HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 26 July 2007

The SPEAKER (Hon. J.J. Snelling) took the chair at 10.30 a.m. and read prayers.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (ENTITLEMENTS OF ELECTED REPRESENTATIVES) BILL

The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher) obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the City of Adelaide Act 1998; the Local Government Act 1999; the Parliamentary Remuneration Act 1990; the Parliamentary Superannuation Act 1974; and the Remuneration Act 1990. Read a first time.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

Members would appreciate that this is a reintroduction of an earlier bill and that it needs to be reintroduced because of the proroguing of parliament. I do not have to reintroduce the bill but I am doing so, and I have to do it this way because of the proroguing. Recently, we had another example of the kerfuffle caused when MPs received an increase in their global allowance. I was one who lobbied for that increase, and I make no apology for that. I do have some concerns with some of the rules that have been attached to it, which I think are unnecessary, but the actual increase was justified. Not long before that, MPs had a pay rise which, once again, caused some consternation among a few journalists and other people in the community. Every time MPs receive a pay rise or an increase in allowance or whatever, there is an 'outcry'. In relation to the process we have at the moment, if we take salaries first, the media reports that as being as a result of an independent tribunal, and that is not strictly correct. In fact, under the federal provisions, the federal remuneration tribunal cannot make a determination in relation to the pay of members of parliament federally: it can make recommendations and determinations in respect of additional allowances for ministers and matters like that.

Currently, as state MPs, our pay is linked to that of the federal MPs, minus $2 000, whose pay, in turn, is linked to a level of the Public Service. It is not strictly independent, although it might be perceived by some as a hands-off approach, and that system was adopted years ago because MPs in this place were criticised if they gave themselves a pay rise, which they did not often do, anyway. I think what we have at the moment is an unsatisfactory situation. We do not have a genuinely independent approach to the setting of salaries, and I believe we should. We have a Remuneration Tribunal here in South Australia which could independently assess the pay of MPs, and I think doing it that way would take some of the heat out of the situation. I personally believe that an independent tribunal would actually increase the pay for MPs. I do not know of any MP, certainly not in this house (and I am not reflecting on members elsewhere, but I do not know their details), who does not work hard and does not contribute to the betterment of South Australia. As I have said publicly, I am happy to go before some tribunal and have my pay and conditions assessed.

If we moved to a genuinely independent tribunal, I think it would take a lot of the heat out of the current situation, where most MPs run for cover and are not available for comment during the times when there is an increase in pay or allowances. The principle works for judges (although some might say that judges are not in the firing line quite like we are), and I think it would work just as well for MPs as it does for judges. Likewise, I think the other allowances (that is, travel, global and electorate) should all be determined by an independent tribunal. Electorate allowances are increased in this way, but I do not believe there has been any real adjustment there over time. I think the tribunal, for a long time, could not make a determination about motor cars because it did not have a benchmark on which to base the allowance. I guess I was responsible in some ways for ending that logjam, although the outcome was not exactly as I desired. Nevertheless, the government decided that it would fix this issue of cars for MPs once and for all and set a contribution to be paid by MPs. Even that arrangement, because it is not determined by the tribunal, still upsets some members of the public and some journalists.

'Hearsay', who writes for *The Independent Weekly*, whom I suspect is Hendrik Gout but who does not want to reveal himself, has been having a go at me in the past few editions of the paper—and that is fine—suggesting that I wanted cars at the cost of $750 for MPs. The point I was trying to make with my legislation was that the tribunal would use that as a benchmark. The allegation that the taxpayer would be subsidising the car by $13 000 was never demonstrated by any actuary whose work I saw. Nevertheless, we still have this ongoing issue with the provision of cars because it is done now through cabinet rather than through the Remuneration Tribunal, which is the proper place for it to be determined. Some of that responsibility has to fall on the tribunal because it did not ever get around to making a determination about cars.

It was always assumed that the electorate allowance could cover cars, but it was never specified: it was left vague; so, at the end of the day, we got a hybrid determination. The government took the bull by the horns and said that MPs could have a car and, as I have pointed out, and as I tried to point out to *The Independent Weekly*, MPs have to make a contribution for possible private use. Not all MPs use the car for private use; not all MPs even access one of those cars. The point that 'Hearsay' in *The Independent Weekly* misses is that those cars do not belong to the MP. They have to be returned and they are sold. Good stewardship by the government in running its car fleet can mean that it does not actually cost all that much to provide a car for MPs to do their work. 'Hearsay' had a bit of a go at me and highlighted the fact that the Hon. Sandra Kanck does not have one of those cars because she has access to a hybrid, environmentally friendly Toyota Prius, which we notice is not made in South Australia, and the cars that any MP accesses through the government fleet scheme have to be South Australian cars of six cylinders or, if it is anything different, there has to be a special case made for it.

It was interesting that in my reply to *The Independent Weekly* my letter was censored because I pointed out that, when this kerfuffle about the cars for MPs was raised a couple of years ago, some of the people in the upper house who were getting a headline did not point out that they had a larger electorate allowance than members in the lower house—certainly, those in the metropolitan area—nor did they point out that they did not have to attend the number of functions that members in the House of Assembly have to attend; for example, school council meetings, naturalisation ceremonies and the like. That part of the letter was conveniently left out of *The Independent Weekly*.

My proposal is not just to cover MPs, their pay and their allowances: it will also cover the superannuation for members of parliament. I am one of the fortunate ones in the very generous PSS1 scheme, which means that if I live long enough I will do very nicely out of that scheme; in fact, if I retired, I would be better off financially as a result of that scheme than if I continue to be an MP. That is a bit bizarre, but that is the reality of it. That scheme does not exist any more, and I do not believe it should have continued in that generous format. I think it needed to be changed, but I was very disappointed when Mark Latham got on the bandwagon and attacked MPs' super and then, shortly afterwards, enjoyed the benefits of the super anyway. The Prime Minister—and I was very surprised that he took the Latham line—had the superannuation of new MPs chopped right down. Since then, of course, the federal MPs have had their super increased back up to, I think, 15 per cent.

I have a lot of sympathy for the new South Australian MPs because I think they have been dudded. They now basically sit in the context of what other people get. Some would say, 'Why should they get something different?' I came into this place mid-career, having had tenure where I was previously, with a very good superannuation scheme and a lot of other benefits like long service leave, sick leave, leave loading and all those sorts of things. They were all given up when I came into this parliament. We have now a situation where the new members of this place (and future new members) have been, in effect, sacrificed on the altar of populism and denied a reasonable retirement income. In time, that will deter a lot of people, particularly in mid-career, from coming in.

I notice, as I said before, that the Prime Minister has adjusted the federal MPs' super up to 15 per cent plus, and I think that, in fairness, the state government should do the same here. I am not holding my breath because whenever there is any suggestion of a pay rise or adjusting super or allowances, usually the Premier and the Treasurer run for cover, but I think that you have to tackle issues fairly and squarely and, in fairness, I think that the new MPs who have come in here and those who will follow them should be treated in a way which takes account of the special circumstances of this job. There is no tenure in here and, if you give up a career midway, you need to at least be able to retire with some dignity at some point in the future. We do not just want people coming in here at the age of 21 who know everything about life, who have never experienced any workplace, who have been schooled in one party or one union only and who will be here for 40 years; I think that is not necessarily totally bad but I do not think that the parliament should be made up simply of people who are career politicians in that sense.

