data we obtain will be used to make proper assessments about the allocation of resources within FAYS and the need for any additional resources.

The government reintroduced the resources prevention intervention system this year. Again, we are starting to collect information about occasions when FAYS district centres do not have sufficient resources to investigate child protection notifications. The RPI system was introduced by senior social workers in 1997 to ensure measurement of unallocated work and to offer employees protection against excessive workloads.

Under the previous government, the systematic collection of data was abandoned in December 2000. Furthermore, I am advised that audits to monitor compliance in child care and guardianship of the minister program areas ceased in 2001. The approach—

Honourable members: Shame!

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.W. KEY: —appears to have been, ‘If we don’t collect information about problems, the problems don’t exist.’ The government is tackling the protection of children head on and is taking urgent steps to put resources where they can provide immediate support to children, families and child protection workers. We are acting to clear up the budgetary and workload mess that the previous government left in FAYS.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.W. KEY: We are systematically considering all the child protection review recommendations to respond to priority areas across the whole of government and the community. We are determined to get our child protection system back on its feet and turn it into the best system in Australia.

The SPEAKER: I tell all ministers that it is highly disorderly to engage in debate in a ministerial statement. The next statement the chair hears containing debate will result in leave being withdrawn.

SURF LIFE SAVING

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH (Minister for Tourism): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH: On Tuesday, the member for Newland asked me a question about the details of the cost of the preparation of the bid for the 2007-09 Australian Surf Life Saving Championships. I can now provide those details.

The bid was a united joint bid between Surf Life Saving SA, Australian Major Events and the City of Onkaparinga. The information provided to me by AME regarding the costs involved with the bid is as follows:

- the bid document production, including GST, was \$9 080;
 - 120 estimated staff hours;
 - travel to make the bid was \$900, comprising two airfares to Sydney to present the bid, and room hire for the preparation of the bid; and
 - approximately \$800 for travel for a lobbying trip, comprising an airfare to the Australian championships in Queensland and one night's accommodation and expenses.
- The City of Onkaparinga has furnished with us these details. It spent 30 hours on the joint preparation, it estimated \$100 in material, and travel was approximately \$375 for one air fare to Sydney to present the bid.

I would like to clarify another issue for the member for Newland. In my reply on Tuesday, I said that we were unable to bid for the event for the full three-year cycle as the first year coincided with the World Police and Fire Games, and there would have been insufficient accommodation. Therefore, we developed a joint bid with the Victorian government. Just prior to the final submission of the bids, Surf Life Saving Australia advised us that such a bid would not be successful and recommended that we not submit a joint presentation.

Surf Life Saving Australia recommended that, instead, South Australia should focus its bid on the next cycle in order to be considered for the years 2010 and 2011, and to do this needed to put in a non-complying tender to host the event in the year 2008 and to register our interest in hosting the events in 2010 and 2011. To ensure that we had the best opportunity to host the event, this is what we did, on the specific advice of Surf Life Saving Australia.

It is this government's policy to bid for major events because we can see that they bring economic benefit and opportunity for the tourism industry. We support the AME, as we have clearly demonstrated, by ensuring its future funding in the out years. I am disappointed that the member for Newland, the member for Waite and, indeed, the opposition as a whole would issue such an attack on the professionalism of AME and its officers, who were involved in putting together this bid, not to mention the reflection on the Onkaparinga council and Surf Life Saving South Australia

for their role in the bid. We put together a high-class bid and the fact is that we cannot win every one that we bid for, disappointing as this always appears. You have to be in it to win it.

REGIONAL IMPACT STATEMENTS

The Hon. R.J. McEWEN (Minister for Industry, Trade and Regional Development): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.J. McEWEN: In answer to a question from the member for Flinders on Tuesday, a further question from the member for MacKillop yesterday and a point of order from the member for Unley, I seek to clarify the distinction between regional impact statements (which are for cabinet consideration and are not public documents), and regional impact assessment statements (which are for significant government decisions and which are publicly available to the community for consideration and input). I want to update the house on the government's overall approach to ensuring that South Australia's regional areas are given the profile they need and deserve in state government decision making in resource allocation determinations.

Last Friday I had the pleasure of jointly announcing with the Premier the adoption of a comprehensive package of arrangements and procedures for assessing the regional impact of any proposals to change government services. The measure will come into effect from 1 July this year. That was the point that seemed to be missed earlier in the week. The state government has considered well over 150 regional impact statements since coming to office. This follows an election commitment that agencies be required to supply such assessments with their submissions to cabinet for any decisions that may impact on a regional community. That was the first step as we worked on the development of a much more comprehensive and thorough process for assessing state government proposals that may have a significant impact on regional communities. In these situations it is important that we hear from the communities concerned to enhance our decision making.

To this end, we have implemented a comprehensive and formal consultation process. Our objective is to ensure greater transparency of government administration in relation to the regions, so we will publish the outcomes of these consultations. The regional impact assessment process is about informing government of all the factors associated with the decision. It does not by any means imply that the government will not proceed with the decision that a regional community or interest group does not like. Rather, it will provide government and the community it serves with a comprehensive process that will inform cabinet of the consequences of decisions that impact on a regional area.

A motion was passed at the Regional Communities Consultative Council just last week—introduced by Port Augusta Mayor, Joy Baluch, I might add—to congratulate the government on this initiative. The support of the Regional Communities Consultative Committee is appreciated, and we look forward to its future input. The key elements of the new model include:

1. A new focus on proposals likely to have a significant impact on a regional community. Such proposals will be subject to regional impact assessment statements, which will be in addition to the process of regional impact statements

currently required for cabinet decisions with a likely regional impact.

2. A vigorous extension of the regional assessment process to embrace all government proposals likely to have a significant impact on a region, not just those going to cabinet for approval.

3. A consistent approach developed for regional impact assessment, including the adoption of a clear policy and guidelines for use by government agencies, including statutory authorities.

4. A streamlined consultation process with stakeholders in the community concerned. The Office of Regional Affairs is developing a guide to regional consultation to assist agencies to undertake such consultations effectively. The office is already investigating the feasibility of establishing a web-based consultation register.

5. All completed regional impact assessment statements—all of them—will be publicly released to ensure transparency and accountability for the community. For the first time communities, including individuals, local members of parliament, key stakeholders and any other interested parties will be able to have an active role in the decision making processes affecting them ahead of the event. Surprise, surprise!

The new model will ensure that the deliberations of cabinet and senior levels of government are more attuned to the concerns and priorities of regional areas. This will improve government responsiveness to regional issues and lift its capacity to take into account regional needs, not only when government decisions are made but also when proposals are at the initial stages of being framed. The new policy guidelines will ensure that economic, social and environmental factors are considered in assessing regional impact, and that appropriate solutions are developed in response to identified impacts. They will also consider impacts in relation to the size of the population and the service concerned.

As members are aware, the government has introduced the initiative of preparing an annual regional budget paper, outlining its commitments to regions for the forthcoming financial year. The paper will form part of the budget process, and it is intended that, over time, the paper will benchmark historical improvements to rural and regional South Australia as a result of government initiatives. The regional budget paper is also a more streamlined and effective approach to assessing the regional impact of the budget rather than attempting a plethora of assessment statements at budget time.

There will be other special circumstances, such as major projects requiring commercial confidentiality, where the regional impact assessment statements may be made in favour of regional impact statements for cabinet's consideration. In short, the newly developed regional impact assessment statement policy is a first for South Australia, and seeks to augment the existing regional impact statement process, as currently required by cabinet, through the following processes:

1. The inclusion of a regional impact assessment statement is already a mandatory requirement of the cabinet submission process and is not public.

2. The development of a regional impact assessment statement seeks to extend this process so that, where an agency is considering a significant variation in government service, there is a full assessment of regional impacts, regardless of the need to take the proposal to cabinet.

3. And, most importantly, it is now required that the development of regional impact assessment statements includes consultation with the key stakeholders, including the community groups involved. All these assessment statements will be made public.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE

Mr CAICA (Colton): I bring up the 188th report of the committee, on the Riverbank Stage 2 project.

Report received and ordered to be published.

SHOP TRADING HOURS (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL 2003

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill with the amendments indicated by the following schedule, to which amendments the Legislative Council desires the concurrence of the House of Assembly:

No. 1. Page 7, lines 23 and 24 (clause 7)—Leave out 'or, for that purpose, remove' and substitute:

, or take away a copy of

No. 2. Page 8 (clause 7)—After line 15 insert the following:

(6) A person is not obliged to provide any bank statements under this section.

No. 3. Page 8—After line 15 insert new clause as follows:

Insertion of section 8A

7A. After section 8 insert:

Offences by Inspectors

8A. An Inspector, or a person assisting an Inspector, who—

(a) addresses offensive language to any person; or

(b) without lawful authority, hinders or obstructs or uses or threatens to use force in relation to any other person,

is guilty of an offence.

Maximum penalty: \$5 000.

No. 4. Page 9, lines 10 to 15 (clause 11)—Leave out paragraph (c) and insert:

(c) from 11.00 a.m. to 5.00 p.m.—

(i) on each of the 9 Sundays immediately preceding Christmas day 2003; and

(ii) on 28 December 2003; and

(iii) from 1 July 2004—on any Sunday.

No. 5. Page 10, lines 9 to 11 (clause 11)—Leave out subsection (8).

No. 6. Page 11, line 25 (clause 17)—Leave out '14 days' and insert:

28 days

No. 7. Page 13 (Schedule)—After line 25 insert the following:
Review of awards

3a. (1) The purpose of this clause is to make provision for the review of awards in the retail industry by the Full Commission of the Industrial Relations Commission of South Australia (the 'Commission') on account of the special circumstances that arise by virtue of the enactment of this Act.

(2) Nothing in this clause is intended—

(a) to derogate from the independence of the Commission; or

(b) to limit the powers of the Commission with respect to any matter; or

(c) to limit the ability of any person or body to initiate or participate in proceedings before the Commission, to make submissions to the Commission, or to exercise any other right under the Industrial and Employee Relations Act 1994.

(3) Subject to this clause, a party to a retail industry award may apply to the Commission for a review of the award.

(4) An application under subclause (3) must be made within 2 months after the commencement of this Act.

(5) If due application is made under this clause, the Full Commission must, subject to this clause, review the award under Chapter 3 Part 3 Division 2 of the Industrial and Employee Relations Act 1994.

(6) A review of an award initiated under this clause—

- (a) must include a review of, and incorporate fresh determinations in relation to—
- (i) the appropriate spread of hours for ordinary time work over the period of a week, and over any other appropriate period (if relevant) under the award; and
 - (ii) the rates of remuneration (including as to any penalties or loadings) payable under the award to employees who work in a shop; and
- (b) may relate to any other matter that, in the opinion of the Commission, is relevant on account of the operation of this Act; and
- (c) must be completed by 31 May 2004 and take effect on 1 July 2004.
- (7) In undertaking a review under this clause, the Commission is to—
- (a) take into account the objects of the Industrial and Employee Relations Act 1994, with particular reference to section 3(b), (c) and (n) of that Act; and
 - (b) have regard to the desirability of maximising employment and economic efficiency within the retail industry in the State, including by—
 - (i) encouraging higher levels of employment in the retail industry; and
 - (ii) ensuring that labour costs are economically sustainable for businesses in the retail industry; and
 - (iii) providing a fair rate of remuneration for employees who work in the retail industry; and
 - (iv) enabling businesses in the retail industry to trade without the imposition of excessive costs for doing so; and
 - (v) promoting efficiency and productivity in the retail industry; and
 - (c) give consideration to the nature of the labour market that works, or is likely to work, in the retail industry (including, but not limited to, work on Sundays); and
 - (d) give consideration to the circumstances of the various kinds of businesses in the retail industry that may be open on Sundays, including the circumstances of small and medium sized businesses operated by the proprietors of the businesses or by members of their families; and
 - (e) give consideration to the ordinary time penalty rates that apply in the other States, and in the Territories, for similar trading arrangements; and
 - (f) give consideration to the desirability of including in the award a variety of options and flexible arrangements to assist in making Sunday trading worthwhile and viable; and
 - (g) give consideration to any additional transitional arrangements that are appropriate in view of the operation of this Act,

and the Commission may consider such other matters as the Commission thinks fit.

(8) Without limiting subclause (7), in undertaking a review under this clause, the Commission is to use its best endeavours to ensure that it does not impose a cost structure within the retail industry—

- (a) that is economically unsustainable within the industry, or a significant part of it, especially taking into account the position of small and medium sized businesses; or
- (b) that has the effect of imposing unfair costs on small or medium sized businesses operated by proprietors who wish to trade on Sundays (especially those businesses where employees may be required to work on Sundays); or
- (c) that reduces the capacity of the proprietors of businesses, and in particular small and medium sized businesses, from employing staff to the maximum possible extent on Sundays; or
- (d) that has the effect of requiring the proprietors of small or medium sized businesses to work on Sundays themselves rather than employing staff on that day; or
- (e) that unduly diminishes the competitiveness of small or medium sized businesses that open on Sundays; or
- (f) that is higher for small or medium sized businesses than the cost structure that applies to larger sized businesses; or

(g) that is likely to impact adversely on the price of goods or services purchased by customers within the retail industry.

(9) As part of a review, the Commission is to give the parties to the award a reasonable opportunity to make submissions, and take those submissions into consideration, and may (as the Commission thinks fit) allow any other person with a relevant interest to appear and make submissions.

(10) In this clause—

‘retail industry award’ means an award under the Industrial and Employee Relations Act 1994 that provides for the remuneration of persons employed in a shop;

‘shop’ means a shop within the meaning of the Shop Trading Hours Act 1977.

No. 8. Page 13 (Schedule)—After line 25 insert the following:
Business advisory service

3A. (1) The Minister must ensure that an advisory service (including, but not limited to, a telephone advisory service) is available to assist the proprietors of businesses and employees in the retail industry who may be affected by the introduction of new shopping hours under this Act.

(2) A service under subclause (1)—

- (a) must be able to provide advice on accounting, legal, industrial relations, tenancy and other relevant issues, with particular reference to the needs of the proprietors of small and medium sized businesses and their employees; and
- (b) must be available at times that are reasonably accessible to people involved in the retail industry, especially the proprietors of small and medium sized businesses and their employees; and
- (c) must be maintained for at least 12 months from the commencement of this Act.

ESTIMATES COMMITTEES

The Legislative Council gave leave to the Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries (Hon. Paul Holloway) and the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation (Hon. T.G. Roberts) to attend and give evidence before the estimates committees of the House of Assembly on the Appropriation Bill, if they think fit.

MATTERS OF PRIVILEGE

The SPEAKER: I can advise the house that, at a later time this day after questions, I will be making a statement to the house about privilege.

QUESTION TIME

PORT RIVER CROSSING

The Hon. R.G. KERIN (Leader of the Opposition): My question is directed to the Treasurer. Did he have the approval of cabinet prior to announcing that the government would contribute an extra \$20 million to \$30 million to the third Port River crossing? In April the Treasurer said that the government did not have the extra money to fund opening bridges. However, shortly before attending a public meeting in his electorate of Port Adelaide on the issue, the Treasurer announced that the government would spend an extra \$20 million to \$30 million.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Treasurer): I am happy to answer that question. As a former premier of this state, the leader knows that matters for cabinet are, indeed, matters for cabinet.

GREEN PRINT SA

Mr RAU (Enfield): My question is directed to the Minister for Environment and Conservation. What are the benefits of *Green Print SA*, which was launched today as part of World Environment Day celebrations?

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Minister for Environment and Conservation): I thank the member for Enfield for the question and I wish him, you, sir, and all members a happy World Environment Day. The launch of *Green Print SA* fulfils another election commitment made by the government. It provides the community with a way in which to monitor the government's environmental progress. *Green Print SA* describes some of the environmental challenges facing our state and details achievements made to meet these challenges. It outlines targets and indicators for future action to allow for public assessment of the government's actions.

Green Print SA provides a guide for government agencies, local government and the private sector to enable them to formulate complementary policies and initiatives. This first edition of *Green Print SA* lays the groundwork for the government's annual reporting. Future editions will become more detailed as pertinent data is collected to provide scope for assessing performance. The government expects that *Green Print SA* will become a useful reference for assessment of government progress in achieving environmental goals.

Issues covered in the report include policies and targets for greener cities, waste management, biodiversity conservation on and off reserves, marine pollution and coastal management, sustainable energy initiatives and conservation of built and cultural heritage. I look forward to working with all sectors of the community to achieve the goals set out in *Green Print SA*. I believe that it will become an essential tool in making South Australia an ecologically sustainable place in which to live. I table the report and indicate to all members that a copy will be placed in their pigeonholes before close of business today.