We need people who have been out in the world, whether it is as teachers, farmers or whatever, to come in here and be able to contribute and then retire in dignity with a reasonable retirement income. I will always publicly defend MPs because I think, as I said before, in my experience, I have not come across anyone in this house who I would classify as not deserving a decent income and a decent, dignified retirement.

My bill goes beyond MPs to include elected members of councils. Once again, the LGA is doing more foot movements than rap dancers because it does not want to avail itself of the possibility of having an independent remuneration tribunal determine the allowances of elected members. In recent times some mayors have been getting $60 000, while some are not. Councillors in some areas are getting more than councillors in other areas. The independent tribunal already exists and has staff and resources in terms of accessing crown law advice and actuarial advice. It already has that opportunity. I cannot understand why the LGA cannot simply accept we already have a body that can do the job—and let them do the job independently. Why create a convoluted alternative that will not do a better job than the independent tribunal can and would do? It comes back to the point highlighted in this place earlier in the week.

Local government suffers from an inferiority complex and a fear that if it gets involved in something like an independent tribunal it will make it appear that somehow it is not enjoying the status in the community which it should. Judges get their remuneration determined by the independent tribunal. I would like someone to argue to me that judges do not have standing in the community. That is not to say that I agree with all their judgments but, as professionals, they have a status in the community—and so they should have.

In conclusion, this bill seeks to put in the hands of the independent Remuneration Tribunal salaries and allowances and superannuation of MPs, and also to bring under their fold the allowances of elected members of councils. It is a reasonable, sensible thing to do and it would allow the community to focus on real issues.

Mrs GERAGHTY secured the adjournment of the debate.

CONSTITUTION (NUMBER OF MINISTERS) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 21 June. Page 520.)

The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher): In South Australia we have 15 ministers of the crown. Victoria has 18 and it has more than four times the population. I can understand why we have 15. The government consciously decided to bring a National Party member and an Independent into cabinet for reasons which related to the numbers in this house in a previous parliament. I think it is more important, rather than simply focusing on numbers—and this provision of the member for Mitchell is for 13—to focus on quality rather than quantity. In my view, it would be better to have possibly an even smaller number. We all know how the system works, whether it is the Liberal Party or Labor Party in office. It is more to do with things such as factional allegiance—'It is your turn for the tap on the shoulder.' It is not necessarily anything to do with merit but, rather, more to do with the fact that you are next in line because you are in the correct faction.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: The Liberal Party has less well defined factions. It is probably more a personality cult in the Liberal Party where people attach themselves to particular leaders in the hope that they will be given a position as a minister. This is an important matter. Realistically, the government will not change it because, like all governments, it is pragmatic and it will look at what gives it a form of insurance. I should say that I was offered a ministry early on by the Rann government—which I thought was a nice gesture—but I decided not to accept it, although I do not pass judgment on the two ministers who did. In many respects, the performance of one has equalled the performance of most other members of cabinet, if I can put it that way. We know that several current ministers are not top performers. About half of the cabinet is probably at the level you would expect of a minister.

Mrs GERAGHTY: I rise on a point of order, sir. I believe the member's comments are reflecting on members of this house. My understanding is that it is unparliamentary.

The SPEAKER: I do not uphold the point of order. In order for it to be a reflection, the member has to attribute a bad motive or something criminal. I think he is expressing an opinion that he does not think they are up to scratch.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: Thank you, sir. I am certainly not reflecting on an individual member of parliament. I am just stating what I believe to be the case. Quite a few members of the current cabinet are not high-level performers.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: I take a point of order, Mr Speaker. The member makes that assertion, but I point out that the member for Fisher was a cabinet member who I believe got dumped from cabinet.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is no point of order. The member for Fisher.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: Thank you, sir. I am happy to explain why I was dumped. John Olsen called me in and said, 'You are a good performer but I have to—

The Hon. J.M. Rankine interjecting:

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: He did. He will swear on a Bible and tell you that is true. He called me into the towers on North Terrace and said, 'You are a good performer and a lateral thinker,' and these are his exact words, 'but I've got to look after the people who put me here.' That is what he said. And he could not have everyone in cabinet: I knew that. He said he had to look after the people who put him there. That is how politics works.

The Hon. J.M. Rankine: And you believed him!

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: Yes. Ask him.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: I have never had a cross word with John Olsen.

The Hon. J.M. Rankine interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: Anyway, some people are very sensitive—I am not sure why. Getting back to the key issue, the point I make is that it is better to have quality than quantity, and simply having 15 ministers does not guarantee quality. The merit principle does not apply in this place and, to my knowledge, never has, on any universal basis. It is a limited application of the merit principle, and that is the reality of it.

I do not think this bill will be accepted and I do not think there will be any real change, but I think it is a point worth making when you look at other states and their populations, and the fact that we are transferring so many responsibilities to everyone else. Local government is copping a lot of responsibility from state government. You have to question why we need 15 ministers to administer a diminishing pie. We are transferring a lot of the powers relating to the Murray to the federal government, so there is another big slice of the pie that will not need to be administered here.

So, apart from the strict merit consideration, and fewer may be better in terms of the number of ministers, the reality is that state governments increasingly administer less. We have privatised the bus services, we have privatised ETSA, we no longer have the TAB: why do we need so many ministers to administer an every-diminishing pie? I think the logic would suggest that we do not need all those ministers but, if we are going to have ministers, and we need some, let us have the best people for the job. That would include people such as the member for Enfield, but he will not get the nod because he is not the next one on the list. This is a point that should be discussed and debated but I will not hold my breath, because it would be a first when the merit principle or the principle of what is best for South Australia was at the heart of decision-making, either I guess in the political party circles or in their attachments. So, I commend the member for Mitchell for raising this issue, and I wish him all the best as he pursues it.

Ms BREUER (Giles): When has merit ever had anything to do with this place? We had our first parliament I think in 1856 and it took until the 1950s before we got a woman in here. So, merit has never been a big issue in this place. I get really angry when I hear comments and implications about members in this place. It makes me very cross, because we are all hard-working people in this place, and we all do our best. There are one or two people I have a few doubts about but, really and truly, we came here because we wanted to make a difference in our communities and to support our communities. We constantly get criticised by the media, Independents and small parties in this place, and that is what makes me really boil. I do not believe we have much of an opposition from the other side at this stage, but people in the media have been trying us for a long time, particularly in the last few months, and they are doing a very good job of it. People out there are talking about politicians as if we are the scum of the earth. We are seen as the lowest of the low. We rate below used car salesmen and insurance salesmen these days, and it makes me very cross that we have this image out there.