TISSUE RETENTION

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): My question is directed to the Minister for Health. Will the minister refer to the new Solicitor-General for investigation and a report all new evidence on the retention of human tissues and brains to determine whether information was deliberately withheld from Brad Selway QC and to ensure families are appropriately informed and counselled if necessary? Former Solicitor-General Brad Selway QC reported two years ago on tissue retention in hospitals. Yesterday, a lawyer claimed that he held evidence of significant tissue retention that has not previously been disclosed.

The Hon. L. STEVENS (Minister for Health): I became aware of the allegations raised by the lawyer, to whom the deputy leader referred, yesterday through the media, and I have said that I will look at those allegations. As people will know and as the deputy leader has mentioned, the lawyer's allegations seem to suggest that the former minister's inquiry may have been lacking in some way. However, I have not been provided with the information and I am awaiting provision of it. As I said, I have only heard of this issue through the media.

I have been informed today that the IMVS is certainly checking the claims from its perspective, even though the lawyer has not provided it with any information, also. So, the

government will look at the information. I hope that the lawyer will provide it to me and, certainly, we would be concerned to ensure that any matters that need looking into are actually looked into.

While I have this opportunity, I assure the house and South Australians, as I did briefly through the media last night, that in fact South Australia has done a considerable number of things in terms of making changes resulting from the initial revelations and, indeed, the work of the deputy leader when he was minister in relation to this matter. I will put on the record things that have occurred here in South Australia, because when I was questioned in the media last night about those matters it was obvious that there was some misapprehension and, indeed, the lawyer himself who made the allegations was under some misapprehension about some of the things that happened here in South Australia.

For the information of the house, the national Code of Ethical Autopsy Practice was endorsed by AHMAC in April 2002 last year. The code provides a nationally agreed set of principles, procedures and guidelines for the conduct of autopsies that addresses community concerns and expectations of autopsy practice and processes. A brochure has been developed through significant community consultation which outlines to families the autopsy process, and it is available in a number of languages. This brochure relates primarily to non-coronial autopsies. The Coroner also has brochures available for coronial inquiries.

An extensive national-state audit required by the Australian Health Ethics Committee of all states was completed in South Australia in December 2002, and that audit identified the location of all pathology specimens removed at autopsy but excluded the requirement to provide data on tissue blocks, histology slides, and retained small tissue samples in formalin pots. The audit was intended to minimise the future likelihood of dramatic revelations about organ collections which could cause distress to bereaved families, as the deputy leader mentioned, and it was also intended to place institutions in a position to provide accurate information to next of kin with concerns about organs removed at autopsy or subsequently disposed of or retained.

The audit identified that specimens were located at several sites, and the custodians of those collections provided details in accordance with the Australian Health Ethics Committee's recommendations. This information is not available for public release, as it contains confidential identified information. The committee requires that state authorities do not contact individual families, but make the information available—

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. Whilst I appreciate, understand and respect the information contained in the minister's response, it is not related to the question in any way. I would be only too happy for the minister to be granted leave to make a ministerial statement at the end of question time so that she can table the information then.

The Hon. K.O. Foley interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Premier should have listened carefully to what the deputy leader was saying. It was the Minister for Health to whom he would give leave, and it was also after question time and not now. I understand what the deputy leader is saying, but the remarks being made by the Minister of Health do explain the context of the answer which is in keeping with the inquiry made by the deputy leader. The minister.

The Hon. L. STEVENS: Thank you, sir. I want to ensure that everyone knows that the hotline established last year to

deal with all the issues raised by families (which was raised by the deputy leader in his question) is still operating. I want to make it clear that this hotline was set up not only for people with concerns relating to the Women's and Children's Hospital and the organs and tissues of children but also to address concerns across the board. In fact, I have been informed that a couple of hundred inquiries have been received by the hotline in relation to tissues and organs from adults.

In summary, I have said that I will look at the allegations. I have not received any of that information from the person who has it. The IMVS is now looking into the issue. In the meantime, the government is certainly taking the change of practice and new guidelines very seriously, and all our hospitals and institutions are following the new guidelines.

SCHOOLS, STUDENT SUSPENSIONS

Mr SNELLING (Playford): My question is directed to the Minister for Education and Children's Services. Has there been an improvement in the use of suspensions and exclusions in South Australian government schools?

The Hon. P.L. WHITE (Minister for Education and Children's Services): I thank the member for Playford for his question. He is indeed a very fine advocate for the schools in his electorate, and I know he takes a lot of interest, particularly in the curriculum offerings in the schools in his electorate.

In the latest audit of school suspension and exclusion activity, there has been a drop of 8.4 per cent in the number of students suspended in 2002. A comparison of figures collected between 2001 and 2002 also shows that the number of students excluded from government schools fell by over 12 per cent in 2002. While these figures can fluctuate from year to year, it is pleasing to see that there is some downward trend in the latest data. It reflects not only a decrease in the number and seriousness of incidents in our schools but it also shows that school communities are going to great effort to ensure that there are alternatives to suspension from school attendance in response to inappropriate student behaviour. They are looking at the causes and whole of school student behaviour approaches rather than some students being suspended, as some students regard that as not much more than a holiday.

However, it needs to be recognised that, in some cases, schools are left with few options, particularly when the immediate safety of others is threatened. It is unacceptable for students and teachers to be subjected to bullying, harassment or violence. Where it does occur, schools take the necessary steps to address it, as they should. As government we are continuing to make good student behaviour and engagement in schooling a priority and a focus through initiatives such as the introduction of more primary school counsellors and the recently introduced program of student mentors for our high school students.

PITJANTJATJARA LANDS

Mr BROKENSHERE (Mawson): Will the Minister for Police explain to the house whether the \$1 million that the government is spending on Operation Safelands 2 in the Pitjantjatjara lands is additional money to the police, and why has the Police Commander advised officers that Operation Safelands 2 will cease in May 2003?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Minister for Police): As we outlined in the budget, obviously the package for the Anangu Pitjantjatjara lands was an injection of new money, a component of which from my recollection is for policing, but whether or not it is for this program I will take on notice and come back to the honourable member with a detailed response.

Mr BROKENSHERE: Will the Minister for Police rule out any increase in police numbers allocated to the Pitjantjatjara lands coming from the Marla police station? I have been advised that Marla police are presently understaffed by two officers and that, if these positions are filled, they will be placed in the Pitjantjatjara lands.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Whilst little that the member for Mawson does surprises me any more, he is a former minister for police, and one of the first things made clear when one becomes a police minister is that, under our system of government in this state, the government is responsible for policy and the Commissioner of Police is responsible for operational matters. It is not for me as the Police Minister—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Members opposite say, 'What about the Parole Board?' We know that members opposite did not support this government when it came to decisions relating to the Parole Board, and it is for them to explain to the wider community why they did not support—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The question is not about the Parole Board but about Marla police.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: It would be inappropriate. This may have been the way the former police minister operated, but it is an operational matter—

Mr Brokenshere interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, the member for Mawson!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I would not be doing my job properly if I were to venture into commenting on operational matters as they relate to the South Australian Police Force.

INTERPRETING AND TRANSLATING SERVICES

Ms BREUER (Giles): Will the Minister for Multicultural Affairs advise what efforts have been made to improve access to interpreting and translating services in regional areas?

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON (Minister for Multicultural Affairs): The government has a policy to re-examine the provision of interpreters in rural and remote areas. A shortage of available interpreters in the Riverland was highlighted by health care agencies after an ethnic link services conference held in Berri earlier this year. A pool of interpreters was established in the Riverland in the 1980s and additional interpreters were recruited in 1992-93 to top up the pool, with refresher training for existing interpreters. Since then the numbers in this pool have diminished because of natural attrition and ad hoc recruitment. The Interpreting and Translating Centre, the official South Australian government interpreting and translating agency, has been enlisted to help overcome this shortage in the Riverland. The Interpreting and Translating Centre was established in 1975 and provides interpreting and translating services to the private and public sectors and individuals in more than 80 languages, 24 hours a day, seven days a week.

Advertisements were placed on Riverland TV, radio and in the local press seeking interest from people willing to be trained to work as interpreters. These people must have near

mother tongue fluency in English and in one of these: Arabic, Greek, Hindi, Italian, Kurdish, Punjabi, Turkish or Vietnamese, although other languages will also be considered. Thirty-one people have expressed interest in becoming translators so far.

I am told that at the end of the month the manager of the Interpreting and Translating Centre visited the Riverland to hold an information session and to interview the applicants. He will return to the Riverland at the end of June to conduct training and, at the end of July, Interpreting and Translating Centre staff will return to train service providers in how to work effectively with interpreters. After the training and once cleared by the South Australia Police, the successful applicants will be able to start work for the Interpreting and Translating Centre in the Riverland. They will also be encouraged to get national accreditation as soon as possible.

I am sure you, sir, will agree that this is a welcome measure, designed to improve access to interpreting services in regional areas. If the program in the Riverland is successful, it is intended to serve as a model to extend similar services to other regional centres with diverse non-English speaking background populations, such as the member for Giles' principal city, Whyalla.

PITJANTJATJARA LANDS

Mr BROKENSHIRE (Mawson): Given the last answer by the Minister for Police, I ask him on what basis he has announced \$1 million for police in the Pitjantjatjara lands.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Minister for Police): One day I might get a question as the Treasurer but, obviously, I am happy to answer Minister for Police questions.

The government has announced a raft of new spending in the budget for policing, because this government is committed to a tougher law and order policy than that of the former government. That is indisputable. This government believes that strong laws and law enforcement give us a safer community.

We will continue to ensure that our police force is able to do its job effectively by giving it access to new technology, more technology, better equipment, new police stations and new programs. This budget delivers on all those matters, and I think that demonstrates that this government is committed to extending the ability of our police force to do its job properly. As I said earlier, as it relates to operational matters, that is a matter for the commissioner.

SCHOOLS, HENLEY HIGH

Mr HANNA (Mitchell): Will the Minister for Education and Children's Services advise the house what progress is being made with the capital works program for Henley High School? In 2001, the former government promised \$4.8 million for a new building complex at Henley High School to replace 45 year old portable buildings which are gradually subsidising. As old scholars of the school, the member for Colton, the Minister for Urban Development and Planning, the members for Enfield and Bright, the Hon. Kate Reynolds and I have a keen interest in the matter.

The Hon. P.L. WHITE (Minister for Education and Children's Services): I thank the member for his question. After the 2001-02 state capital program was announced in the 2001-02 budget, the former Liberal government wrote to a number of schools (Henley High School being one of them) promising that, even though they were not in the 2001-02

program, after the election they would be included in a future program, subject to budget considerations at that time. In this case, the former Liberal government was promising for two years ahead. Those promises were made to a significant number of schools right across the state. However, in addition to those schools, a number of other schools, which did not receive promises, had equal or even greater need. That comes on top of the huge backlog that had built up over 8½ years of Liberal government programs. In the meantime, after promising those schools—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Bragg is out of order. I know that she is riding on the wave of the cacophony that came from other members on the opposition benches. The minister.

The Hon. P.L. WHITE: In the meantime, a whole range of additional needs have arisen in our schools. Some schools have run out of space due to enrolment growth, some schools have had plant and equipment breakdowns, and there have been fires. Members may remember that there was a major fire not so many months ago at Salisbury East High School. That is one project that was placed on this year's capital program and, in reference to that particular project, which was just recently announced—

The Hon. W.A. Matthew interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, the member for Bright!

The Hon. P.L. WHITE: —I read an article in the local Messenger paper in which the principal said that his school had been waiting 37 years for an upgrade. A lot of backlog in demand has built up—

Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, the member for West Torrens!

The Hon. P.L. WHITE: —and a lot of occupational health and safety issues have arisen over the last couple of years. The demand is high and the former government has left it for the new Labor government to try to fit as much as possible into its program. That is despite the current government, in this financial year, spending more than the former government planned in its forward estimates to spend on capital works in schools this year. We have also increased the budget for next year, 2003-04. Demand is high. We have an ageing stock of school buildings—

Mr Brokenshire interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, the member for Mawson!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The minister has the call.

The Hon. P.L. WHITE: I am not sure whether that comment by the member for Mawson was some sort of calumny, but perhaps we can excuse the blench from this side of the house. In making recommendations to me about what should appear in the 2003-04 capital works program, the department prioritised the needs right across the state and, as a consequence, there were higher priorities for this year's program than the Henley High School. However, this government is providing for Henley High School \$90 000 in asset maintenance (and I announced that program yesterday) to undertake repairs, including restumping of a building and repairing sinking floors at that school. Despite the blenching of opposition members, that asset maintenance allocation is more than double what the former government distributed in maintenance funds in January last year. I have recently spoken to the principal of Henley High School and reiterated our government's commitment to the future of the school. The government will continue to allocate capital works funding according to priority needs across the state.

ELECTRICITY, ENERGY AUDITS

Ms THOMPSON (Reynell): Can the Minister for Energy advise the house of the detail of a recently announced proposal for energy audits, and can he indicate whether there has been support for this initiative?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Minister for Energy): Earlier in the week, I was able to announce that the first step in providing free energy audits for low income households had been taken, with a commitment of some \$2 million to it.

The Hon. W.A. Matthew: What they want is their actual concession.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Bright is no longer the minister.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Sir, I do welcome that interjection, and I will come back to that in a moment.

The SPEAKER: No, you will not. You will get on with the answer.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: The relevance of my answer will touch on the matter that was quite improperly interjected upon. The program will involve not only the provision of free energy audits to low income households, but we will also provide to those households a package including compact, low energy use fluorescent globes and AAA rating shower-heads. This portion of the project has been trialled earlier, in projects where we cooperated with local councils on these audits, and we saw some 15 per cent reduction in energy use in many households. In addition, we will also have a buyback scheme for old energy inefficient whitegoods, which will help to remove them from households, and we are negotiating, and we are very confident that we will be asking retailers to participate in an interest-free loan scheme, repaid over a long period of time, to replace energy inefficient goods with energy efficient goods. Because we have had trial programs of these things, a conservative estimate is that, for the \$2 million that we expend, there will be \$4.9 million in savings. So, rather than a concession that is merely a payment to a retailer, this is a value adding, and all the savings stay in the pockets of the householders.

The opposition's answer is to give a concession. Of course, we do give substantial concessions to energy users and, in the past, we were able to use the proceeds from the electricity assets to fund concessions and to fund cross-subsidies. But, of course, the opposition deprived us of those assets, and we all know how that was done. There has been support among welfare agencies for the scheme. Unfortunately, the shadow minister for energy said that it is an insult to low income households. That, apparently, is the official opposition line—it is an insult. He also went on to say that they already are very cautious users of energy. But the problem is that that comment is completely ill-informed. The truth is that, ironically, often it is lower income households that cannot afford to upgrade to energy efficient white goods. It is low income households that are struggling with energy inefficient goods.

While I cannot get support from the shadow minister for what I think is an excellent scheme, all is not lost because, apparently, some Liberal members do support it. Perhaps if the shadow minister did a little work in his portfolio area he would know that tabled in the Legislative Council in May was the result of an inquiry into poverty—the poverty inquiry. Section 17 relates to electricity costs, and it did not recommend concessions. It recommended (at 17.1) that the Minister for Energy examine the feasibility of a state

domestic energy management strategy. The strategy would include:

- education information to help households reduce electricity consumption. Tick.
- Low cost to free energy audits for low income households. Tick.
- Low interest loans for items to assist in the reduction of energy use. Tick.

In fact, we got a little beyond that: we are talking about no interest loans and free energy audits for all Housing Trust tenants, and that is something we will be discussing further with the minister. There is still some work to be done in discussion with welfare agencies to make sure that it is properly targeted. We would like to see this become commercially available at a low cost because the outcomes are outstanding, and they are outstanding in every regard. The reduction of energy use is a net positive; reduction in the amount of money that people pay is a net positive; and reduction in greenhouse emissions is a net positive.

I am even doing the Minister for Water Resources a favour by supplying AAA roses but, as I said, all is not lost: I do have some support on this because, of course, these were the unanimous recommendations of the inquiry into poverty, which included the Hon. David Ridgway MLC in another place and Joe Scalzi MP, the member for Hartley. I may not have the shadow minister but I have the lion of Hartley on my side. Instead of running out and making ill-informed and insulting comments, maybe the shadow minister should find out what his party thinks first.