This is not helped by the Independents and the smaller parties in this place who, every time something happens, get on the bandwagon. You turn on your radio and, day and night, there is always some Independent saying the very populist things that we would like to be able to say but, of course, we are members of major parties and we do not say those things because we are sensible enough to know that the reality of life is that you cannot do things the easy way that the Independents and the small parties keep pushing.

Why do we have to put up with this criticism constantly? Once I came into parliament, my lifestyle completely changed. I had never worked so hard in my life, and I still work hard. I will give members a rundown of what I am doing over this two weeks. On Sunday I flew to Melbourne for a conference, and I was there for two days. I flew back Tuesday night and came back in here. I spent two days in this place, and I am going back to Whyalla tomorrow morning. I get half a day in my office and on Saturday I will drive to Coober Pedy to watch a football match. I will be there for about three hours. It is a six-hour drive to Coober Pedy. Then I will drive back to Port Augusta. I stay there overnight, and drive to Adelaide next morning to go to a meeting. I will go back to Whyalla on Monday morning and spend two days in my office, if I am lucky. Then I go to Roxby Downs for a day. I will be in Whyalla all day next Friday because I will have a minister there. I am travelling to Adelaide on Saturday because I have meetings in Adelaide. I will go to Glendambo on Saturday night and then drive across to Oak Valley, which is probably a 12-hour trip, for two days. I have a day to get there, a day in Oak Valley, and another day to get back (another 12 to 14-hour trip). Then I think I have a day in Whyalla, and so on.

Don't tell me that we are not working in this place and that we are not doing a very busy job. I am a bit unique because I have such a big electorate—the biggest electorate in this state—but I know my colleagues are working 12 hours a day

as well, most days of the week. Don't pass this rubbish on about merit, about performance, etc. We are all doing our job. If we are not doing our job the people out there, our electors, will tell us. Stop caning us every time we get a pay rise, or anything else. We are working very hard. Our electors are there to judge us and will decide whether or not we are doing our job. Stop grandstanding and making these stupid statements about us, and let us get on with our job.

Mr WILLIAMS secured the adjournment of the debate.

WATERWORKS (WATER MANAGEMENT MEASURES—USE OF RAINWATER) AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

A few weeks ago, I moved to have this matter restored to the *Notice Paper*, along with two other bills that had already been through the other place. I understand that they were passed through the upper house prior to Christmas last year before the house rose and, indeed, were introduced into this house in the last parliament. They dropped off the *Notice Paper* when parliament was prorogued. It is interesting that, in relation to this bill and the next two matters on the *Notice Paper* (which I hope we will get to today in the time allotted for Orders of the Day), we are still in the grip of drought, at least across the Murray-Darling Basin. Some small portions of Australia have received extraordinary rainfalls, but that has not been the case in South Australia, and it certainly has not been the case in the catchments across the Murray-Darling Basin. When I cast my farmer's eye skyward, I am concerned about the current season and that we certainly will not have a wetter than average year. I would be delighted if we got to the point where we could claim that 2007 was a year of average rainfall, and I think we would be all very fortunate if that came to pass.

Only this week, the Minister for Water Security announced a slight increase in the allocations to be made to irrigators on the River Murray and informed householders in metropolitan Adelaide and those across South Australia who receive their water supply from SA Water that the restrictions introduced on 1 July will continue until at least August. At the time, the minister talked about the Hills storages and indicated that they were currently at about 75 per cent of capacity. That is somewhat good news, but I remind members that the minister, in making that announcement, also noted that about half the water in the storages has actually been pumped from the river. So, to date (and we are almost at the end of July), there has been very little run-off from the Hills catchment into the Adelaide Hills storages.

I am absolutely certain that, come springtime, the minister will ensure that the Hills storages are at capacity. If we do not get significant rainfall, I have every confidence that the pumps will be switched on again at Mannum and that the Hills storages will be topped up. Notwithstanding that, the capacity to continue to pump from the river during the summer will possibly be limited, and every litre of water we take out of the river during the summer will be one less litre available to our irrigators and to the productive capacity of those people along the river who use water for irrigation to grow our food crops. I am trying to paint the picture that we need to conserve, save and reuse every litre of water available to us.

It is also interesting that, on a number of occasions, I have heard the Minister for Water Security highlight the fact that, at about 20 per cent of reuse, South Australia leads the nation in its reuse of water through our waste water treatment plants, particularly at Bolivar and Christies Beach. In the five years that the Labor Party has been governing South Australia, not one extra litre of water has gone to reuse. All that 20 per cent capacity has been there for over five years; it was installed by the previous government, which had a sound program to build and increase reuse capacity.

It is lamentable that this government has dropped the ball in regard to water in South Australia. It is lamentable that we have a proposal to extend the Bolivar pipeline to the northern Adelaide Plains to increase the amount of water that can be used in that area for irrigation. It is lamentable that the government has dropped the ball on the Waterproofing the South program, which was sponsored by the Onkaparinga council. The only thing I have heard recently from the government about that is its whingeing that the federal government did not give an extra $20 million. I think the federal government announced about a month ago some $34 million towards the project.

I do not know where the state government's money is, but the money which the minister in the other place complained is not available for the project is, indeed, money that could be put into capital works within the waste water treatment plant which, I would have thought, would be a function and an obligation of SA Water. SA Water, as we know, is a very profitable organisation and, certainly, would have the capacity to greatly increase the amount of water that is reused in South Australia if only the Treasurer would take his hands out of SA Water's pockets, because that is where all the money is going: into the consolidated account.

Before I get on to the detail of the bill, can I say again that the thing about reuse and all these schemes that we might have to increase the amount of water available are only beneficial if we can actually get either new water or reuse existing water to replace an existing use of water. The water that is pumped from Bolivar out to the Northern Adelaide Plains for irrigation largely has not replaced water that comes either out of the Hills catchment or the River Murray. So, even that reuse is not building the capacity that we have to supply potable water to the households of South Australia. The sad reality is that even the reuse that we have is not really increasing the amount of water or our water security. We need to come up with innovative approaches to find new water—

Mrs Geraghty interjecting:

Mr WILLIAMS: Absolutely, and I have a bill on the *Notice Paper* that will address the matter about which the honourable member interjects. What we need to do is find new water which will substitute for the water that is currently delivered by SA Water from the Hills storages or the River Murray to metropolitan Adelaide, in this case, as well as country areas, because the reality is that, by and large, the water that goes to country areas comes from the same source, that is, the River Murray. At this stage I will restrict my further comments to this particular matter on the *Notice Paper* but, obviously, the general comments I have made apply not only to this item on the *Notice Paper* but also to the next two items which, as I said, hopefully we will get to today.

This measure is about the use of rainwater tanks. This bill will allow people, with the installation of a back-flow valve, to connect their rainwater tank directly to their existing plumbing. The government has gone part of the way toward achieving this by making it compulsory for all new houses to have a rainwater tank and for those rainwater tanks to be plumbed for certain uses, but it is quite restrictive in that it applies only to new houses when most of the water use in Adelaide is by existing homes that have been there for many years.