JAM FACTORY

Mrs HALL (Morialta): My question is directed to the Premier in his capacity as the Minister for the Arts. Is he aware that the Jam Factory has informed more than 35 South Australian and interstate artists that they may not be paid for up to 90 days, and is this a breach of the Treasurer's instruction? I have been informed that the Jam Factory has notified artists, who are owed more than \$80 000, as follows:

We are entering the slowest period of the year and our cash flow analysis indicates that payment delays could drift for 90 days leading up to June 30. However, we expect to restore terms to 60 days from early July and maintain or improve terms from then on. We appreciate your support and patience.
Yours sincerely, Mark Ferguson, Chief Executive.

I am sure the Premier is aware that the Treasurer's instruction 11.2.3 requires payment of government accounts within 30 days.

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Minister for the Arts): It is so nice to be asked a question by the opposition. Normally, I expect a stirry opposition—one that is prepared to heap calumnies upon me, maybe even virago calumnies, I do not know. I will certainly investigate this matter and report back.

CROWN LAND

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop): Will the Minister for Environment and Conservation assure the house that the Crown Lands (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill 2002 will be debated in parliament before September this year or, alternatively, will he extend the deadline for freeholding applications beyond 30 September? With the exception of estimates committees, there are only four sitting days between now and 15 September 2003. As many members would be aware, a deadline of 30 September has been set by the government for perpetual lessees to apply for freehold at a discounted rate.

Under the recommendations of the select committee (recently tabled in the house), many other conditions of freeholding will change on 30 September, including that the transfer of perpetual leases that are able to be freeholded will not be permitted, and lessees who apply to freehold after 30 September will not have access to the proposed review panel. Many constituents have expressed to me and my colleagues their desire to have these issues confirmed well before the 30 September cut-off date as it will influence their decision whether or not to apply to freehold.

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Minister for Environment and Conservation): This important issue has been before the house since the budget of last year. If the government had had its way, this legislation would have been dealt with by the parliament in October or November last year but, as a result of the decision by the opposition to support the establishment of a select committee, this matter has been delayed.

The SPEAKER: Order! The minister may not reflect upon a decision of the house in the course of his answer.

The Hon. J.D. HILL: Well, sir, I do not know how else to answer it, because I was asked whether or not the bill will be dealt with in this session. I am advising the house that the reason it has not been dealt with so far is a decision of the house to delay the bill. I thought that would be a perfectly appropriate point for me to make.

The SPEAKER: If that is the only direction in which the minister is going, he may proceed.

The Hon. J.D. HILL: That is the point I am making: the house has not had a chance to debate the bill because the matter has been before a select committee, which met earlier this week and finally resolved the issues before it and, I believe, reached a reasonable consensus about what should happen. There are a couple of issues on which, obviously, there is disagreement between this side and the other side of the house.

The issue as to whether it can be dealt with prior to the end of this current sitting period is obviously a matter for the managers of the house. I have talked to the leader of the house, and I would like to see the matter dealt with, as I think all members would. But, if the house is sitting for only a few days—and I know many members, especially on the other side of the house, wish to speak to the bill—it may not be practical to have the matter dealt with.

SA WATER

Ms RANKINE (Wright): My question is directed to the Minister for Administrative Services. What measures have been taken by SA Water to ensure that its operations are conducted in an environmentally sustainable way?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Minister for Administrative Services): I have responsibility for SA Water. SA Water has established a sustainability advisory group headed by the Chair of the Natural Resources Council, Dennis Mutton, whose expertise covers the environment, water resources and agriculture. In addition, it has created a sustainability business unit to implement environmental, social and economic sustainability principles in all of its activities.

The sustainable advisory group will investigate options for new water sources, such as desalination and increased use of treated waste water, increasing efficient energy use and reducing associated greenhouse gas emissions. It will also look at ways of providing drinking water from poor quality sources, treating waste water to a high level, and pumping

more water long distances. The social impact of SA Water operations and water conservation strategies on customers will also be considered.

The government is committed to a sustainable use of water resources and reducing the impact of SA Water's operations on the environment. Already, SA Water has committed to joining Australian Greenhouse Challenge and is a leader in projects for the reuse of treated waste water, and it is actively pursuing sustainable use of the River Murray through its work in the Murray-Darling Basin Commission.

It will be a relief for all members to know that SA Water is now considering matters much closer to home instead of having its attention distracted in places such as, let's say, West Java, for instance. Members will be very pleased to know that they have a water corporation that is now regarded as one of the most economically, environmentally sustainable and socially responsible corporate citizens in the country.

THEATRES, REGIONAL

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite): My question is directed to the Minister Assisting the Premier in the Arts. Did the minister receive departmental advice or a brief in 2002 advising him of the need for him to take urgent action on occupational health and safety at the four regional theatres for which he is responsible, and did he read the brief?

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Minister Assisting the Premier in the Arts): It is good to hear the member for Waite asking questions again: I have not had a question from him for some time in relation to arts issues. He usually gets the wrong end of them, and he has done so again on this occasion. Just before the budget, after an announcement had been made about a \$500 000 package to assist with regional theatres occupational health and safety issues, the member for Waite put out a press release saying that there was a danger that those four theatres would be closed. That was absolute, arrant nonsense: there was never such a suggestion.

A proposition has been before government (including the prior government) for some time that a considerable amount of money—\$7.2 million or thereabouts—ought to be spent on those theatres to bring them to a higher standard. Certainly, the government would love to have that money to spend on regional theatres but, unfortunately, we have other priorities. Education, health, transport, roads, and so on, are some of those priorities. However, in this current budget we have given priority to occupational health and safety matters, and we have allocated \$500 000 to address all those issues.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite): Given the Minister Assisting the Minister in the Arts' answer to my previous question, can he advise the house if it has been safe, and is it now safe, for patrons and employees for the Northern Festival Theatre to remain open? Information provided to the opposition reveals that as early as April 2002 (some 13 months ago) concerns were directed to the minister regarding serious safety concerns at the theatre, including:

1. Providing panic bolts on exit and entry doors and erecting disabled facility signage.
2. Replacing the automatic fire detection system, which is obsolete and does not comply with the current code.
3. Relocating fire hydrants stands and sections of PVC pipe work previously found to be causing failures.
4. Fixing the partially inoperative and incomplete emergency lighting system.

5. Installing an emergency lighting system in the theatre that is separate from the dimming switch.

The Hon. J.D. HILL: The theatres to which the member is referring are about 20 years old, and the issues to which he has referred have developed over time, including the eight years his party was in government and did absolutely nothing to address the concerns. They made announcement prior to the election and they put big figures into press releases, but they did absolutely nothing to deal with the issues. In its budget this year, this government has allocated a half a million dollars to address those issues.

Ms Breuer interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Giles seems to be suffering from a lack of something.

ENVIRONMENT SHOP

Mrs REDMOND (Heysen): My question is directed to the Minister for Environment and Conservation. On World Environment Day, can the minister advise the house why the government is closing the environment shop? The one stop environment shop was opened by the Liberal government on 8 May 2001 to provide the public and visitors with a range of environmental information, such as information on recycling, biodiversity, air and water quality, walking trail maps, park brochures, park passes, park information, wildlife posters, bushwalking guides, advice on park accommodation and recreation facilities within the national parks at one central location.

Operated by the Department of Environment and Heritage, the shop also offers a broad range of books, posters, cards, and environmental friendly gifts covering topics such as environmental issues, helpful camping and walking information, Australian flora and fauna, heritage and conservation, environmental protection as well as a great range of books for children. The shop showcases environmentally sustainable design principles, making use of recycled plastics, plantation timbers, recycled carpet, low energy lighting, vegetable-based paints, and other natural products.

The SPEAKER: The Minister Assisting the Premier in the Arts and in his other capacity as the minister for just about everything, including the environment.

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Minister for Environment and Conservation): Thank you, sir. Of course, the environment is everything, and I thank the member for asking this question on this day. It shows that she is no pipsqueak when it comes to environmental matters. I am so pleased to have been asked this question. I did not like closing the environment shop, but it was a decision made by the government to address departmental priorities. We made a decision that there were higher priorities than running a shop on Grenfell Street.

The reality is that the environment shop loses about a quarter of a million dollars a year, and the government has decided to spend a quarter of a million dollars a year funding Aboriginal rangers to work in the Unnamed Conservation Park on the western part of our state. If you are spending a quarter of a million dollars, and you have choice: do you put it into Aboriginal rangers in the Unnamed Conservation Park or do you put it into an environmental shop on Grenfell Street, which loses a quarter of a million dollars a year—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. HILL: I know that the honourable member's only achievement in the environment portfolio was to update that shop, and the member for Davenport is proud of it. It is piquant to him, but to us it is not a priority. We

have gone through the budget process in a detailed way and set priorities. We would rather put available resources into looking after the environment than into running a bookshop. The information provided by that bookshop can be provided by other means to the community. We will use the other networks of shops and bureaucracies across government and a lot of the information will be put on the net.

I am sad that it has to close. I grieve with the people who work in that place, who will not lose their jobs in the Public Service unless they choose to take a package. There is no loss of employment associated with it for those people, but we have to have priorities, and our priority is not to run a shop on Grenfell Street. It may be the priority of the member for Davenport as it was his great achievement, but we have different priorities.

CROWN LAND

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop): Will the Minister for Environment and Conservation inform the house whether, if the Crown Lands (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill 2002 is not debated before 15 September, he will extend the deadline for freeholding applications? That was part of the question I asked earlier and, as the minister was sitting down, I believe he shook his head and said no.

The SPEAKER: Order! That has nothing to do with the question.

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Minister for Environment and Conservation): The honourable member has asked a second question about crown leases. The government put out an offer to perpetual leaseholders earlier this year and gave the lessees six months to respond to it. So far 30 per cent or so of lessees have responded positively, have accepted the offer and are going through the process. As a result of the select committee process, we have come up with a more generous offer and have a whole range of new arrangements that can be put in place for people to take advantage of the offer. We will not be extending the offer. It would be unreasonable to do that, because we have said clearly that they have six months to do that. When we first announced that we would change the arrangements, people said, 'Please give us extra time; we'd like six months,' and we have agreed to that.

The question asked by the member for MacKillop is based on the assumption that legislation will substantially change the arrangements in place. There is only one element in the legislation that is dealt with by the select committee, namely, the issue of whether there should be a minimum rent or a standard service fee. The select committee that looked at this originally agreed to a standard fee of \$300. The minority of the committee has changed its mind in that regard and that matter will be debated before the house, but all other elements are matters of policy that can be done by administrative fiat and not matters that need to be dealt with by legislation. It is perfectly reasonable for the government to maintain the offer of six months. We will write again to all lessees giving them the revised offer and the more generous conditions that will apply to that offer and we expect a substantial percentage of those lessees to accept the offer made to them, as I believe it would be in their best interests to do.

The SPEAKER: The question was allowed, notwithstanding the fact that it relates to a matter that is on the *Notice Paper* and before a select committee, simply because of the timeliness element of the information which it sought. The chair cannot determine, and nor should it, how long it might

be before the select committee reports and, following its report, the government determines when it will move to process the legislation through the parliament, yet the public is entitled to know what the government may be thinking.

HEALTH AND MEDICAL RESEARCH ADVISORY COUNCIL

Mr O'BRIEN (Napier): Will the Minister for Health outline the objectives of establishing the new Health and Medical Research Advisory Council to advise her on health and medical research in South Australia?

The Hon. L. STEVENS (Minister for Health): I thank the member for Napier for his question, particularly as this week is Medical Research Week. I had the pleasure of attending the annual Australian Society for Medical Research (South Australian Branch) dinner with the deputy leader and the Hon. Sandra Kanck on Monday night at which we celebrated medical research in South Australia and enjoyed a very piquant meal. The state government has established a Health and Medical Research Advisory Council to provide leadership in developing a coordinated and strategic approach to health and medical research in this state. The Health and Medical Research Advisory Council will support the work being undertaken by the science minister, my colleague the Hon. Jane Lomax-Smith and the Science and Research Council established by the government to develop a 10-year strategy for science, research and development.

The council will be chaired by the prominent paediatrician Professor Don Robertson from Adelaide University and the Women's and Children's Hospital and is made up of people with strong and diverse clinical, research, population, health and business backgrounds drawn from the public, private and university sectors. The council's objectives are to strengthen the health and medical research sector, increase its competitiveness, maintain and increase linkages between research, clinical practice, population health needs and health system priorities and maximise the contribution research makes to the health, well-being and economic prosperity of South Australians.

The council will provide leadership to ensure greater collaboration and to foster excellence in our research efforts, and it builds on other initiatives taken by the government to strengthen research in South Australia. The council members include: Professor Michael Sawyer, the University of Adelaide nominee; Professor Greg Barritt, the Flinders University nominee; Professor David Wilkinson, the University of South Australia nominee; Professor Guy Maddern, representing medical research; Dr Diana Read, representing biotechnology research; Professor Peter McDonald, representing health research; Professor Fran Baum, representing population research; Dr Simon Coblar, representing biotechnology research; Ms Sharon Cruse, representing Aboriginal health research; Dr David Roder, representing epidemiological research; Ms Karen Richardson, representing a consumer/community organisation perspective; Ms Rosey Batt, a lawyer; Dr Jurgen Michaelis, the CEO of Bio Innovation SA; and Mr Jim Birch, the Chief Executive Officer of the Department of Human Services.

ABORIGINAL LEGAL RIGHTS MOVEMENT

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW (Bright): Is the Attorney-General aware of mining industry concerns over cuts in funding to the Aboriginal Legal Rights Movement for

indigenous land use agreement negotiations and, if so, what action is the Attorney taking to resolve these concerns? In a media statement issued on 29 May 2003, the South Australian Chamber of Minerals and Energy, through its Chief Executive Officer, Mr Phil Sutherland, said:

A clear statement of continued fiscal support for the Aboriginal Legal Rights Movement is necessary so they can continue to be at the negotiating table with the resources industry, government and other stakeholders in the development of regional land access agreement templates or ILUAs. All the parties to these negotiations expect a successful outcome in the near future. The withdrawal of government support now at the eleventh hour would be a deplorable waste of resources to date—a step backwards.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON (Attorney-General): The current government continues the policy of the previous government, which is to support indigenous land use agreements. We would prefer native title to be resolved that way or by consent determinations rather than in contested litigation, which has cost the Australian taxpayers and ATSIC enormous sums of money for no good result. Our view is that in the ILUA negotiations the ALRM ought to be supported by the commonwealth, and we are disappointed that the commonwealth will not come to the party on funding ALRM's involvement in ILUAs.

An honourable member interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for Bright has asked his question.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: I will take advice on the matter and get the member for Bright a considered response. However, on the question of ILUAs, I do not believe that it is quite the eleventh hour.

REGIONAL IMPACT STATEMENTS

Mrs PENFOLD (Flinders): Will the Premier advise the house whether, in light of the new regional impact assessment statement guidelines, he envisages decisions, such as cuts to regional hospital budgets and services and changes in funding formulas, such as those that cover active club grants and sporting facilities grants, qualify for public consultation and a public regional impact assessment statement?

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Premier): Obviously, the honourable member is aware that what I am really looking for is synchronicity, but I will be happy to get a report for her.

ACE GRANTS PROGRAM

Ms CICCARELLO (Norwood): My question is to the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education. How will the recently approved ACE grants program assist disadvantaged people in our community?

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH (Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education): I thank the member for Norwood for her interest in the ACE community grants program. I realise that I will not be able to talk about sheep shearing during this response!

This year, there has been an increase in the funding to this important area that will particularly target the disadvantaged and those in regional areas. It would be curmudgeonly of us not to want to put at least 29 per cent of our funding organisational support into rural areas, and this year we have achieved that goal. The ACE grants strive to give literacy, numeracy and, particularly, improved language skills to participants. It is appropriate in this, the first year of the Decade of Literacy, that—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! It is impossible to hear the minister. I do not have a clue what the minister is saying.

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH: It is appropriate that, in the first year of the International Decade of Literacy, we should place particular focus on this. In addition, we would like to announce that we have produced a regional partnership whereby we fund certain projects for longer terms (perhaps up to three years), in partnership with local government, business and other community organisations, to give a long-term outcome for the community. The scheme encourages small providers to work together and also to work through the resources of the local government and TAFE institutes. The ACE sector in our state is a vibrant and strong group, and we have been pleased to put more funds into the ACE programs this year and to improve the number of grants given at this moment.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

FERAL PIGS

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett): I rise to speak on a very serious threat not only to South Australia but also to Australia, that is, the 12 million wild pigs that are running around this country. Members have heard me speak about feral cats. In a bad year, there are 20 million feral cats, but they are quite harmless when compared with the 12 million wild pigs. I received a press release from the Australian Veterinary Association national conference that is to be held in Brisbane this week. The press release was entitled, 'Action plan on the way to control feral pig menace'. In the action—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Can the Whip, the minister on the floor, the members for Chaffey, Schubert and Hartley do something other than stand around and block the view of the chair. It is impossible to hear. We have had some late nights, and we need some cooperation. The member for Morphett.