Plenty of home owners want to take advantage of the water that can be collected off their roof and direct it into a rainwater tank. However, the most ridiculous scenario that we can have with regard to rainwater tanks is to have tens of thousands of people install rainwater tanks, have those tanks fill from one rain event and then not use the water or use it sparingly for, say, drinking or making tea over the 12-month period. We need to ensure that the water collected from any rainfall event is in fact used, and used reasonably quickly.

Plumbing a rainwater tank into the toilet system in households would be an ideal way of achieving that. The government is already doing that, as I said, with regard to new homes, but it is almost impossible to do in the case of an existing home. To retrofit to do that involves quite a substantial change to the existing plumbing within a house and yard and at considerable cost. The opposition contends that the cost involved precludes most people from doing this, therefore the take-up is very limited. For a much lower cost we are suggesting (and the bill would enable this) that people put in a non-return valve adjacent to their water meter to prevent any water flowing from their property back into the SA Water system.

The argument that SA Water makes is that if you plumb your rainwater tank into your plumbing there is a chance that the water from your rainwater tank may not meet the standards that SA Water requires, and that is because, obviously, it is not chlorinated and, as it goes into the pipe network, it may become contaminated. Pathogens may build up in the system without chlorination in that water, and the opposition and I fully accept that. We are saying that a non-return valve at the meter would obviate the need to replicate the plumbing on the property or within the home.

With one simple piece of technology, people could then purchase a small pump. I have one in my own home. Incidentally, my home, apart from the toilets, runs completely on rainwater. All the rainwater collected at my home—a home in which four children were raised—is used for all the washing, cooking and drinking. A 5 000 gallon or 22 000 litre rainwater tank provides all that water, and I can assure the house that we do not have a health problem.

Mr Venning interjecting:

Mr WILLIAMS: Yes, it does rain quite a bit. Our argument is simply to allow people to plumb their rainwater tank to the house via a small pump. As I say, they are relatively cheap. I think $300 or $400 would buy a small pump with ample capacity to pump the rainwater into at least the toilet or, if you wanted, throughout the whole house. In fact, I recommend rainwater for household use unless you live in an area which has a particular problem with air pollution, and I do not think there are too many areas in South Australia like that now. Even in metropolitan Adelaide, I recommend rainwater. It is fantastic to wash and shower in. The towels come out of the wash much softer than those that are washed in Adelaide water.

Mr Venning interjecting:

Mr WILLIAMS: I know that. I like a soft towel. I would recommend that everybody install a rainwater tank in their house, with a small electric pump and a non-return valve adjacent to their meter, and then pump the water through their existing network.

Members interjecting:

Mr WILLIAMS: Mr Speaker, members of the government are saying you can do that right now. My understanding is that the legislation does not allow you to do that right now. If you can do it right now, I look forward to the government's support for the bill. If government members do not have a problem with it and claim you can do it right now, they will obviously be supporting this bill, although that is not what they did in the other place. The opposition, all the minor parties and Independents in the other place supported this measure—and the other measures I will be bringing to the house—but the Labor Party voted against it, just as they have done nothing in five years to secure the future water for Adelaide and South Australians. I commend the bill to the house.

Mr VENNING (Schubert): Briefly, in support of the bill introduced by my colleague the member for MacKillop, I think it is a very commonsense proposal, and it is amazing that it has taken us this long to come up with a commonsense action like this. I am not sure whether, under the current legislation, you can do this. Having a bit of a plumbing background, I know that previously you were prohibited from doing it because of the design of a non-return valve. It was all about protection of the mains and, if there is any possibility at all that your rainwater or anything else could get into the mains, it was forbidden. Today, however, there are very sophisticated valves and, although valves can fail, there are certain ways of doing it. Particularly when you plumb a twin system into a house, it can be made totally foolproof by switching one system off and switching the other one on; the two are not linked. In a new home it is quite easy—you have a dual system—but in an existing home it not quite so easy and you rely on the same plumbing in the house to deliver either the rainwater you are pumping into it or the mains water. But, with a modern tap, you cannot have both taps on because the one tap will only deliver one way or the other, so it solves that problem of possibly making a mistake. However, there has been the valve there that does not allow you to put water into the main. The main uses static pressure—in Adelaide, about 95 PSI under the old rules—and, as most pumps operate at about 30, how can you put rainwater into the system?

However, people have been known to be actually sucking the main and have been caught doing this; of course, they create a negative pressure in doing so. In that case, if your neighbour up the road has rainwater tapped in, it can actually suck that rainwater into the system, and this has happened. I think it is a commonsense thing, and I think people ought to be encouraged. People have all sorts of excuses for not having a rainwater tank, but those excuses do not stack up because we now have the poly lightweight tank that is so flexible. If you have no room for the tank, you can put it under your driveway. As the member for MacKillop has said, you just dig your driveway up.

Mrs Geraghty interjecting:

Mr VENNING: It depends. If you are about to put a new driveway down, or even if you have pavers on the driveway, it is not very expensive to hire a backhoe, and I am sure that the government, in this instance, could look at some subsidy.

Members interjecting:

Mr VENNING: It would be necessary to hire a backhoe for an hour and a half to dig a hole for, say, a 5 000-litre tank; that is not a big deal or a problem. Otherwise, you normally put the tank alongside the house or, if you have a raised site, the tank could be put to the rear on the high spot so, in that instance for your toilet, you would not have to pump it; you would use gravity. Every situation is different.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr VENNING: Every situation is different, and I think today we are being positive and doing our bit for the environment by saving both energy and stormwater. The member for Giles and I have just come back from the conference, and I can tell you that this is really gaining momentum. In fact, 80 per cent of the population are now absolutely fully supportive of the concerns we have in relation to climate change, and we have to do anything we can to save the environment. Any politician who does not will ultimately pay the price politically.

I have been here for 17 years and I have raised this matter about 10 or a dozen times, and of course 10 years ago you could not get any traction at all—people did not want to know about rainwater tanks. 'Why would I want to put in a rainwater tank? There are too many impurities in the tank'—all that sort of stuff, but today it is totally different. First, we have poly tanks; secondly, we have these devices that allow the first few points of rain from the roof to go out on the ground, and the system is flushed. In addition, tanks can be easily flushed—not like the old galvanised iron tank which was hard to flush. I shudder to think what is swimming around in our tank at home: probably everything from dead rats, pigeon poo, the lot, and look at me and how healthy I am!

Members interjecting:

Mr VENNING: I think part of the problem today with a lot of our younger people is that they live in a too-sterile environment. It is amazing what nature does to us, but if we actually looked in our rainwater tanks, we would think twice. Today with the poly tank, people do flush them out. It is not very difficult; they have a bung on the bottom, and before winter you let the dregs out. As the member for MacKillop said, we should be encouraging people to use the water for everything. The first thing you do is encourage people to put an indicator on the tank so that they can see how much water is in there. If it is three-quarters full, use it; when it gets down to below half, switch off and make sure you always have that reservoir there for your drinking and your potable uses. But, when it is full, you may as well be using it in your toilet because the more water you use, the more you are saving in terms of SA Water at your own meter, and doing your bit for the environment. This is a commonsense motion. I hope that it has the full support of the house, because I cannot see any reason why it should not. I support the motion.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY secured the adjournment of the debate.