Dr McFETRIDGE: Thank you, Deputy Speaker. I was interrupted by some ferals! Reading from the Australian Veterinary Association's media release from its national conference in Brisbane, where over 1 000 veterinarians met, tail docking was discussed. From another press release, I noted that legislation in relation to tail docking is being introduced in every state and territory in Australia, but South Australia is lagging behind. The tail is wagging the dog in this case.

Referring to feral pigs, the media release states that 'feral pigs pose a triple threat to Australia: they cause enormous damage to farm land'. They threaten livestock, and they threaten humans. Feral pigs harbour a number of exotic diseases. The media release continues:

The rapid spread of foot and mouth disease two years ago in Britain was a frightening demonstration of how rapidly disease could spread from herd to herd. The outbreak started in a domestic piggery feeding infected food refuse.

The other day, I noted a report in the media that AFL footballers came to Adelaide bringing in food from interstate—in this case, fruit. We have to be very careful with our quarantine, not only in Australia but also in South Australia—

because here we have feral pigs on Kangaroo Island, in the Mid North and in the Adelaide Hills.

In the rural press not long ago there was a warning about driving on the Adelaide to Broken Hill highway. Drivers were being warned to look out for wild pigs. If you hit a 200-pound pig, it would do a bit of damage to the front of your car. The media release from the Australian Veterinary Association conference continues:

Some scientists believe that more than 20 exotic diseases can affect feral pigs, and there are strong fears that foot and mouth disease could be one of them.

The federal government implemented an action plan to control foot-and-mouth disease in Australia. I believe that the Premier attended and, if he was paying attention, he would be aware that an outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease in Australia could cost anything between \$9 billion and \$30 billion.

I was surprised to hear the Premier, in a previous question about foot-and-mouth disease, give the exact date of the first outbreak in Australia in 1872, so he must have been paying attention at that conference. He is aware of the potential damage that feral pigs could be causing not only to the Australian agricultural industry but also to the South Australian industry. I urge this government not to slash the Primary Industries budget, as it has been doing, and take primary industry in South Australia seriously.

Feral pigs are on the outskirts of Sydney. I read an article in which it was stated that every week three or four pigs are being shot in the outskirts of Sydney. I have a press release that states:

The 40-kilogram, metre-long feral pig shot yesterday morning in Sydney's western suburbs was teeming with lice and infested with mange.

Who knows what else this pig could have been carrying had somebody brought some meat product in from overseas that was infected with foot-and-mouth, or one the many other diseases, such as Dengue fever, leptospirosis, cryptosporidium and coccidiosis. I could go on and on about the diseases that feral pigs can carry.

Australia is in a very delicate situation in relation to quarantine. We cannot rest on our laurels for one moment. Feral pigs are an absolute menace. I note that the Minister for Emergency Services offered to help shoot them, which is what needs to be done. In one day in one part of Queensland, 1 200 feral pigs were shot from a helicopter without even trying. However, there are thousands of feral pigs on Kangaroo Island, in the Mid North and in the Far North.

At this stage, I have had no response from the government when I raised the issue of controlling feral pests in Australia at last year's estimates committees; I hope to get one this year. The problem of animal and human disease cannot be overemphasised. 'The pigs are hairier, dirtier and smarter than dogs and an environmental nightmare,' states another press release.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: We can be thankful they do not fly!

WORLD CONSERVATION DAY

Mr KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens): Today I was honoured and privileged to attend, with the Minister for Environment and Conservation, St George College to celebrate a landmark in the advance of our society. I was unaware when I was first elected of the high levels of pollution that the western suburbs had to endure. That was

partly as a result of foundries, general industrial pollution and lead pollution from traffic. The corner of South Road and Henley Beach Road is one of the busiest intersections in South Australia, coming third or fourth behind North Terrace and King William Street, Anzac Highway and Marion Road, and Grand Junction Road and Port Wakefield Road at Gepps Cross. I remember that the EPA released a report saying that the levels of lead were so high that they are equal to or greater than the lead levels in Port Pirie near the lead smelters.

St George College was gifted to the Greek community by the former Labor government in 1992-93. On that site there is a facility for measuring levels of lead and pollution in the air. It is a great relief to know that that will no longer be required at the school because, since the introduction of unleaded petrol and lead replacement petrol, lead pollution is no longer a problem in that area. That does not mean that we can be complacent or that we have done enough for the environment, but on World Environment Day it was a nice moment to go to a school at which, when it was a public school, parents used to be concerned about lead levels. Parents now know that sending their children to that school is not dangerous in any way.

We in the western suburbs have, unfairly, put up with a lot of pollution, because in the past the EPA has not had the legislative framework to go after polluters, and the former government was not as committed to attacking polluters as this government is. The two foundries in my electorate that are causing the most grief are Hensleys foundry, which is in breach of its EPA licence and has had its licence suspended, and Castalloy. I understand that the Health Commission has undertaken checks of postcodes and conducted surveys for health problems and medical conditions in the areas surrounding the foundries, and nothing has been found.

I know it is only anecdotal evidence, but of the committee that was established to fight off Hensleys foundry, which used to be called Mason and Cox, over half its original members contracted a form of leukaemia. They were in the greater postcode of Flinders Park, and it is hard to tie it to that foundry. The residents have struggled long and hard with former Labor governments, former Liberal governments and the current Labor government to have that foundry operate under the guidelines set down by the EPA. The EPA finally acted, suspending its licence, asking the company either to relocate—

The Hon. Dean Brown interjecting:

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: That's right. The deputy leader makes a very good point. I am fearful because, once a licence is reinstated at any of these foundries, it takes residents groups years to have their case heard again by the EPA. It is too precious to give these companies a second chance. If these companies win back their EPA licence, they start polluting again, and it takes two to four years to get their licence suspended because of the way in which testing is done and the cumulative effect of pollution. I do not support residents having to fight tooth and nail for these issues. They need an easier path.

FIRST HOME OWNERS GRANT

Mr MEIER (Goyder): Today I wish to highlight an issue that I referred to the Treasurer just a little while ago, and it relates to an interest payment on a first home owners grant that needed to be repaid. I first took up this issue regarding

eligibility for a first home owners grant with the former treasurer, the Hon. Rob Lucas, on 25 February 2002, just prior to the change of government. At that stage, my constituent, whom I will not identify at this stage, and her partner had sought and been granted a \$7 000 first home owners grant. However, my constituent then disclosed that she was one of the names on a leasehold shack, a non-freehold shack, on Yorke Peninsula and, as a result, it was felt by Revenue SA that she was not eligible for the \$7 000 first home owners grant.

It was then that I took up the issue and asked that she be allowed the \$7 000 because a life-tenure shack does not have permanency and it cannot be sold. Following that approach of 25 February, on 18 March 2002, 19 March 2002, 22 April 2002 and 26 April 2002 there was further correspondence to and from Treasury, or the Treasurer to me, or my correspondence with that constituent.

A couple of days ago—more than one year later—I was contacted about a letter that my constituent had received from the Ombudsman. I had advised my constituent to take it further, and the Ombudsman indicated that, as a result of his investigations, not only would they have to pay back the \$7 000 but also they would have to pay interest of \$866.54. One wonders how you could get interest of over \$800 on a \$7 000 loan. The reason is that Revenue SA, or the agency that administers the first home owners grant, charges interest at 12.8 per cent.

I would like to know who in this state or country can get 12.8 per cent on their money. If they know where to get that amount, please let me know immediately. I would be happy to invest, even if it is just a few dollars. I suggest that, if you can get 4 per cent you are doing satisfactorily, and, if you look around, you might be able to get 5 per cent and, with some risk, perhaps even 6 per cent. Interest at 12.8 per cent is ridiculous. I have asked the Treasurer to look into this matter and to use his ministerial discretion to waive the interest.

My constituent has no problem with having to repay the \$7 000, but she does not believe it is fair to have to pay the interest, when the grant was given to her in the first instance after assessment of her eligibility. The issue has gone on for some time but, if this is the way that the department carries on—and it is not necessarily a state government department; it is probably a federal government issue—things have to change. I trust that this can be waived, at least for my constituent, and I thank the Treasurer for at least agreeing to look into the matter.

I also thank the Minister for Transport and perhaps the Minister for Police for what they have done to get a police inspection for a bus driver in my electorate. I raised this issue in the house last week. Whilst the inspection had not gone through on Monday, my office received notice late yesterday or today that the police report had been done, so the bus company on northern Yorke Peninsula will be able to continue to operate with the full number of drivers. I just hope that these police checks will be sorted out, and that we do not continue to have this six-week wait, which has caused enormous problems for some of my people and for people in other electorates.

SEA RESCUE

Mr CAICA (Colton): Yesterday, my attention was drawn to an article in the *Australian* informing the readers that an Australian frigate was steaming out to rescue two British

rowers who had left Perth some time before to make their way to an island off the coast of Madagascar, for some mysterious reason. I will not ponder here for any length of time what might drive two British sailors to hop in a boat and try to row across the Indian Ocean. Suffice to say that it is somewhat eccentric. I would expect they would know that there is some inherent danger in undertaking such an exercise.

Mr Rau: Apparently not.

Mr CAICA: No, apparently not. Maybe they were not sufficiently educated to know that there is something of a swell out there in the middle of the Indian Ocean. Nevertheless, today's *Australian* again hits on that article and reports that the HMAS *Newcastle* has rushed to rescue these two gentlemen, and I expect they are very thankful for that.

It reminds me of when the Australian Navy was deployed some time ago to rescue the around the world sailor Tony Bullimore, and the reaction of the Australian people at that time. I make no comment on that, except to highlight the ability of Australian defence personnel—particularly those in the Navy—who risk their lives in rescuing people who probably should not be where they are, and who show the rest of the world how expert they are at rescuing these people. It is a great effort by the Australian Navy.

One of the questions that have been raised publicly is whether or not there should be some form of cost recovery for such an exercise. We know that there are international obligations that bind Australia to undertake such rescue exercises and rescue people within its specific area of responsibility, and that is quite appropriate. However, I think that people such as Mr Bullimore and these two rather eccentric British rowers who attempted to make their way to Madagascar from Perth ought to be responsible for some form of cost recovery with respect to the exercise that is, of necessity, undertaken by the Australian defence forces to retrieve them from a situation in which they, I would suggest, deliberately put themselves.

The link that I wish to make today is the Australian Navy's being deployed to undertake such rescue exercises and the inherent dangers to defence personnel in undertaking that type of activity at any time, and the circumstances that arose some time ago with respect to the *Siev X*, where, in fact, no attempt was made at any time to rescue those people. There is a cloud of conjecture about why it was that Australian defence forces were not deployed in time. Again, I do not know whether the answer will ever be known to the people of Australia, but we are talking about a vessel which sank off the coast of Australia, and 353 lives were lost. It might well be that the Australian defence forces at that time were not deployed in time, and that in itself begs the question why. We can find a man called Mr Bullimore 1 000 miles off the Australian coast—bearing in mind that he might have an EPIRB and a beacon and be a lot more easily found. I am talking about a boat that was monitored leaving Indonesia with 353-plus people on board, whose whereabouts were known, and there was no timely effort by the Australian government at that stage to deploy the magnificent Australian resources that are available in any form of rescue attempt.

I am not quite sure what the reasons for this might be, and I expect that they might never be known. However, if I can draw some analogy, it seems that we are able to rescue people who are passing by Australia, such as Bullimore, or in fact leaving Australia, such as two eccentric British rowers, but perhaps the main difference is that we did not deploy our resources because these people were possibly coming to Australia, and that could be the significant difference. Suffice

to say that there is a shameful period in Australia's history where perhaps not all was done that could have been done to rescue these people; or, to draw on another analogy, that circumstances became so clouded that, indeed, at the time of an election, Australian people believed that children were being thrown overboard.

POLICE NUMBERS

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY (Light): I rise today to inform the house—and the Treasurer—that the constituents of Gawler are not happy. Over the last 10 days, a spate of crime has occurred in Gawler. There have, in fact, been three different sprees, which have left a trail of destruction and damage of some thousands of dollars. It has left local business operators absolutely fuming, because of the fact that there are not enough police in Gawler at the right time or to cope with the amount of crime that is occurring, particularly in the last 10 days. In fact, it has been suggested that the offenders are creating a diversion, to take the Gawler police unit out of the town late at night so that there is no police unit left in the town, and then accessing the businesses. As a result, a unit from Elizabeth has to respond to a call and, in many cases, they are also busy.

In one instance this week, it took some 40 minutes for an Elizabeth unit to reach Gawler to respond to a break-in. The owner of the shop was waiting for the police to turn up, and it took them some 40 minutes to get there. This is not the fault of the police, might I add very quickly: they do a wonderful job, but we need more police officers. It was very disturbing to see in last year's budget that, over the period of this government, there is no funding allocated for one more police officer. The people of Gawler are not happy about this at all.

Let me give some examples of what has happened over the last couple of weeks. After opening only five weeks ago, the local Allphones shop has been burgled twice in the past week. The value of the stolen telephones exceeds \$7 000, and the shop owner is quoted as saying that he is absolutely rovable. The premises of Office National at Gawler were broken into in the early hours of Tuesday morning last week. The shop owner said that a group of thieves broke the side window and the front door and trashed the premises before escaping with hundreds of dollars worth of telephones and office equipment. Game City had a glass door shattered and is looking at a \$400 damage bill. At the top end of Murray Street there is a new Bedshed business. The building is not yet completed, and it has already been completely graffitied. In Gawler South on the weekend, perpetrators went about with red, blue and silver spray paint and graffitied a large number of homes, businesses and fences.

This is an extremely serious situation, and it is exacerbated because of the fact that there are not enough police in Gawler on the weekends or at night to ensure that, if one vehicle is called out, there is a back-up vehicle to respond to other calls. We all know that these people who perpetrate the crimes are not idiots. We might think they are, but the point is that they are smart enough to know that, if you divert the police to another call-out out of the town, the town is left unguarded, because there are not enough police officers there. The Elizabeth police are then the ones who have to respond in relation to any of the crime that is occurring.

If one walks down the main street of Gawler, one will find that every window of every business has been graffitied and had scratches etched into the glass (my own included, many

times over). As I have said, this has reached a stage where it is extremely serious, because it is costing the businesses of Gawler many thousands of dollars in increased insurance premiums or in replacing goods—let alone the fact that they are called out in the middle of the night and have to attend to their business. It is not good enough. This government, as I said, in its four-year term, has not allocated any funds for one extra police officer. We know that, over that period, we will end up with population growth. What will happen? Will the government be happy with this situation?

SOUTHERN SUBURBS

Ms THOMPSON (Reynell): Mr Deputy Speaker, I want to speak about something in which I am sure you will be very interested. I know that the minister welcomes your support for the Office of the Southern Suburbs which, as you know, was opened last Saturday 31 May. It was opened in the presence of the Premier, a number of other members of the house, our local Mayor and Mayoress (Ray and Edith Gilbert), the Mayor of Marion (Felicity-Ann Lewis), many local councillors and, importantly, significant figures from industry in our area, including Tom Phillips and Rex Keily from Mitsubishi and Glenn Henson from Mobil.

The opposition seems to have had a little difficulty understanding the role of the Office of the Southern Suburbs but, basically, it is to represent the needs, potential, development and direction of the southern suburbs to other agencies and to ensure that other agencies focus their attention on the southern suburbs. This has not always been the case in the past, yet the south is quite a unique region. Its population is different from the population of Adelaide in minor ways, but it is, and the social atlas shows us so. The social atlas also shows us that there are slightly different needs in the south.

Its geography determines different opportunities and potential for development. There are difficulties for industry. There is not a cheap gas supply and, under the previous government, there were threats that the price of gas to the south would be increased, hence increasing the barriers to industry development in the area. Fortunately, that has not come to pass and, fortunately, too, the Minister for Energy—

The Hon. Dean Brown interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The deputy leader is out of order.

Ms THOMPSON: —as part of the negotiations on SeaGas is trying to ensure that there is a spur pipeline for gas directly into the south, which will be a great advantage. The Office of the Southern Suburbs is trying to identify the needs and potential of the south. One project is an audit of infrastructure. This has been requested for many years but it is now happening, and I am very pleased to welcome that. The Minister for the Southern Suburbs (Hon. John Hill), in introducing the Premier to open the office, pointed to a couple of important initiatives for the south that have already been taken by this government.

The first is the extension of the metro ticket service, something of great benefit to the residents of Seaford, Aldinga and McLaren Vale. This has been fought for for a long time and has finally been granted in the second budget of this Labor government. Another important initiative the minister announced was that of Clever Communities. Part of Clever Communities is to make available 10 scholarships of \$500 each to be awarded to local students who choose to attend university. The more complex part of Clever Communities is about encouraging schools, neighbourhoods, parents,

employers and sporting coaches to work together to indicate to our young people and, indeed, some of our older people just how important education is for the future development of the south.

As you know, sir, the south was largely settled by people coming out to provide the extremely important manufacturing work force that was particularly needed in the 1950s and the 1960s. Unfortunately, many of those jobs are no longer required; so, the aspirations of the people of the south, the children of those original venturers, need to change. In order for the children to look for different futures, their parents need to look for different futures. The impact of Clever Communities, in enabling the south to see different ways of developing, will be extremely important.

I would like to thank the students of the Aberfoyle Park High School for providing excellent musical entertainment, the Noarlunga Rotary for the sausage sizzle and the Christies Downs Community House for the morning tea. Many people attended the opening. About 80 people attended, as you know, sir, and it was very difficult to move. Those 80 people chose to come along to show their commitment for the Office of the Southern Suburbs. The conversation was very lively and the commitment to the south very strong.

Time expired.

LIDLAW, Hon. DIANA

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Before calling the Attorney, the chair notes the impending retirement of the Hon. Diana Laidlaw and acknowledges her lengthy public service to the people of South Australia and wishes her well for the future.

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON (Attorney-General): I move:

That the house at its rising adjourn until Wednesday 25 June at 2 p.m.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I rise on a point of order, sir. I thought that the estimates committee is, in fact, a formal sitting of this house but as an estimates committee. That is my understanding. I therefore raise the point as to whether or not the next sitting of the house should be the first day of estimates committees.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The answer is that the member for Finniss is wrong. The estimates are a committee of the house, not a full, normal sitting of the house.

Motion carried.

NURSES (NURSES BOARD VACANCIES) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 22 October. Page 1661.)

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): I support the bill in its amended form. This simple bill deals with how you fill a vacancy that occurs on the Nurses Board. The government introduced legislation on this matter a fair time ago now. It was introduced on 22 October 2002 (so, more than nine months ago), but the

government then introduced a further amendment to the bill. First, the bill is simple and the amendment is also simple.

The bill, with its amendment (which I know we cannot talk about in the second reading debate, but unless you do the second reading debate in this case becomes meaningless) means that, now, in the first year after an election for an elected position on the board (and nurses in particular stand for the elected positions), the fixed procedure is that you go back to the next person who did not get elected, and, if that person does not wish to stand, you go to the next person who did not get elected.

If no-one wishes to stand, there is a process of consulting with various groups, including the Australian Council of Community Nursing, the Australian New Zealand College of Mental Health Services, the Australian College of Midwives, the Australian Nursing Federation and the Royal College of Nursing. If there is a casual vacancy in an area of a member appointed by the minister, the minister can put forward a nomination and is required to consult with the respective body from which that person would normally come.

So, the opposition supports both the amendment to the bill and the bill itself in its amended form, and I hope that the matter is progressed through the parliament as quickly as possible. There is no justifiable reason why this measure has sat on the table for nine months now.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher): I want to make some brief points regarding this bill—not so much in terms of the mechanics of it, but some general points. We hear a lot about the shortage of nurses. In actual fact, there is not a shortage of nurses: there is a shortage of nurses who want to work in hospitals, and I suspect it has a lot to do with outdated rostering systems and other factors which militate against those who have a family commitment or who do not want to work the conventional early starts and late finishes and the combination of late start and early finish, which is about as sensible as what we do in this place.

In terms of the way in which we train nurses, I think it was an error to go into the totally focused university approach. I think we could have kept a balance and a combination of hospital-based training, capped off with a university-based program at the end of the initial training for hospital-based nurses. I know that if you talk to what I will call mature age nurses (for reasons of diplomacy and to protect my neck against attack, including attack by my oldest sister) they will readily tell you that the training they had, which was hospital-based, was superior. I do not necessarily accept that argument, but we went from one extreme to the other, and I think we need to look at bringing back some balance into the way in which we train nurses.

I accept that there are programs for enrolled nurses, as distinct from the program for those who become registered nurses. The enrolled nurse program can be undertaken through a private provider or through TAFE, but that does not really address the issue of whether or not we have the right balance in terms of the hospital-based component vis-a-vis the university-based component. I think it is appropriate that we revisit that issue. I am not seeking to downgrade the status of nurses, for whom I have great respect and admiration, but in literally throwing the baby out with the bath water I think we denied a lot of young people, particularly young women, the opportunity to come in through the traditional hospital-based system. We went from a system which provided low cost accommodation and a training allowance to one in which

young people entering nursing now pay for the privilege through a HECS component.

So, I think it was two steps forward and about three steps back. Many in the nursing profession say that this is about raising the status of nurses. That is an important aspect, but I do not think it should be the primary aspect in terms of determining what training program is offered to nurses. I believe that midwives are in a special category and that they feel threatened by some of the developments that have occurred over time. It is important that their special role is not devalued and that they are appreciated and recognised as skilled professionals.

As I said at the start, I realise that this bill is more about mechanics than anything else, but I think those things need to be picked up, hopefully in the near future, so that we get more people wanting to enter the nursing profession and so that the noble profession of nursing is available to not only those who have substantial means or whose families have substantial means, but also those who may not be well off.

The Hon. L. STEVENS (Minister for Health): I thank honourable members for their contributions to the debate and their support for the bill. In relation to the comments made by the member for Fisher, I want to say that those issues are indeed very important, and the government is taking them seriously and dealing with them in terms of the nurse recruitment and retention strategy. Each of those things, such as training and the issue of the balance of practical and theoretical training, is being examined. I am pleased at the interest of the member for Fisher, as well as the interest of the deputy leader, who I know also supports these measures.

Members should note that there is a further amendment which we will discuss in the committee stage, which has come about with the support of both the ANF and the Nurses Board, and I will speak about that when we get to the committee stage.

Bill read a second time.

In committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3.

The Hon. L. STEVENS: I move:

Page 3—

Line 9—Leave out ‘If’ and insert:

Subject to subsection (8), if

Lines 14 and 15—Leave out subsection (8) and insert:

- (8) If a casual vacancy occurs in the office of a member of the Board appointed under subsection (1)(b) within 12 months of that member's election under that subsection, the Governor must, subject to subsection (9), appoint the person who was the sole candidate not elected or excluded after the election of the fifth person at the election in which the member was elected.
- (9) If a person who would otherwise be appointed under subsection (8) is no longer qualified to be appointed, or is unavailable or unwilling to be appointed, then the Governor must appoint the last excluded person at the election in which the member was elected, or, if that person is no longer qualified to be appointed, or is unavailable or unwilling to be appointed, the second-last excluded person, and so on.
- (10) If there is no person qualified, or available or willing, to be appointed under subsection (9), then the Governor may make an appointment under subsection (6).
- (11) A person appointed to a casual vacancy under subsection (6), (8) or (9) will hold office for the balance of the term of that person's predecessor.

These amendments are the result of discussions with and the work of the ANF, and have been agreed to by the Nurses Board. Their purpose is to more truly reflect the outcomes of the election which would occur under the regulations. Members will note that these amendments apply if a casual vacancy occurs within 12 months of a board member's election—in other words, soon after the general election the person has, for whatever reason, resigned and created a casual vacancy—and this amendment means that the board's composition would truly reflect the results of the election.

Members should note that these amendments have been drafted on the advice of the state Electoral Commissioner, Mr Steve Tully, in conjunction with parliamentary counsel to ensure that the wording is in accordance with the procedures of the Electoral Commission. I commend the amendments to the committee.

Amendments carried; clause as amended passed.
 Clause 4 and title passed.
 Bill reported with amendments.
 Bill read a third time and passed.

LEGAL PRACTITIONERS (INSURANCE) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
 (Continued from 28 May. Page 3207.)

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg): This bill is designed to ensure that legal practitioners have current professional indemnity insurance. The opposition supports the bill. The law currently provides that a legal practitioner cannot obtain a practising certificate unless the practitioner is insured. Until recently, both the practising certificate and the standard insurance policy were issued on a calendar year basis, commencing on 1 January. However, the current insurance will expire on 30 June 2003, and arrangements have been made by the Law Society for a new policy to commence on 1 July. Thereafter, the period of insurance has been changed for the financial year (that is, to commence on 1 July).

The current practising certificate will continue until 31 December, and, if a practitioner does not obtain new insurance, that practitioner will be licensed to continue practising for the following six months without insurance. This bill ensures that such a practitioner will not be permitted to practise, and is consistent with the spirit of the act. It is designed to ensure consumer protection for those who deal with legal practitioners.

We are not debating the merits of the original legislation. If that were the case, I might have further comment. However, as we are simply filling the six month period, I indicate that the Liberal Party supports the bill, which I note is also being supported by the Law Society. I thank the Law Society for bringing this matter to the attention of the government.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I take it that this is insurance for lawyers, not insurance against lawyers! Member for Mitchell.

Mr HANNA (Mitchell): I agree with the comments of both the Attorney-General and the member for Bragg in relation to this bill. I disclose an interest in that I am a legal practitioner. In any case, I support the bill.

Mr RAU (Enfield): For the sake of completeness, I make a similar disclosure.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON (Attorney-General): I thank the members for Bragg, Mitchell and Enfield for their support for this necessary measure.

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

Mr SNELLING: Mr Deputy Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the house.

A quorum having been formed:

UNIVERSITY OF ADELAIDE (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
 (Continued from 2 April. Page 2707.)

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg): This bill was introduced into this house by the minister on 3 April 2003, following a period of consultation with interested stakeholders subsequent to the release of the discussion paper in June 2002. The proposals therein were apparently initiated by the University of Adelaide Council. Appropriately, the minister called for submissions and with the lapse of time a more extended period to the present submissions has been achieved. Regrettably, it appears that there had not been full consultation on the bill itself prior to its introduction to the house and, although I am aware that there have been some expressions of disappointment at that process, I am mindful of the importance of now getting on with the debate and amending the law where appropriate and where it will clearly be beneficial for the future of the university.

The Liberal Party in general supports the intent of the legislation and many of the proposed amendments. I will address areas of reservation of support, a foreshadowed amendment and, in some areas, complete opposition. I thank the minister for the opportunity to be briefed late last month by representatives from her office. I consider it always instructive and helpful to attempt, where possible, prior to debate to identify areas of possible compromise. Unfortunately, that has not been achieved in any areas, but it is clear that we have identified those areas of concern and where changes may simply not achieve the high expectation of the outcome foreshadowed.

The principal amendments to the bill as proposed by the government have been described by the minister as follows. In paraphrasing, I summarise as follows:

1. Change the current structure and processes of the University of Adelaide Council;
2. Increase freedom to operate within a more corporate structure and still meet community obligations and expectations;
3. Establish clearer lines of decision making, including powers of delegation while imposing heavy penalties for breaches of propriety, leading to loss or damage to the university;
4. Protect via statute the university's name and devices;
5. Remove restrictions on the disposal of freehold property, that is, land owned by the university but excluding land given in trust, such as North Terrace, Waite and Roseworthy campuses;
6. In recognition of the Academic Board, University Graduate Association and Students Association, making the presiding officer an ex officio member of the council;
7. Provide for the election of two graduate members to replace the current senate members;

8. Disband the senate as a formal body of review, giving the council the central decision-making power;

9. Provide for honorary awards to those whom the university thinks merit special recognition;

10. Ensure that the Adelaide University Union reports its financial position to the council. The University Union's autonomy is preserved, but sufficient information must be provided to the council for setting the fee for union membership.

I hope I have accurately summarised the position in relation to the government's intent and proposals in this reform as I understand it. When considering this bill, it would be inappropriate to view the University of Adelaide in isolation but as one of 38 universities across Australia. The life of our university is significantly influenced by federal jurisdiction, both by legislation and government policy.

The University of Adelaide was established here in South Australia before Federation. Indeed, it was the third university in Australia. All Australian universities, including private ones, such as Bond University and the University of Notre Dame, are incorporated by acts of parliament. The acts provide for the particular distinguishing feature of universities over other education institutions, namely, the power to confer degrees and other awards on a self-accrediting basis. Given that they consume a significant amount of public funds, and there is substantial public interest in accessibility of higher education, universities are accountable to the state and community at large.

Although the University of Adelaide Act is the responsibility of this parliament, its funding has been and remains substantially in the hands of the federal parliament and federal government. Significant reform in that arena occurred in 1988-89 when the federal Labor government amalgamated the colleges with the then universities. Recognising that the taxpayer could not afford a free public education and university for everybody, it then introduced the Higher Education Contribution Scheme (HECS). There was enormous outrage at the time against the then minister (Hon. John Dawkins), with claims that it would be the death of higher education. To his credit, I note that 14 years later the number of people in Australian universities has doubled and the proportion of population attending has doubled. Very significantly, the proportion of 18 year olds from the poorer socioeconomic status suburbs has gone from 19 per cent to 25 per cent in the 10 years leading up to 1998.

Under minister Hon. Amanda Vanstone, differential HECS was introduced, which clearly recognised the cost of delivery of courses and the substantial variation in the financial benefits of the graduates, depending on the type of course undertaken. More recently, the minister (Hon. Dr Brendan Nelson) has taken higher education and universities to a new era, and it is within that program laid out for the next 10 years, with a vision of outcomes leading up to 2020, that we consider the bill before us.

The current federal reform is based on two realities, namely, that Australian universities needed access to considerably more money and that the management, regulation and administration of universities needed improvement. After extensive consultation and, I think importantly, with the support of the leaders of Australian universities, universities will enjoy major reforms. New programs, supported by a massive increase in funding, namely, \$1.5 billion over four years will: first, ensure equity and a further increase in the participation of lower income Australians; secondly, provide the tools to measure and improve the quality,

particularly of teaching in universities; and, thirdly, facilitate diversity, that is, to create a system that encourages universities to be different. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

SHOP TRADING HOURS (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL 2003

Consideration in committee of the Legislative Council's amendments (resumed on motion).

(Continued from page 3442.)

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendments be disagreed to.

Today the Rann Labor government is delivering the most significant shop trading hours reforms in South Australian history. This is a victory for all South Australian families. This breaks the back of shop trading hours reform after 100 years of tinkering. Many said it could never be done, but it has been done and now the South Australian community will reap the benefits. The Labor package recognises the need for balance and provides 51 days of Sunday trading each year and shopping in the suburbs until nine o'clock during the week. Following an exchange of correspondence today with the Industrial Relations Commission, industrial relations concerns will be addressed. The Labor government's reforms will safeguard our competition policy payments. This is a package for all South Australians. All the stakeholders deserve acknowledgment. There has been a vigorous and mature debate, and that is why Labor has been able to crack open shop trading hours. I want to thank the Premier, my ministerial colleagues, my caucus colleagues, my staff and, in particular, Michael Ats.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: The opposition supports this motion. I want to make some observations in relation to this debate. In fact, we brought it to a head by announcing our position regarding deregulation a few weeks ago. As a result of that, this debate has flowed to this position. We entered the debate trying to protect South Australia's national competition payments, as a result of which, as we are all aware, deregulation was required.

We also continued to maintain the argument that we needed some certainty for industry in relation to the review of awards. I have spoken to the industry groups today, and they are happy with this outcome. If they are happy, the opposition is prepared to support the government's motion. All the retail awards will be subject to a section 99 review, which the industry will initiate as a priority. The commission has given an undertaking in writing to the house that consent matters will be dealt with by the end of this calendar year, and it will use its best endeavours to deal with those matters that need arbitration by the end of this calendar year. Given that written undertaking, the industry groups and the opposition are happy.

The opposition entered the debate seeking to protect national competition payments, to deregulate the industry in a South Australian model and to protect small business by having all the retail awards reviewed in a timely manner. We have achieved those outcomes, and we are pleased to have done so. In particular, we are pleased about the outcome in relation to business, which will have the opportunity to put its case before the commission and provide a competitive business environment to grow jobs, which we think is important for South Australia. We commend the motion to the house.