SEWERAGE (WATER MANAGEMENT MEASURES—USE OF WASTE MATERIAL) AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

Like the measure that I spoke to only a few moments ago, this is designed to provide for new water to replace existing use. Right across metropolitan Adelaide and in country centres we have a single water supply distributed through a single network, and it is high quality potable water, only a portion of which is actually needed at that standard. There are many uses of water around our cities and towns where the water does not need to be of potable quality. There are many instances, from irrigation of parklands and recreational fields, sporting ovals etc. to industrial uses where a lot of water is used purely for cooling or for wash-down, where it does not need to be high quality potable water. This bill would allow SA Water to regulate to allow certain prescribed bodies to 'sewer mine', is the term used.

That is, to take material from an existing sewer, filter the solids out of it and use the water—recognising that the water probably would still contain some pathogens, but use it for purposes where that is of little or no consequence, and to return the solid material that is filtered out back into the sewers. The beauty of this is that it does not require a new distribution network for a second grade of water but can be applied anywhere across metropolitan Adelaide, in this instance, where a company or interested person (perhaps a council) could tap into a convenient sewer main, draw out the water and material and put it through a filtration plant, put the solids back into the sewer—with a certain amount of water, obviously—and use the water to replace water that would otherwise be taken from the SA Water main.

The important thing about this bill is that it would replace water supplied via the SA Water distribution network. So, suddenly, we are obtaining new water, unlike where we have the water from the Bolivar treatment plant, for instance, being piped to the northern Adelaide Plains and used for irrigation, which is not replacing potable water from the distribution network. It is not like increasing our capacity; it is not finding new water.

Mr O'BRIEN: On a point of order, I am not trying to be disruptive but I think there is a problem with the numbering. Bill No. 41 actually refers to grey water, so there is something wrong with the *Notice Paper*. We should be addressing the Sewerage (GreyWater) Amendment Bill 2006 and we are actually addressing bill No. 43.

Mr WILLIAMS: The honourable member is correct. The numbering on the *Notice Paper* is back to front.

The SPEAKER: The number of the bill may be incorrect and it may be that it is meant to be No. 42 rather than No. 41 in brackets after the name of the bill but, as long as we are debating order of the day No. 4, Sewerage (Water Management Measures—Use of Waste Material) Amendment Bill, the honourable member is in order.

Mr WILLIAMS: So, if there is a confusion, the actual words take precedence over the numbering?

The SPEAKER: That is right.

Mr WILLIAMS: The important thing about this measure is that it is akin to finding new water, because we are taking existing high quality, potable water from our mains and replacing that use, so it is akin to finding new water. This is not a new idea and not something that has just been thought up here in Adelaide. It is my understanding that this technology and this method of finding new water for use in cities is already happening in other cities in Australia and, in particular, is quite widespread in Sydney.

So, it is a system that has already been utilised for the very purpose that the opposition is indicating as the reason behind the introduction of this bill, that is, to create new water so that the people of Adelaide and people in our country towns can continue to enjoy the sort of facilities and lifestyle they have hitherto enjoyed, with green parklands and gardens; and, as I said earlier, some of our industries could continue to use significant quantities of water without impinging upon our ability to supply high grade potable water for the important needs the community has for that grade of water. Indeed, as with the earlier matter, the government in the other place did not support this measure. In fact, the government spokesperson (Hon. Bernie Finnigan) spoke at length on the three bills (that is, the bill I have already mentioned, this bill and one other which relates to grey water and which I do not think we will get to today). The Hon. Mr Finnigan said that the government supports the principle, and he even said that the government was working on its own legislation to address some of these matters. I seek leave to conclude my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

AUSTRALIAN WORKPLACE AGREEMENTS

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop): I move:

That this house:

(a) condemns the state government for supporting the federal Labor Party policy to ban individual workplace agreements and notes that—
- (i) in the first year of the operation of WorkChoices, 24 606 South Australians have already made the work choice of brokering and signing an individual workplace agreement with their employer;
- (ii) the resources sector has identified that individual workplace agreements provide efficiency gains of between 25 to 30 per cent in the mining industry;
- (iii) individual workplace agreements in the resources sector have provided for significant wage improvements with a premium of 30 per cent compared to awards; and

(b) calls on the Premier to join with his counterpart the Western Australian Premier to publicly condemn the federal Labor anti-AWA stand due to its potential impact on South Australia's burgeoning mining industry and other workers' free choice.

I have to inform the house that things have moved considerably since the time I first gave notice that I was going to move this motion.

Mr Kenyon interjecting:

Mr WILLIAMS: Yes; I don't mind wishing Mr Howard a happy birthday today. I find it disturbing that there are people in our society, particularly politicians of the Labor ilk, who suggest that, because someone is 68, they should not be involved in decision-making at a political level. I think that is absurd. In fact, many countries with a long history of democratic traditions (and not necessarily democratic traditions, either) rely very much on the wisdom of seniors in their circle of government. I certainly do have a great deal of pleasure in taking the opportunity to wish our Prime Minister a happy birthday on this day.

To get back to the matter at hand, I point out that things have moved a long way since the disastrous ALP federal conference held back in April, when the deputy leader of the federal ALP launched Labor's new IR policy. The ALP realised how far off the mark it was and, within days, the leader (Kevin Rudd) was out there assuring business that he was not going to do anything to the unfair dismissal laws contained in WorkChoices. However, on a daily basis, we hear, for pure base political purposes, state Labor premiers and ministers denigrating WorkChoices. They continue to talk about the unfair dismissal laws, yet Kevin Rudd has come out and said that he is not going to change them. Kevin Rudd has accepted that, under the old unfair dismissal laws so-called, it was not about unfair dismissal but about a system that made it much easier, more convenient and more cost effective for a business to pay out $20 000 or $30 000 to someone who deserved nothing than to fight the case in the Industrial Court. That is what this was all about. That is what unfair dismissal laws are all about.

The reality is that we have a very tight labour market at the moment, and any working man or woman who is doing a fair day's work and doing the right thing is a very valued employee. I get to talk to a lot of business people in my role as the shadow spokesman for industrial relations matters, and the biggest issue businesses have at this time is getting workers, certainly in my electorate and certainly in the South Australian context. So, the notion that business people are out there sacking workers unfairly on a whim or capriciously is a nonsense, and Kevin Rudd recognised that very soon after Julia Gillard came out with the policy at the ALP conference. Within days, or at least within a week, he announced that he would make no changes to the unfair dismissal laws as they stood. So, that is the situation we have.

Our Premier, along with all the other delegates from South Australia, went along and supported Julia Gillard, in full knowledge of what he was doing. He was playing base politics. He was not supporting South Australian business people; he was not even supporting the workers of South Australia, because when you impose those capricious costs on business, it affects every employee. This is the point that the union movement has always failed to understand. I actually thought that the union movement had got out of the 18th century and that it was arriving at the 20th century; I really thought that the union movement was arriving at the 20th century and that it was going to build itself a worthwhile position.

With people like Julia Gillard and Greg Combet being responsible for industrial relations matters at a federal level, the union movement very quickly decided it wanted to retreat back to the 18th century. That is what this is about. That is not what South Australia needs; that is not what the Premier of South Australia should be doing. At every opportunity, as a vice-president of the ALP and supposedly an influential member of the upper echelons of the ALP, he should be out there fighting for South Australia and South Australian business people, and that is just not what he is doing, and that is why I have moved this motion.

The reality is that South Australia's future—and the Premier talks about it at every opportunity—according to this Premier, because he has hung his hat on it, will be in the mining sector. The growth in jobs in South Australia will be in the mining sector. I happen to agree with the Premier that that will be the case, if he gets it right; unfortunately, to date, he has been getting it wrong. The mining sector relies almost exclusively on AWAs, and the minerals sector, the sector which seems to be growing in South Australia, almost exclusively relies on AWAs. The metalliferous sector also relies on AWAs almost exclusively. Certainly, the coal industry is heavily unionised and it works by and large on collective bargaining, but the metalliferous sector moved away from collective bargaining some years ago and it relies almost exclusively these days on AWAs, and there is very good reason for that.

Mrs Geraghty: Tell us what it is.

Mr WILLIAMS: The reason is that the workers involved in the mining sector on AWAs are enjoying much better conditions, much higher pay than they would otherwise enjoy, because the companies involved—and I will tell you a story in a moment—are much more profitable. The story is that BHP and Hamersley Iron some years ago were looking at a joint venture in north-west Western Australia. They were both operating in the area and they looked at a joint venture. They said, 'How do we go about working out how to apportion the costs to the two companies in this joint venture?' So, they decided that they would open each other's books, send in the accounts and have a look at it to see what sort of costs each company had in their own operations. BHP very quickly walked away from the negotiating table because it recognised that Hamersley Iron was getting between 20 and 35 per cent greater labour efficiency. That is why most mines now in the metalliferous sector, when that all became common knowledge—

Mr Kenyon interjecting:

Mr WILLIAMS: The member for Newland would be well aware of this and he would know the story, probably better than I do.

Mr Kenyon: It was a contract: it wasn't AWAs. It was a statutory contract.

Mr WILLIAMS: It was the same thing.

Mr Kenyon interjecting:

Mr WILLIAMS: I will come back to that in a moment. The workers were enjoying higher wages, the businesses were operating more efficiently and things were humming along. That is why the sector has moved away from collective bargaining and is relying on AWAs. Go to Roxby Downs, to BHP Billiton (and Western Mining prior to that), and they are working largely on AWAs. The member for Newland said that they were working on statutory contracts. The problem with those contracts is that they are subservient to the award; so, if there is an award that covers those people under one of those contracts and the award says that you should work so many hours a week or you should have certain holidays, the award conditions prevail. Under AWAs, the company and the workers can come to a mutual agreement, with which the award cannot interfere, because what happens on a lot of these remote mining sites, and even on those that are not—

Mr Kenyon interjecting:

Mr WILLIAMS: No. The mining industry, because of the nature of the industry, and quite often these mines have a relatively short lifespan, does not build a town like we have at Roxby Downs. They build a camp and the work force flies in and out. It is ridiculous to fly someone in and out based on a 38½-hour week. It is ridiculous to fly someone in and out on a five-day working week and a two-day weekend. They will work on a nine-days on/five-days off roster or some other combination. They will work 12 hours a day, and they will be remunerated very well. That is why the industry and the people employed in the industry have embraced AWAs. That is why Alan Carpenter, the Premier of Western Australia, stood well away from Kevin Rudd, Julia Gillard and Greg Combet. He wanted to have nothing to do with it. I invite the member for Torrens to go back and look at some of the things that Alan Carpenter has said about these measures, because he understands the mining sector. Why? Because the mining sector already accounts for about 25 per cent of the GDP in Western Australia. That is where I want it to be in South Australia. That is what I want for South Australia. I want us to reach our potential in the mining sector and I want us to get it right.

I do not want BHP Billiton contemplating plan B where it digs up the material, simply concentrates it and ships it to China to be processed. When we were in government and developed a plan for the mining sector—which the Premier claims was his plan and his target—we had a target not only of $100 million for exploration per year for greenfields exploration but also for a $4 billion a year minerals processing industry. We will never hit that target if BPH Billiton is forced by a crazy federal government and a South Australian Premier who supports that craziness to say, 'We cannot afford to process in South Australia, we will go to plan B and ship the concentrate to China and process it in China.' That is what this is about. This is not about doing in the eye of working men and women.

As I said earlier, working men and women who are doing the right thing are valued employees and no company or business can afford to lose them. They do lots of things to protect their workers in order to stop them being poached—and a lot of poaching is occurring in industry at present because of a shortage of workers. Employees are valued and employers bend over backwards to protect them from being poached by others. Kevin Rudd understands that, although he will not enunciate it because it does not serve his political ends. At least he has said it quietly, but he will run the same method of attack where he gets the state premiers and state ministers to attack the federal government while he says, 'No, we agree.'

Time expired.

Mr KENYON (Newland): The government opposes the motion and confirms its support for the federal Labor Party policy to remove individual workplace agreements.

Mr Williams: Why?

Mr KENYON: Obviously, if one listens to the member for MacKillop it will be doom and gloom and the world is about to end. If one looks at the way things are going at present, there is a good chance—almost a certainty—it will end. In this motion the member for MacKillop states that in the first year of operation of WorkChoices over 24 000 South Australians have brokered and signed individual workplace agreements with an employer. There might be some debate about the actual number, but the real question is how many of these were fairly negotiated. There is a big difference between saying, 'Welcome to your place of employment and here is your AWA,' and 'Welcome to your place of employment. Would you like to go onto the award? Would you like an AWA? Would you like an individual statutory contract?' I suspect not too many choices were given when people walked into their place of employment.

Individual workplace agreements are used in the mining industry, but let us not overstate their use. Only 13 per cent of people employed in the mining industry in South Australia are on AWAs. In fact, mining relies more heavily on common law contracts as provided for in the federal Labor policy. I take the member for MacKillop's point. He was talking about the Pilbara and iron ore and he was making a comparison between Rio Tinto and BHP. The most important thing in that case study was the cultural change that went into Rio. Rio did not say, 'All right, we are now on statutory contracts,' and leave it at that and get a 20 per cent productivity improvement. That is not how it happened. It changed the attitude of all its workers and made the workers feel more responsible for the way in which the company operated and then remunerated them accordingly. It got a 20 per cent productivity improvement in a short time, but it happened in 1994—two

years before the election of the Howard government and the introduction of AWAs. It had nothing to do with AWAs.

The same policy that allowed the 20 per cent productivity improvement to occur is in place with the federal Labor Party. There is not a single reason that other companies cannot get or maintain those productivity improvements. In fact, if one is talking about productivity, the government which in the past 20 years has neglected productivity more than any other is the Howard government. We have seen a gradual contraction of productivity over time since the end of the Keating government in 1996. Even where genuine bargaining is taking place, the booming mining industry in Western Australia and, similarly, in South Australia has enabled workers to hold significant bargaining power in the negotiation of agreements. It is an important point.