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: I rise to support the position we have reached on this issue. I well and truly welcome the fact that there is a negotiated agreement and a way forward, and it is good that we have come together finally on this issue. The general public had an expectation that, both houses of parliament having had their opportunity to have a say (which was important), we would now be able to reach agreement.

Today, I thank everyone who has been involved for the understanding that we needed to find a way ahead, and we needed to do so quickly. I also thank the Hon. Nick Xenophon in the other place for his role. I particularly want to thank the member for Davenport. All members of parliament were in a difficult position, because our various constituencies have had very differing views on shopping hours over a number of years. The party room and I asked the member for Davenport to try to find a position that would deliver on several issues: first, deregulation; and, secondly, the thorny issue of protecting the state from losing competition payments.

We wanted a mechanism whereby we would be certain that there would be a review of retail awards, which is fair to both workers and employers. Having talked to industry, we wanted certainty about what the future held. The package which has now been negotiated delivers on all those issues, and I think that is something for which all members of this place should be grateful.

I also thank all those in industry who have put an enormous amount of time into this issue over the last 12 months but, particularly over the last couple of weeks. It has been very difficult, because these industry organisations have many members and, within that membership, there are many points of view. Shopping hours is one of the most difficult issues that many of the executives of the industry organisations have had to handle.

I thank all those who have been able to manage a position from their various organisations and have come together as a group to help both parties find a way forward to give the certainty that is needed within the business community on this difficult issue. I thank them for their efforts. I hope that now we can see both industry and jobs grow in the state. We acknowledge that measures such as this do create a realignment in markets, and there are always winners and losers. However, over a number of years, we have moved ourselves into a position in which there have been some inequities because of the way it has been handled, and we have reached a stage where deregulation is the only way forward to give the certainty that industry requires.

I thank not only those who have negotiated this agreement today but also all those who have worked very hard in recent months to help us achieve this outcome.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I want to commend this outcome and, particularly, the Minister for Industrial Relations for outstanding work well done. We have just had an Economic Growth Summit, which occurred in this chamber with 280 delegates but which did not deal with the issue of shopping hours. However, what I said about that economic summit is that I wanted South Australia to be open for business. So, it was very important to show, as we did in the budget, on a whole range of matters (and I hope that we will get the support of the retail traders and others), that we wanted to send a clear signal to the business community that we are a pro business Labor government and, much more importantly, that we are a pro family Labor government.

The vast proportion of South Australian families want to have the freedom to shop on a Sunday afternoon. Why should

there be different rules in the city compared with the suburbs, whether it be Marion, Salisbury, Elizabeth, Noarlunga or elsewhere? That is the key question. Rather than total deregulation, we have taken a substantial, historic step forward. South Australia is open for business: that is the message that we are sending. Now it is over to the business community to show that it does increase jobs. I will be on their tail ensuring that the statements they have made, which I am sure have been made in all sincerity, ring true: choice for families, jobs growth, and a state that sends a signal to the nation that we are open for business.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: I want to congratulate the government and the opposition on the way in which they have handled this matter. I think that it could have been resolved much earlier. I want to acknowledge that it is being resolved because of the cooperation and effort of the opposition as much as the government. I also want to note the Premier's commitment to industrial relations and micro-economic reform.

This matter and the industrial relations reform issues that go with it were virtually missing from the Economic Development Board's framework and also were not discussed in any detail, or raised as a priority issue, during the summit. Economic and micro-economic reforms, such as shop trading hours and measures in the industrial relations reforms that must go with it, are a vital piece of reform if this state is to grow and prosper.

I congratulate the member for Davenport and the Leader of the Opposition, who have made this bill possible. The government has been dragged to the table with a more comprehensive and better bill than it introduced on the last occasion. I think that further reforms lie ahead, but this is a step forward. There will be changes now for small business. Change can be painful and it can be quite agonising. It is crucial now that the minister in the chamber today commit himself for the next two to three years to the issue of industrial relations reform and that the government take the view that it must be to the mutual benefit of employers, employees and, in particular, small business, so that all can benefit and prosper. Without a commitment to that reform, the shop trading hour changes could be meaningless, because they would impact unfairly on too many. I commend the motion to the house.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: We have heard from the Premier with great gusto that South Australia is open for business. The government is loud with its pro-business rhetoric but unfortunately very retarded and limited when it really counts and when one really wants to do things to help people in small business and regional and country South Australia.

The minister and the opposition have reached agreement. Unfortunately, these proposals still have in them the most draconian and unnecessary powers for inspectors. I will guarantee that the average small business operator and shopkeeper has no idea that these people have the ability to march into their premises armed with these draconian powers, with no regard for their personal privacy or wellbeing. This minister has gone on record time after time as an agent for public servants: whatever proposal they put up, he accepts.

Let me make it very clear to the minister, the public servants and the bureaucrats: the first time they go into a shop or a business in my electorate and act unreasonably, they will be named in this parliament. I do not care what they think of me, because the average person is greatly disadvantaged when they are being confronted by these little apparatchiks. They are unsympathetic to business. It is like putting a

uniform on some of these people: they are like turkey gobblers. They get all puffed up with hot air, go red in the face and think that they are important.

In a democracy, people do not have to put up with that sort of behaviour. The Premier can laugh. He has never run a private business. The Premier or his family have never been confronted by some of these people, and it is not democratic. I thought that this government believed in democracy, but it empowers people and has two sets of rules. Inspectors are untouchable but, if a person stands up for their rights, they are subject to a \$25 000 fine. When I want to put a proposal in the legislation to reverse that, the government will not agree with it. People have to resort to their members of parliament coming in here to stick up for them.

The Hon. Dean Brown interjecting:

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: I intend to; make no mistake about it, because I know how they act. They are unsympathetic and uncaring because they think they are important. I am pleased that agreement has been reached. I am very unhappy that the welfare of ordinary people who do not have the ability to defend themselves has been overlooked. I say to the business people: be very careful when you agree to these sorts of things. It will not affect the big operators. One telephone call and the government would back off at 100 km/h, because they have the best QCs. The average shopkeeper does not have that ability. The little shopkeeper in the Mitcham Shopping Centre does not have that ability. Last Thursday night, on my way home, I called in there to get a *Stock Journal*—and I suggest that he reads this week's *Stock Journal* because it will enlighten him—

The Hon. M.D. Rann: I hope that you are not reflecting on my time living in the bush in New Zealand.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Members need to get back to the amendments.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: I think the Premier has long since forgotten his country roots. He has been consumed by the metropolis of Adelaide and has forgotten about his country roots. I am pleased that we have reached a sensible outcome. I know that the Leader of the Opposition played a very important role in the action he took in that, and he is to be commended for it. As for this so-called pro-business attitude that the Premier has spoken about, I hope that he starts to put it into effect, because the legislation that has been passed through this parliament (and the restrictions on people's individual liberty) is something to be questioned and something of which we should really take careful note.

I make it very clear what is going to happen. The first time one of these little characters does it, they will be named and I will move a motion on them in the house. I tell people to stick up for their rights when they come and hassle them. They do not have to put up with it. The difference between this place and a Mugabe-type regime is that people have rights and they can defend themselves.

Mr SCALZI: I, too, congratulate the shadow minister on what he has been able to achieve. However, I still have reservations about the changes. I do not think it is the great, historic moment that people are talking about, a 30-year change. I believe that it is wrong for an unelected body, such as the National Competition Council, to bring us to this point. I believe that, in the long run, the only change will be the transformation from small business to large business, not for increased competition but for increased market concentration. There will be little gain for a lot of pain, but I acknowledge that there has been an agreement, and I welcome what the opposition has been able to achieve.

Motion carried.

The CHAIRMAN: Before reporting to the chair, I wish to make a brief comment. I have been interested in this matter for a long time and I commend the Minister for Industrial Relations, the Premier, the member for Davenport and the Leader of the Opposition for dealing with this matter in a statesmanlike way. It is important that small, medium and large business have certainty and know what is ahead of them so that they can plan.

The cooperation that has been shown in sorting out this matter has been excellent. Those members who were here after midnight last night would know that there was an air of gloom. I am pleased that things have progressed substantially since then, and I am heartened by the commitment of the government to assist small business in this transition period. I will be making sure that that assistance is provided.

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH (Minister for Tourism): I move:

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

Motion carried.

PROHIBITION OF HUMAN CLONING BILL

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill without any amendment.

RESEARCH INVOLVING HUMAN EMBRYOS BILL

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill without any amendment.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (WATER CONSERVATION PRACTICES) BILL

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill with the amendments indicated by the following schedule, to which amendments the Legislative Council desires the concurrence of the House of Assembly:

No. 1. Page 4, lines 15 and 16 (clause 4)—Leave out paragraph (b) and insert:

(b) the Minister should give consideration—

- (i) to the impact that the regulation would have on any rights or entitlements arising under or by virtue of any licences or permits granted under this act; and
- (ii) to the provisions of any relevant water allocation plan, and of any other relevant part of this act.

No. 2. Page 4, lines 27 and 28 (clause 4)—Leave out paragraph (c).

UNIVERSITY OF ADELAIDE (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading (resumed on motion). (Continued from page 3455).

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg): For the first time in history and in our lifetime, we will now see some of our Australian universities reach the top 100 universities in the world, something which has escaped us to date and which is clearly critical if we are to develop a higher education and an international education industry. South Australia can, and should, share in the opportunities and, of course, it is up to us all to support South Australia's stake in that regard. I am

proud of South Australia's three universities, having watched the birth of one of them in my lifetime and, in particular, the development of the Law School. I trained and obtained qualifications at the other two, and I now have two sons undertaking degrees.

I turn, firstly, to the composition of the council. The Hon. Brendan Nelson stated on 16 May 2003, in respect of university governance and the government's proposal:

It involves actually trying to see that universities are administered and governed according to at least reasonably modern business practice in terms of size, the professional development of people in governing councils. How can you possibly accept that we are, on the one hand, trying to pursue excellence and then, on the other, have university governing councils with as large as 35 on them, average 21, business expertise ranging from zero per cent to 68 per cent and, in some cases, no expertise at all?

Accordingly, we must ask: where does the University of Adelaide sit in this regard? Looking at relatively recent history, I considered the restructuring of the governance of each of the South Australian universities in 1996. The then minister (Hon. Bob Such) had commissioned an independent review, chaired by Mr Alan McGregor AO, to consider the issue. The structure had been subject to little change for many years. The McGregor report (as it was known) was delivered in February 1996, and reiterated the function of university councils. Importantly, it was not to develop as a managerial body. The report indicated that the council should be a smaller, more cohesive body, which should concentrate on policy, strategy, review, management, performance and capacity and, in particular, that membership and size of the council should comprise not more than 20 members; and, further, that the composition should also change, providing for a significant shift, with the introduction of external members. This would help to develop medium and long-term visions for the universities.

Accordingly, as a result of amendments passed in this house, the University of Adelaide council, like the University of South Australia and Flinders University councils, was, first, reduced to 20, with the power for appointment of a co-opted member if desired by the council; secondly, reduced in internal academic representation; and, thirdly, increased in external members to bring expertise from the broader community. This new structure was introduced largely with the support of the opposition, and the university governance entered a new era. Interestingly, there was no attempt at that time to sever the role of the senate, which had a longstanding association with and direct involvement in university governance.

In the context of the federal minister's comments two weeks ago, the University of Adelaide is already at a high level of preparation to embrace the future opportunities for universities in Australia. I note that, at the time of the announcement of the federal budget, considerable reference was made to the federal inquiry, and the Hon. Brendan Nelson, in the document entitled 'Our universities backing Australia's future', had published an attachment to set out the proposed national governance protocols for higher public education institutions. That sets out some very clear guidelines, or protocols, and I think it is important that they be considered, at least, during the adjourned consideration of this matter, which I think inevitably will occur. There will be an opportunity to consider those protocols; otherwise, given that they are so important in relation to ultimate funding entitlements, this government may need to consider some further

amendments. Nevertheless, they are matters with which I think we need to be familiar.

In the context of the federal minister's comments, the University of Adelaide is already at a high level of preparation to embrace the future opportunities for universities in Australia. Let us consider the composition of the university's council at present. It is led by the Chancellor, Robert Champion de Crespigny AO, with the appointed members, Mr Ross Adler AO, Ms Kate Castine, Mr Brian Crozer AO, Mr Ian Kowalick, Ms Pamela Martin and Mr Stephen King. I suggest that that already brings an extraordinary level of business and commercial enterprise to the council. So, what else do we need to change? I need to traverse the last 13 months to answer that question, as it is now clear that this debate is really about the abolition of the senate.

In April 2002, I was given the privilege of being appointed Liberal spokesperson on education, including universities. Almost immediately, I was invited to meet with the Chancellor on 15 May to discuss proposed reforms, and I did so. This was at a time when the university had been facing some financial difficulty. Indeed, the 2001 financial year had recorded in excess of a \$6 million loss, and some faculties appeared to be struggling to attract and secure growth. There was a temporary vice chancellor in place, having been appointed after a period of some apparent management difficulties. I was presented with an argument that appeared meritorious, given the surrounding circumstances.

Shortly after that time, the conclusion of the 2002 financial year occurred and, as we now more recently know, an operating surplus of \$12.4 million was recorded, and I am pleased to note that there was a significant increase in the net asset position. At the time of the meeting with the Chancellor, I was informed that there would be a proposed consultation period, with a view to a bill's being introduced within a few months. The proposals were outlined in a one-page memorandum dated 1 May 2002, which I will read, as follows:

The changes can be grouped into four general themes, of which the major one relates to the council as the governing body.

1. The governing body.
 - 1.1. Making its membership structure more consistent with the membership of the councils of the other two South Australian universities.
 - 1.2. Incorporating best practice provisions in respect of council members' activities, including conflict of interest, good faith, obligations of care and diligence, misconduct and responsibilities being to the council and not an electorate.
 - 1.3. Clarifying the powers of the governing body.
 - 1.4. Including provision about the frequency and nature of meetings and the use of the university seal.
2. Clarification of the purposes and powers of the university.
3. Providing for the Vice Chancellor to be the university's Chief Executive Officer.
4. Establishing an academic board as an advisory body to the council and making its convener a member ex officio of council.
5. Including greater accountability requirements on the Adelaide University Union (the student union).

The memorandum further states:

In recognising that council is the sole governing body of the university, the council has agreed that there is no longer a role for the Senate as presently defined in the University of Adelaide Act 1971. The university remains committed to involving its graduates in the life of the university but intends to continue to do this through its alumni association, which has been functioning for nearly 20 years, rather than through the Senate. It is pleasing that the three members of university council elected by the Senate (Mr Michael Abbott QC, Dr Harry Medlin and the honourable Justice John Perry) all support the abolition of the Senate.

The document is dated 1 May 2002. I seek leave to conclude my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (WATER CONSERVATION PRACTICES) BILL

Consideration in committee of the Legislative Council's amendments.

(Continued from page 3458.)

The Hon. J.D. HILL: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendments be agreed to.

I thank both houses for dealing with this measure so promptly. It is important that we get it in place by the end of this calendar month. The water restrictions will come in place from 1 July. This legislation gives us the tools that we require to do it and, while a number of issues and questions were raised by members in both houses (and they did make reasonable points), I think that they were addressed in both chambers. I am grateful to all members for dealing with this expeditiously, and I particularly thank the shadow minister for his assistance in that respect.

Mr BRINDAL: The opposition notes the amendments from the other place and is supportive of the amendments, as it was with the bill as it left this place. I have discussed the matter with the minister and he believes, and I support his belief, that the amendments from the other place are constructive and add to the bill. Could I just say for the minister's information that the Water Restrictions Act, as it passes through this parliament, has started to engender strong debate among some of my colleagues, and perhaps some of his, because, I think, the house is becoming, with these water restrictions, more acutely aware of a profound shift that has occurred over the last five or 10 years that water is now a tradeable property right.

I do not know whether the minister saw the same article in the newspaper this morning where the Prime Minister and the federal government are now hotly debating issues of water property rights. They are debating whether people such as Rupert Murdoch and Collins Street farmers should be able to own water, or whether water should be attached to land. I just say that in the context of this because, while we accept this and while it is part of the current policy, I think that the minister will be aware that, as members in this chamber become more aware, we are in a profoundly new area and it will have impact on the way in which people can farm, what they can farm and where they can farm it, and it is prescriptive law.

I think that, in the future as we debate this, we will probably need more time for both sides of the chamber to come to grips with it and then consider it in this chamber. But we do support this bill. It is part of the current thrust. I just alert the minister to the fact that all our colleagues are getting more excited about this issue, so we will probably devote more time to it in the future. However, I commend the bill as amended to the committee.