The real effect of AWAs, particularly in industries with skills shortages, such as mining, is being hidden. The biggest single fear of the mining industry is a massive price drop in commodities. If that happens, fewer projects will go ahead and there will be less demand for labour. As soon as we get to that point, the real insidiousness of AWAs will be examined and shown for what it is. Let us not pretend at any point that AWAs were designed (as they stand now) to increase wages and conditions. That is not what they were about.

We had AWAs after the 1996 changes to the legislation. They were in place but, basically, there was a safety net underneath them. You could use an AWA but you could only go up; you could only lift wages and conditions. There were awards that said, 'These are the wages and conditions and, if you want to improve them, go your hardest.' There was nothing in awards or federal legislation that said that you could not increase wages. There was nothing that said you could not improve flexibility for the benefit of the workers. There was nothing to say you could not negotiate a position where everyone won. It is no surprise then that so few AWAs were actually taken up.

It was only when the most recent legislation was passed—the WorkChoices legislation which cut out the safety net—that employers were allowed to cut wages and conditions—which was their essential aim. It was quite a radical change in some ways. It is moving towards the American ideal of having a minimum wage. Over there it relies on Congress to raise the wage. It has got to the point over there where one cannot live on a minimum wage any more; it is poverty line stuff. The WorkChoices legislation was aimed at introducing that system. It cut away a safety net. It is no surprise that, once employers realised that they could cut wages and conditions, it was a rational thing to do. There is a lot of pressure on them to do that.

The member for MacKillop mentioned the Western Australian Premier's comments, and it is important that they are accurately quoted. In a recent address to the Chamber of Minerals and Energy, the Western Australian Premier expressly stated that his government's opposition to AWAs is because they exploit workers. Premier Carpenter went on to emphasise a view, which our government agrees with, and that is that the mining industry is unique. It is an industry whose employment conditions have been influenced by the resources boom and the need to attract skilled workers to remote locations. So, the experience of AWAs in the mining industry is not reflective of the general experience in AWAs in other sectors such as retail and hospitality.

The statistics of the Office of the Employment Advocate—the government's office, which it set up—and the Australian Bureau of Statistics do not paint as pretty a picture of individual agreements as do the Liberal Party and the member for MacKillop. The office's analysis reveals that AWAs have been used to strip conditions, and in the information released by the Office of the Employment Advocate to the Senate estimates committee in May 2006 it was very clear that every AWA—every AWA that has ever been signed since the new legislation—had cut at least one protected award condition. The figures show: 64 per cent of AWAs removed annual leave loading; 63 per cent removed penalty rates; 50 per cent removed shift allowances; and 40 per cent removed public holiday rates. Further, 22 per cent of all AWAs contain no increase for the life of the AWA so, if you sign it for three years, that is your pay for three years, regardless of the effects of the wider economy—rises in interest rates and inflation, both of which are increasing under the Howard government in recent times. In addition, 16 per cent of all AWAs signed removed all award conditions and replaced them with the five statutory minimum conditions. So, it is a bit rich to talk about flexibility and fairness when this is the effect that they are having.

I will read from a little case study on one particular person and members can see the effect that AWAs are having. This is in regard to changes to working hours and the experience of severely disadvantaged sole parent Ruby. She was employed as a clinic secretary for 15 hours a week, on Wednesday, Thursday and Friday from 9.30 a.m. to 2.30 p.m. Another woman worked 9.30 a.m. to 2.30 p.m. on Monday and Tuesday in a job-share arrangement. These hours enabled Ruby to combine paid work with accessible paid care for her preschool-aged son and were ideal for when he started school. Ruby commenced employment as a casual on a pre-WorkChoices individual contract based on the South Australian Clerks Award.

When two staff left in January 2006, Ruby and the other job-share worker were asked to increase their hours from 9 a.m. to 5 p.m. Ruby agreed, but the other worker refused and resigned. She was then asked to work four days 9 a.m. to 5 p.m. She was able to accommodate three full days' paid work, but more hours made juggling work and care problematic. Her son was just about to start school and after school hours care was not available on Wednesdays. After discussion, the head of the clinic agreed that she could work until 2 p.m. on Wednesdays until care was found. Ruby then tried, without success, to find after school care. Her father offered to pick up her son from school on Wednesdays to help out.

During this time, Ruby was asked by the head of the clinic to take on a floating secretary's role. She was excited by the prospect of learning new skills and accepted on the understanding that she could work on a permanent part-time basis. This was agreed to. The new position was due to commence in April 2006 after two weeks' leave which Ruby was taking to settle her son into his first year of school. (I imagine it was very dusty around that area at that time: it always is when one of my children start school. It makes my eyes water a little bit when they start school.)

While Ruby was on leave, she was contacted by the newly appointed clinic manager for a meeting. Ruby attended the meeting in her own time and had to bring the child with her. On this occasion, and in a subsequent phone call to her home, it was made clear that the manager wanted a part-time worker willing to fill in on a full-time basis when the secretarial staff went on leave. No consideration was given to previous commitments to Ruby or to her caring responsibilities. Ruby said, 'She just said that she needed me to be more flexible, and I said I don't know how much more flexible I need to be.

My contract is 9.30 to 2.30. I haven't done that since January. I have been working 25, 30 hours a week.' So, essentially, what I am saying is that flexibility was thrown out the window and people were forced to do something they did not want to do; and the whole point of this was there were supposed to be more flexible arrangements. That is why the government opposes this bill.

Motion negatived.

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett): I move:

> That this house congratulates the University of South Australia on celebrating its first 15 years of operation and, in particular, congratulates Professor Denise Bradley on her leadership over that time.

This motion congratulates Professor Denise Bradley on an outstanding academic career. It is one that I take great pleasure in moving. The other part of the motion congratulates the University of South Australia on 15 years of providing educational excellence to South Australia.

I am very proud to say that Denise Bradley started her teaching career in my electorate of Morphett, at Brighton High School. When you look at her academic record since then, it has been (as the Minister for Tourism often says) stellar. Last month, more than 400 people from industry, government and the higher education sector (including the former prime minister, Bob Hawke, and Blanche d'Alpuget; Sir Eric Neal and Lady Neal; former minister for education, Dr Susan Ryan; and Professor Lowitja O'Donoghue) attended a special dinner to celebrate and mark the career of Vice-Chancellor Professor Denise Bradley.

Professor Bradley retires from the university at the end of the month, and I would like to read from the insert in an invitation to attend the celebration at the Convention Centre on 9 May 2007. It says:

> In her 10 years as Vice-Chancellor and President of the University of South Australia, Professor Denise Bradley AO has helped create one of the most innovative and progressive universities in the nation. In a career marked by extensive contribution to national education policy, educational equity and international education development, Professor Bradley has led the university through a decade of enormous change and rapid development. It is with great pride that we invite you to help us celebrate this significant career, and the emergence of a mature, international and successful institution.