Mr HANNA: I take a keen interest in the bill. I received the schedule of amendments made by the Legislative Council just five minutes ago. There are two items: the first is fairly self-explanatory; and the second I do not understand without further elucidation from the minister. All that members of this house receive is something that says that clause 4C should be left out. Could the minister briefly explain the implications of that?

The Hon. J.D. HILL: I thank the member for Mitchell. I apologise, I perhaps should have referred to that when I

spoke. As I understand it, the second amendment was really an amendment that was consequential on one of the amendments that had been moved in this house when we first dealt with it and it had been inadvertently left in the bill. I can find out exactly which amendment it related to, if the honourable member wishes, but it is really just a consequential amendment.

Motion carried.

UNIVERSITY OF ADELAIDE (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading debate (resumed on motion).

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg): Now that we have completed trading hours and water—those other minor things in the state—we can come back to this important bill concerning the University of Adelaide. I have just referred to the memorandum that was provided to me and read into *Hansard*. It is that which was provided at the meeting with the Chancellor on 1 May 2002. I noted that there appeared to be support of the three representatives from the Senate, and I was informed that there was a general support from senior members of government, including, of course, the minister. I took the opportunity to read the strategic plan 2001-05 for the university, which had been approved by the council on 26 November 2001 and which identified the following:

The mission of Adelaide University is to contribute to the wealth and wellbeing of South Australia and the international community through educational research and community service of distinction.

Reference to a commitment to the highest international standards all reflected the university's entering a period of clear understanding of the real world and participation at a global level. However, it was still unclear to me as to how and why the abolition of the Senate, and its direct representation on the council, would be a positive move. In June 2002, a discussion paper on the review of the University of Adelaide Act 1971 was issued by the minister, inviting submissions by the 19 July 2002.

The discussion paper identified that the minister had received a submission from the University of Adelaide council outlining a number of areas that the council had presented for reform, including the governance. In respect of the senate, at page 24 it outlined as follows:

10.2 (ss.18 and 19) The senate.

10.2.1 The senate is constituted by the present act and comprises all graduates, staff members with appropriately recognised degrees from other higher education institutions and postgraduate students.

10.2.2 The senate has three primary functions.
(i) To consider any matters referred to it by the council (the council has not referred any such matters for many, many years).
(ii) To elect three members of the council (it is proposed in para. 5.2 above that the three members be appointed in a different way).
(iii) To approve statutes and regulations of the university (it is proposed in para. 10 above that all statutes and regulations become rules and that neither the senate nor the governor's approval be required).

10.2.3 Consequently, there is no role left for the senate. The university remains committed to maintaining relationships with its graduates but does this and will continue to do this through its Alumni Association. The effective abolition of the senate would avoid the dichotomy of there being two graduate bodies, the senate and the Alumni Association, and would make

it clear that council is the sole governing body. The changes in governance, accountability, responsibility and operation of universities in the 127 years since the senate was first established, make its role now superfluous.

That is what was outlined in the submission presented by the University of Adelaide council.

As my inquiry into this matter progressed and submissions were received, it became clear that:

- (a) there was clearly not universal support for this proposal, notwithstanding the observation by the Chancellor, and
- (b) there was still a view, very strongly held by some, that the senate, although unique relative to other universities, had been and remained an important part of governance.

Quite possibly, there was some wishful thinking on the part of the Chancellor at this time. For the purposes of this debate, I do not attempt to make any judgment in relation to that, nor do I consider it would be constructive, but I do observe that it would have been quite reasonable at that time for members of the government to rely on this assertion by the Chancellor in pressing ahead with this part of this reform package. I expect it has caused some hurt and angst in the process, but the real issue to be considered is whether the abolition of the senate is necessary and a positive step forward for the university, particularly in the light of the recognition of the current proposal that members of the graduate community would still have representation on the council.

For the purpose of considering this matter, I have read submissions by and consulted with current members of the senate, and have valued their time and consideration. A range of views has been presented, even within that community.

I have read the Senate select committee final report of October 2001 which recommended, after conducting its own survey and consultation process, in summary:

1. the consultative and electoral rolls of the senate be retained but revised;
2. the standing committee's consultative role be clearly set out in its provision of consultation, resolution and advice and securing its opportunity to address the council on behalf of the graduate community with a review after a period of three years;
3. enshrining in the act the consultative role for election processes; and
4. there be no changes to the provision of section 22 of the act and that the provisions for annual meetings be enhanced and strengthened.

I confirm that I have paraphrased these recommendations: that is as I understand the Senate select committee's final report of October 2001.

It was therefore not surprising when I read the submission presented by Mr Warren Rogers, warden of the senate, dated 19 July 2002 that the proposed abolition of the senate was not universally acclaimed or welcomed. I refer to page 3 of the submission on this point, which states:

The existing act is not regarded as satisfactory, either by the senate or by the council, but each body takes a radically different position as to the appropriate amendments.

1. The Senate's preferred position is to amend section 12(1)(c) of the present act to give effect to the report of the Select Committee of the Senate on the future of the senate. That report was unanimously adopted by the senate in November 2002 but has been rejected by the council. It is respectfully suggested that the minister should examine this report. In addition to redefining the role of the senate and the structure of its standing committee, it recommends that section 12(1)(c) of the act be amended to provide that only graduates

of the university, as distinct from other members of the senate (see section 18(1)(b) of the act), should be entitled to elect the three members of council referred to in section 12(1)(c). The Alumni Association is willing to make its role of graduates available to implement that change.

In addition to making the membership role of the Alumni Association available for the election of council members by graduate members of the senate, the report of the select committee envisages that the Alumni Association, through its chapters, will cooperate in the appointment of the standing committee of the senate to achieve a wider representation of graduates on that committee. The principle which underpins the report of the senate committee and the continuance of the senate is the accountability of the council to the wider university community. The senate is the only forum representative of that community in which matters of concern to that community can find expression. Section 18(5) of the act provides:

The senate must consider and determine without undue delay any matters submitted for its consideration by the council and it may initiate discussion on any matter pertaining to the university and may make reports and recommendations to the council upon such matter. It therefore provides a forum in which both graduates and academic staff are able to participate directly and in their capacity as individuals in the affairs of the university. There is no limit on the range of issues of concern to the university community which may be discussed. Abolition of the senate would bring no benefit to the university.

I also refer to the submission made by Dr Harry Medlin, who is currently a member of the council elected by the senate. He has a longstanding association with this university, and many others internationally, and has served for almost 35 years on the council. His contribution has been most valuable. In relation to the senate, I am mindful of his comments and refer particularly to paragraph 3 of his submission, as follows:

I would have thought that it goes almost without saying that a governing body is or should be answerable per se to the movement which it serves. The words 'answerable', 'accountable' and 'responsible' are commonly misconstrued, in my opinion, as synonyms. I regard 'answerable' as the more rigorous and, within my experience, the more incumbent both upon and within universities. Academics, for example, are answerable to their students, to their colleagues, to their families, to their professions, to their departments and faculties, to their governing bodies and to the community at large which supports and sustains them, and also to the community's managerial infrastructure. It seems to me that the discussion paper contemplates the removing of any obligation upon either the university or, indeed, its governing body, the council to be answerable to anyone or anything. It proposes to abolish the upper house (the senate) and also to abolish any requirement for any review either by the senate or, indeed, by the governor. Even though the Governor is no longer the visitor to the university, there presently remains a much to be desired safety value, as well understood and valued in our democratic society.

On the other hand, I have read and heard claims that the senate is best described as an archaic and ineffectual body, and the question has been raised as to whether it truly represents the graduates of the university. I should say at this point (and I think I have already indicated) that I am a graduate of the University of Adelaide, which I believe should at least be recorded.

However, this may not be a fair assessment when it is clear that the senate continues in a useful and active role. Indeed, the incorporation of amendments in this bill to protect the name of the university reminds me of their value. In recent years, it has become a practice for stationery (letterheads and the like) to refer to the University of Adelaide as 'Adelaide University'. Clearly, this is not its official title, and I understand that this deficiency in practice was alluded to by

senate representatives. I am pleased to see that this deficit is to be remedied in the current amendments, but let it not be said that the senate has not continued to make a contribution right up to the threat of its extinction.

Notwithstanding the diverse contributions, it appears quite clear that the government is determined to proceed with abolition. In those circumstances, I want to first record my appreciation, both as a graduate of the university and as a member of the broader South Australian community, for the 127 years of dedicated contribution by members of the senate to the protection and advancement of the university.

What remains is the question as to what should be done to protect the accountability of the council to the wider community. The Liberal Party agrees to support the government on its course for abolition of the senate, but will introduce an amendment to secure a forum by which the university community may ask questions and raise concerns to the council. This will take the form of a requirement for an annual general meeting to be held, notice of the same being properly published within the community, with the availability of the council to both answer questions and to respond to concerns. This meeting should also have the opportunity to pass resolutions and facilitate an address by the Vice Chancellor.

I understand from my initial briefing with the minister's representative that the government does not favour this initiative, but I hope that, in the course of this debate, there may be some reconsideration of that. The Liberal Party's view is that this is an important mechanism for the university's protection, but, probably more importantly, to ensure that the university community goes forward without loss of goodwill, initiative and wisdom.

I return now to the other amendments proposed to the principal act, particularly the composition and function of the council. With the abolition of the senate, it is said that the proposed council membership will reflect the membership of the other university councils and, to some extent, that is correct.

The convenor of the academic board and the President of the Students Association will be made ex officio members of the council, together with two elected academic staff, two elected general staff and two students (one undergraduate and one post-graduate). Representation in these areas will be the same across each of the universities. As the act currently provides for three elected academic staff and three students, there are consequential amendments for reduction to accommodate the ex officio inclusions.

The President of the Adelaide University Union is seeking that the ex officio member representing the student community be a representative of the Adelaide University Union. They present the case that the annual student fee is set and collected by the union board, that the union provides students with not only political representation but also an extensive variety of groups and services across the campuses; further, that it represents all students. It is pointed out that none of its affiliates, including the students' association, is universally represented.

These are important arguments, and I thank Ms Heath for her submission. However, the Adelaide University Union is more of a union of students than a union as a representative body in the strict sense. The students' association clearly has a specific role and would be an appropriate body to recognise for the purpose of council membership.

It is suggested that the association, of its own resolution, may progress towards cessation in the future. If and when that

occurs, and in the absence of a successor, that matter could be reviewed. As an aside, I note that media reports in recent weeks claim that the federal minister is preparing a proposal for voluntary union membership, but the fate of that has yet to be determined. However, if this occurred, the union representation argument would be considerably weakened, and the Chancellor, Vice Chancellor and the power to co-opt would remain the same across each of the universities.

Essentially, the difference that would remain would be that Flinders University and the University of SA would each have 10 members appointed by a council selection process. Although the Adelaide University will no longer have the three senate elected members, it would continue to have its seven members appointed by council and three members representing the graduate community. So, they would still have 10 each in this total category but, of course, the University of Adelaide would have seven external members and three representatives of the graduate community.

Thus, even under the government's proposal, council membership would not be the same across each of the three universities. The University of Adelaide would still have fewer external members (only seven compared to 10, leaving aside the Chancellor) and have the legislatively protected graduate representation. I seek assurance that the presiding officer of the graduate association, currently the Alumni Association, will actually be available. Apparently, the Alumni Association has seen itself as a fund-raising and friend-raising body, and thus its preparedness to be involved needs to be clarified. I look forward to the minister's giving that indication. It is most important, particularly given the unique history of the university senate, that there be direct graduate representation, and I will deal with the machinery of the elections, etc., during the committee stage.

As to the seven council appointees, currently appointed on recommendation of a selection committee (section 12(1)(b) of the principal act), that selection committee consists of the Chancellor and six other persons appointed by him in accordance with the guidelines determined by the council. Given the proposed abolition of the senate and the increased responsibility and power of the council, it is critical that the process of appointment of external persons should be both open and transparent. I note that a submission on this matter has been presented to the minister by other senior members in the university community. As there is no amendment forthcoming from the government, I indicate that this will be introduced by the opposition. It is proposed that there be some recognition and clear instruction as to the membership of the committee, and that this should include:

- (1) a nominee of the academic board;
- (2) two graduates selected by the same process as those elected to the council; and
- (3) one elected staff member.

It may be that there are others that should be appropriately represented. I would be happy to receive some indication from the minister, if she considers that others would be suitable. However, this is not an amendment, having discussed it with a member of her department, that appears to have received any sympathy, but I again seek that it be reviewed by this government.

Then there is the delegation of powers by the council. This was another important area in relation to the accountability of the council in an environment where it will be free of the senate. Currently, section 10 of the act provides that the council may delegate any of its powers to any officer or employee of the university. It is restricted in the sense that it

can only be delegated to a person. The council, the Liberal Party says, should continue to have a power of delegation. That is not an issue. For the purpose of carrying out a particular task, this is frequently a power used, that is, to direct the Vice Chancellor to conclude, finalise or sign off on a particular project on behalf of the council.

The government suggests that the amendment, in particular the substitution of a new delegation provision is, first, to clarify the power of delegation, including the power of subdelegation, where the instrument of delegation so provides; secondly, to provide protection against abuse by requiring the delegation to be in writing (and that is revocably at the will of the council); and, thirdly, that the clause is similar to the University of South Australia Act. That is the basis upon which they present this amendment to the delegation power. The concern I raise, irrespective of whether it is in the University of South Australia Act or not, is that this new provision is much wider than is desirable or necessary. In particular, the unique aspect of this amendment against the usual powers of delegation down the hierarchy is to specifically provide for the delegation to a committee.

In an environment of reform, which will increase powers to the council, it is not surprising that there is some alarm at this proposal. Effectively, council could, for an indefinite period, delegate powers up to small committees under this new proposal. In those circumstances it would be very important to limit the specific issue or air of responsibility to be delegated and limit the duration to ensure that the council would then have to reconsider, after a fixed time, an extension, variation or revocation of the matters delegated.

Having looked at the federal protocol, I also draw attention to the fact that that protocol will suggest that the institution must have its objectives specified in enabling legislation and that in relation to the question of delegating power it would seem, first, as the institution's governing body, the council should adopt a statement of its primary responsibilities and the institution's governing body should not delegate approval of any listed primary responsibilities. Given that that is the federal protocol, I suggest that, first, the delegation power in the principal act at present fits within that protocol as to the delegation power and, secondly, that it would be unwise to introduce a new delegation power without having attended to these other requirements. Even if it were to introduce this new delegation power and limit in definition and time, as I have indicated, that may be a very difficult drafting exercise. Therefore, it is the Liberal Party's proposal that this amendment be opposed and that the current powers in section 10 of the act remain. It appears to have worked well to date, and there is no evidence presented as to why it is necessary. I suggest that it hardly clarifies the power, actually provides no protection and the current provision is working well.

I note also in the discussion paper under 3.9.4 on page 13 proposals relating to the conduct of the business of the council and in particular the capacity to make resolutions with contributions from council members not necessarily being physically present but being able to submit a statement in writing and to hold meetings using remote forms of communications, that is, teleconferences. I understand that the minister considered this, but there is no inclusion of these proposals in the current bill. Given the requirements for personal attendance of members of council, if an emergency situation arose and the council was desirous of convening hurriedly to revoke a delegation that may have been abused, then this may be difficult to achieve. I urge the minister not

to proceed with this redefinition of delegation power, to keep the power of delegation, which is quite proper and which has worked well, and is in order as it is currently.

I now return to the amendment to the principal act in this bill, which proposes to introduce and detail the responsibilities and obligations of council members and the imposition of penalties. At present the council may remove an appointed or elected member of council from office in circumstances of mental or physical incapacity, failing to comply with council requirements, that is, the attendance at meetings, who is convicted of an indictable offence or for serious misconduct. The act then makes provision for filling of the council vacancy. The government proposes to insert provisions apparently to provide a greater level of honesty and accountability in respect of council members in keeping with the increasing commercial operations of the council.

I note that legislation recently passed through this house incorporating amendments to the Public Corporations Act 1993 that will impose similar obligations on public corporations. I note, too, that (and I may be corrected if I am wrong) notwithstanding when we debated that legislation, a list of public corporations was provided which included the three universities in South Australia, and the Public Corporations Act 1993 in the definition specifically excludes the universities. I am not suggesting that the legislation we recently passed applies to three universities, but it seems to be similar in form to match that legislation.

However, as I understand it, the government is committed to press for these amendments to be included, which will principally require council members to: first, exercise a reasonable degree of care and diligence or face a fine of up to \$20 000 if they are culpably negligent in the performance of their functions; secondly, act honestly or face the same fine or imprisonment for four years; and, thirdly, disclose conflicts of interest both as to matters under consideration or where contracts are entered into and there is some personal or pecuniary interest to be acquired or face the same fines. This provision covers a member, his or her spouse and extended family.

I note the council itself, as outlined on page 13, paragraph 3.10, points 11 and 12, of its submission, invited reform to incorporate obligations to be clearly set out in respect of conflict of interest, care and diligence and to act in good faith. Indeed, they refer to the current provisions of the University of Tasmania Act 1992. Interestingly, that legislation only seeks to impose directions as to care and diligence and to act in good faith.

Although this would clearly be considered as contemporary legislation for universities, it seems that they are content not to codify obligations in relation to conflict of interest and, importantly, they have not included any penalties for breach of responsibilities in these areas. It should be noted that, in section 8(3), the Tasmanian act imposes 'primary responsibility and accountability of council members to the council over any other constituent body'. Section 9.2 provides:

The council must act in a way to advance the best interests of the university.

Section 11(3)(b) provides:

Exercising 'business judgment' is not to have a material personal interest in the subject matter of the judgment with qualifications of rational belief of a 'reasonable person'.

That all seems complicated, but I think it is important for the government to consider that legislation. I note that it also seems to be far more in line with the federal protocols, and

I think it is important that, where possible, we accommodate those. The most significant issue is that this university is perhaps one of the most recent to have reformed its governance. It is clear that, on its assessment, whilst there should be provision for care, diligence, acting in good faith and having primary responsibility and accountability of the council over and above all other interests and that it not have a material interest, these are the contemporary issues which I suggest are consistent with the council's original submission but which are a far cry from what is contained in this bill.

From further research I note that no other university in Australia imposes on its council members financial or imprisonment penalties in relation to these obligations. I think that is very significant. It is fair to say that, from those who have spoken to me or forwarded written submissions, the imposition of penalties (not included, as I have said, anywhere else in contemporary university acts or in Australia) has caused shock, dismay and offence. These submissions have probably been even more impassioned than those in relation to the abolition of the senate, which aroused some level of distress as well.

It may be that other universities in Australia have suffered loss as a result of council members acting to the detriment of their university. However, in the absence of any single example of such conduct or, alternatively, such conduct occurring and dismissal by the council not being effected, I suggest that their reaction is completely explicable. One must bear in mind that council members accept their appointment on a voluntary capacity. In my experience, when members are appointed to the University of Adelaide Council, it is with honour and a genuine dedication to the future and success of the university. Thankfully, they have this recognition and, indeed, some status, because quite obviously they do not receive any personal reward or compensation for their valuable experience, wisdom and time.

The recent move by this government to bring in all manner of public servants, contractors and employees of public bodies has captured (obviously deliberately) some other boards whose members act on a voluntary capacity—for example, the Festival Centre Trust, the board under the dried fruits act and the wine centre act. Those examples have been given. However, I did not agree with the extent to which that legislation was there then and I do not agree with it now.

Here we have volunteers. I suggest that it is a far cry from what is reasonably necessary, that is, to impose financial penalties and imprisonment of up to four years on the directors. Even some rapists face less penalty in sentencing. In short, the university council has not asked for it, no other university has it, and there is no track record to justify it.

Whilst recognising the government's direction in this regard, the Liberal Party will move an amendment to at least delete the penalties. On balance, this will ensure that council members clearly have notice of their obligations from the amendments presented by the government and that they will face sanctions of forfeiture of their seat on the council if they are guilty of the same. It would be a tragedy if legislation such as this were in any way to deter honest, decent and valuable men and women who are otherwise willing to give their time freely to the university. I particularly say that because at least two submissions were put to me from another university community in South Australia outlining the concern they have that this type of legislation will indeed do just that, that is, deter those who are otherwise willing to come forward and offer their time freely to the university. So,

I again plead with the government to reconsider seriously the detriment to the university if this were to occur.

In conclusion, I am concerned that this regime of penalties will also be imposed on other universities in South Australia. It seems clearly on the government's agenda. Let us stop further distress and angst that will surely follow and ensure that a bad precedent is not set. With the abolition of the senate and the proposed removal of regulations, significant amendments to sections 22 and 23 are consequential. The council will also have power to constitute and regulate the academic board and other boards of the university and will have the power to specify that offences be tried by a tribunal established by a statute or rule of the university. An apparent safeguard is a procedure for variation or revocation of the statute or rule and that a statute does not come into operation until confirmed by the Governor. I understand that there is some other pressing business. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debated adjourned.

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

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

I move:

That the sitting of the house be extended beyond 6 p.m.

Motion carried.

MATTERS OF PRIVILEGE

The SPEAKER: I rise to address the house on a matter of privilege, to which I drew attention earlier in the sittings this afternoon. I point out to the house that I received a letter on Thursday 23 January 2003 from the member for Playford about a matter of privilege. It arose from investigations he undertook in early December 2002 into a matter of concern to him as a member of parliament. He has shown me a copy of a letter that he wrote, which is dated 4 December 2002, seeking information from people, whom he told me were lawyers, about their involvement in an anonymous attack to discover from them if they were involved in that anonymous attack upon the Attorney-General.

In his letter to them, he told them that he would 'be taking further steps in this regard tomorrow afternoon', which, of course, meant in the parliament because parliament was sitting at that time. He stated that, in the interest of fairness he wanted to 'give you', that is, the person to whom he had addressed such letters, 'the opportunity to confirm or deny your involvement in the campaign'. Every detail in the step he took to that point was entirely proper and utterly responsible in every particular. He concluded his letter by saying, 'Your prompt reply before that time will avoid any misunderstanding.'

At least one of the people to whom he wrote responded immediately stating that his, that is, the member for Playford's, letter was 'menacing, ill-informed and grossly offensive'. The writer then demanded that he, that is, the member for Playford, 'provide me with the name or names of your anonymous informants as a matter of urgency'. The member for Playford received a similar response from some other lawyers to whom he also wrote. They have now taken the matter to court, demanding the information. In the meantime, he wrote to me as I have related, expressing alarm at the implications for parliamentary privilege, should such actions and demands be entertained and supported by a court, and sought my opinion of the matter.

I have read widely on the history of this matter and similar matters, and more carefully considered more than a dozen learned opinions, not only in our jurisdiction but in courts elsewhere in this country, as well as historically similar provincial and national jurisdictions elsewhere in the world. I have revisited many of those during the last several weeks.

I am astonished that lawyers could make such a demand in this day and age after such an overwhelming amount of opinion on the matter, all of which concludes that, since the Bill of Rights of 1688, it is not lawfully possible to obtain from, leave alone to make demands of a member of parliament for, their parliamentary papers relating to a matter which they are investigating in the public interest in the performance of their duties as members of parliament, however subjectively any observer may consider that they, the honourable members, have been or are pursuing such matters.

May I remind the house of the traditions and conventions of its proceedings as they relate to the retention of privileges of the parliament, held by the parliament and not challenged or challengeable since ancient times, to wit:

At the commencement of every parliament it has been the custom for the Speaker, in the name of and on behalf of the house, to lay claim to the undoubted rights and privileges by royal favour. The authority of the Crown in regard to the privilege of the house is further acknowledged by the report of the Speaker to the house that their privileges have been confirmed in as full and ample a manner as they have been heretofore granted and allowed by Her Majesty.

I quote a very recent extract from the House of Assembly, in the 50th parliament, the votes and proceedings of Tuesday 5 March 2002, which is identical to that of the preceding parliaments:

8. Presentation of Speaker

The Speaker, attended by a deputation of members, then proceeded to Government House; and being returned, the Speaker resumed the chair and announced to the house that he, accompanied by a deputation of members, had proceeded to Government House for the purpose of presenting himself to Her Excellency the Governor and had informed Her Excellency that, in pursuance of the powers conferred on the house by section 34 of the Constitution Act, the House of Assembly had this day proceeded to the election of Speaker and done him the honour to elect him to that high office; that in compliance with the other provisions of the same section, he had presented himself to Her Excellency as the Speaker and that he had, in the name and on behalf of the house, laid claim to their undoubted rights and privileges and prayed that the most favourable construction might be put on all their proceedings; whereupon Her Excellency had been pleased to make the following reply:

To the Honourable the Speaker and members of the House of Assembly, I congratulate the members of the House of Assembly on their choice of the Speaker. I readily assure you, Mr Speaker, of my confirmation of all the constitutional rights and privileges of the House of Assembly, the proceedings of which will always receive most favourable consideration.

Government House, 5 March 2002

Marjorie Jackson-Nelson, Governor.

All words used in this statement are relevant. All phrases are important, and nothing is redundant, especially the ultimate sentence in Her Excellency's address. The major privilege or immunity that may offer a measure of protection to the records, the correspondence and the notes of any kind held by members which might be regarded by other parties as being of interest to them in whatever cause they pursue is nonetheless covered by that parliamentary privilege known as the 'freedom of speech' privilege. This immunity is declared in Article 9 of the Bill of Rights 1688. It states:

That the freedom of speech in debates or proceedings in the parliament ought not to be impeached or questioned in any court or place out of parliament.

Freedom of speech is not conferred for the personal benefit of any individual nor even the benefit of a member of parliament. It is conferred for the benefit of the parliamentary system. Through that system, inquiries into matters which are intended by the member to be used in the discharge of their work in the parliament, which they subjectively believe to be in the public interest (and in any consequent remarks made by the members of parliament arising from such inquiries), and which remarks and views subjectively held by the members are in the public interest are privileged, so long as they comply with and observe the letter and spirit of the standing orders and the Bill of Rights. Subsequent determinations by courts have consistently upheld that position.

Let me then go straight to the privileges of the houses of parliament in this state and from whence they derive their legal foundation. It is in section 9 of the Constitution Act 1934, which is as follows:

Privileges of parliament

9. The parliament may, by any act, define the privileges, immunities, and powers to be held, enjoyed, and exercised by the Legislative Council and the House of Assembly, and by the members thereof respectively: provided that no such privileges, immunities, or powers shall exceed those held, enjoyed, and exercised on the 24th day of October, 1856 by the House of Commons, or the members thereof.

It is beyond question that the privilege of the House of Commons in 1856 included the provision in Article 9 of the Bill of Rights 1688. I could go on and provide definitions of many things, but it is sufficient for me to proceed to say that, as to documents from third persons, I would quote McPherson, the judge of appeal, in the case of *O'Chee v Rowley* [1997] QCA 401. The judge rejected the notion that mere supply of the documents to a parliamentarian is sufficient to invoke the privilege. Junk mail is not privileged by reason of its deposit in a parliamentarian's letterbox. However, McPherson JA recognised that the process of collecting material for the purposes of proceedings in parliament may continue for a period after the last word on the subject matter has been spoken in parliament. He explained:

To view the indemnity as available only before or during, but not after, the event would be to turn back the pages of history to the time before 1688. When in 1629 nine members of the House of Commons elected to criticise the government of King Charles I on the last day of the parliamentary sittings, they found themselves summoned before the council the following day to explain their 'undutiful and seditious carriage in the lower house'. They had not been prevented from speaking on the previous day, but were now to face the consequences of doing so. According to a recent biography, John Selden, who was one of them, deliberately refused, on being questioned in the council, to tell the truth (P. Christianson, *John Selden at 180-181* (1996)). He remained a prisoner in the Tower until he offered a humble apology in 1634. Some of the other nine members were less fortunate. Strode and Valentine were detained until 1640. Having been convicted of sedition for what he had said in parliament on that occasion, Sir John Eliot died before being released. . . . The possibility that something similar will be repeated is happily now remote. The point of this historical digression is, however, to emphasise that Article 9 is intended to operate retrospectively to afford protection for things said or done in the past.

That is as much as it is prospectively. In applying that principle to the case before him, the appeal judge, McPherson, said:

There must be (one may hope) few parliamentarians who do not at sometimes in their careers take steps to assemble or record information in writing for purposes of or incidental to transacting business in the house by using it in debate, at question times, or in other parliamentary proceedings. . . . requiring Senator O'Chee to produce for inspection documents of the kind listed in section B of his affidavit, for which parliamentary privilege is claimed, has an obvious potential to deter him and other parliamentarians from

preparing or assembling documentary information for future debates and questions in the house.

In correspondence with the Committee of Privileges and the President of the Senate, which forms part of the material before us, Senator O'Chee claimed that threats of proceedings being taken against his informants had the effect of discouraging them from providing further information about Mr Rowley's activities, and so of restricting the Senator's ability to pursue the subject in the House. The material... conforms with what one would expect in those circumstances.

The appeal judge, McPherson JA, concluded in that judgment:

If the decision below is allowed to stand, the next step in the action [that is, the decision that the papers were to be presented and were then subject to justiciable action] no doubt will be to administer interrogatories questioning the Senator. . . Proceedings in Parliament will inevitably be hindered, impeded or impaired if members realise that acts of the kind done here for purposes of Parliamentary debates or question time [or any other matter—my words] are vulnerable to compulsory court process of that kind. This is a state of affairs which, I am persuaded, both the Bill of Rights and the Act of 1987 are intended to prevent. . . I would allow the appeal; set aside the order made below; and dismiss the summons for inspection filed by the respondent plaintiff on 4 April 1997.

In summarising their conclusions as to this constitutional struggle, Erskine May observed that, although the House of Commons has never expressly abandoned its claim to treat as a breach of privilege the institution of proceedings for the purpose of bringing its privileges into a decision by any court other than parliament, there is in fact considerable common ground between it (the House of Commons) and the courts on the underlying principles involved. Those principles are that neither house of parliament is by itself entitled to claim the supremacy over the ordinary courts of justice which was enjoyed by the undivided High Court of parliament—and that is the undivided High Court of parliament. Furthermore:

Since neither house can by itself add to the law, neither house can, by its own declaration, create a new privilege. This implies that privilege is objective and its extent ascertainable, and reinforces the doctrine that it is known by the courts.

Or it should be.

Let me move on to a case in this jurisdiction—and it relates to me: I am not embarrassed by it. Chief Justice King, in a judgment in *Wright and Advertiser v Lewis* (1990) 53 SASR 416 at page 423, noted:

The role of the courts in determining the scope of Parliamentary privilege has been the subject, historically, of controversy and even some conflict between Parliament and the courts. The now settled principle is stated by Dixon CJ—

this is then Chief Justice King quoting Chief Justice Dixon in the High Court—

in *R v Richards ex parte Fitzpatrick and Browne* (1995) 92 CLR 157 at page 162 as follows:

'It is for the courts to judge of the existence in either House of Parliament of a privilege, but, given an undoubted privilege, it is for the House to judge of the occasion and of the manner of its exercise.'

I repeat, that is a recent judgment. It continues at page 427:

There is a well established rule that a member of parliament is not compellable to answer questions as to its proceedings without the permission of the house whose proceedings are in question.

It must be acknowledged in contemporary Australia that the courts have the right to determine the extent, let me emphasise again, by saying to determine the extent of parliamentary privilege. This is consistent with community expectations. However, in this matter the extent of the privilege is well known and defined as I have demonstrated to the house in this brief dissertation.

On behalf of the house and the parliament, the chair forthwith directs the attention of the presiding member of the court to this fact. The presiding member of the court must cease and desist in these endeavours forthwith. The chair now makes an observation as an aside, that, spread over several centuries, enough time of parliament and the courts has been spent and enough public money has been spent and enough lawyers have examined and argued at great public expense in proceedings which have established that this privilege applies in this precise circumstance.

Should the presiding member of the court persevere in attempting to direct the member for Playford (who does not own the privilege and therefore cannot give it away or be coerced into giving it away) to act in breach of parliamentary privilege he (the presiding member of the court) should be aware that parliament may choose to impeach him for contempt.

LEGAL PRACTITIONERS (INSURANCE) AMENDMENT BILL

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill without any amendment.

SHOP TRADING HOURS (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL 2003

The Legislative Council did not insist on its amendments to which the House of Assembly had disagreed.

SUPPLY BILL

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill without any amendment.

ADJOURNMENT

At 6.46 p.m. the house adjourned until Wednesday 25 June at 2 p.m.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY**Monday, 2 June 2003****QUESTION ON NOTICE****MINISTERS' OFFICIAL VISITS**

147. **The Hon. G.M. GUNN:** What is the government's policy regarding ministers notifying local members on official visits to their electorates?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Generally I believe it is appropriate for ministers' offices to notify local members of parliament of official visits to their electorates.

This certainly occurs with community cabinet's, where local MP's are involved in the process regardless of their political party membership.