As I said, 400 people, including from both sides of parliament and Independents and many business and industry leaders, helped us celebrate on Wednesday 9 May in the Convention Centre.

Professor Bradley's career as an educator goes back to her high school teaching days at Brighton High in my electorate of Morphett. Her role in the history of the University of South Australia was the focus of that evening. In his dinner speech, Chancellor David Klingberg applauded Professor Bradley's leadership. He said, 'One of the great experiences of my professional career has been working with Denise Bradley, and my admiration for her has grown with each passing year of our association.'

Professor Bradley took on the role of lecturer at one of UniSA's founding institutions in 1975. She progressed quickly in her career and, at the time of the university's inception in 1991, she was Deputy Vice Chancellor, playing a critical role in the idea, establishment and early growth of the institution. When appointed Vice Chancellor, Professor Bradley was only the third woman in Australia to hold such a position. She took the helm at one of the most rapid periods of change ever seen—economic, social and technological—and huge change in the higher education sector. Chancellor Klingberg highlighted the emergence of UniSA as a mature institution under Professor Bradley's leadership. He said:

> The picture of UniSA's growth over the last decade is remarkable. Since 1996, student numbers have grown from 24 000 to 34 500; international students from 1 000 to 11 000; and the number of graduates has tripled to 100 000. Research income has also tripled, and the number of research institutes has increased from two to eight. Annual revenue has risen from $240 million to $400 million.

He also noted that UniSA's reputation and successful research in collaboration with industry have taken the university to number one in the nation in 2006. Similarly, UniSA's role as a leading Australian provider of offshore education had won it top spot from 2002 through to 2005, and it was a five-time winner of the Business SA Export Award for Education. Chancellor Klingberg said, 'Professor Bradley has built enormous respect for this institution among our peers and colleagues.' He went on to say:

> Denise's influence of sector governance and policy leadership has been nothing short of extraordinary. Her eye for the emerging issues—university alliances, online learning, student services, capital infrastructure—and her ability to identify the questions that need to be addressed and her capacity to make persuasive contributions to their resolution has been sought by many state, national and international bodies.
>
> In particular, her critical role in the reshaping of what is now Australia's fourth largest export industry, both through UniSA's international activity and as chair of Australia's international education agency, IDP, has gained international respect.

Reflecting on Professor Bradley's leadership, Chancellor Klingberg said that each step in her career had always been a new challenge that she embraced with energy. He also said:

> Denise approaches new challenges with youthful engagement in the ideas, a questioning mind and a leader's eye for the horizon. It is a mark of her leadership that change was never not an option, assumed positions could be altered and existing presumptions could be challenged. This is what we expect of our universities. As Denise herself has said, universities need to be young and brave in their thinking, and in Denise Bradley UniSA has benefited from a leader who has built those values into the foundation of the institution.

At the celebration, the Chancellor also announced that the forum in the new Hawke building would be named the Bradley Forum to mark Professor Bradley's enormous contribution to the university. Professor Klingberg finished his speech that night by saying, 'I thank Professor Bradley for her tireless efforts and ongoing contribution to our university and to Australian higher education.' I personally congratulate Professor Bradley on her contribution to UniSA and education generally.

We have now had UniSA for 15 years, and David Klingberg's message, in a booklet handed to us on the evening of the celebration, makes some very interesting points about the university. He says:

> When UniSA was formed in 1991. . . Our Act demands that we work with the industry to provide the graduates needed to contribute to the state's present and future economy, and that we generate ideas and know-how through research and consultancy. At the same time, we must pursue and support access to higher education for a broader cross-section of the community.
>
> UniSA is now the largest university in the state, it is a major provider and exporter of education programs, a leader in applied research and a champion of social justice, contributing to South Australia's income and employment generation, social and cultural development, and wealth-creation. We are a leader in educating professionals, creating and applying knowledge and engaging our communities. . .

> The University now educates most of the state's teachers, social workers, nurses and midwives, physiotherapists, pharmacists, accountants, marketers, engineers, scientists, town planners, architects and builders—to name just a few professions. Since 1991 over 100 000 UniSA graduates have made their mark in the world.
>
> UniSA's reach and impact have not been restricted by geographical borders, with the University growing to become one of Australia's most significant exporters of education. . . The institution has been awarded the Business SA Export Award for Education five times since 1999. . .

UniSA will continue to grow. I remind everybody that, as Professor Klingberg pointed out, education is the fourth biggest export earner for Australia. With people like Denise Bradley at the helm of a very fine university, I am sure that it will continue to grow. I wish her well for her retirement.

Ms THOMPSON (Reynell): I am very pleased to respond on behalf of the government to note the first 15 years of operation of the University of South Australia and, in particular, to speak of the significant contribution of its former vice-chancellor, Professor Denise Bradley, whose leadership over the past decade has played a crucial role in the creation and development of the University of South Australia as a centre of educational and research excellence. I am particularly pleased to do so, as I worked closely with Professor Bradley for a number of years at one of the precursor institutions to the University of South Australia, that is, the South Australian College of Advanced Education. Professor Bradley recently observed that she was one of the few who had been part of the birth and development of a major public institution. This is truly one of the most influential and transforming roles anyone in public life could have. I use the word 'transforming' advisedly, as Professor Bradley has spoken and written often of education as a transforming influence; a belief that education opens doors and changes lives. This belief derives from her own story, one that she has worked passionately towards throughout her career in education and, in particular, on behalf of almost 100 000 graduates of the University of South Australia who have used education to transform their lives.

I would like to dwell for a moment on Professor Bradley's impressive credentials, and my apologies if I repeat what has already been noted here and elsewhere. I will name just a few in order to reflect the diversity and depth of her experiences across a range of sectors. Professor Bradley began her career in education as a high school teacher. She taught at Brighton High School in the 1970s. From a career in teaching and lecturing, she moved into policy development to become a women's adviser to the South Australian Education Department before returning to the tertiary sector where she became a lecturer at one of UniSA's founding institutions. Professor Bradley quickly moved into a leadership role and was elected as the Dean of the Faculty of Education of what was then the South Australian College of Advanced Education.

That is where I first started working with Professor Bradley in her role as dean and as a leading advocate for education being a transforming experience, particularly in terms of women's education at the old Underdale campus. The early 1990s was a period of great change for the higher education sector, with the sector undergoing the biggest structural reform in its history in Australia. Professor Bradley was an integral part of the emergence of the University of South Australia from the South Australian Institute of Technology and the South Australian College of Advanced Education.

In 1991 Professor Bradley was named Deputy Vice-Chancellor, Planning, and she was a professor at South Australia's first new university for a quarter of a century. In 1997 Professor Bradley became only the third woman in Australia to hold the position of vice-chancellor. For over 20 years Professor Bradley has helped to create, shape and define higher education policy, bringing her knowledge, expertise and wisdom to a formidable list of state and national forums, again too numerous to mention.

I will, however, name a few recent achievements. Professor Bradley was named Asia Pacific Woman of Distinction in Education by the Asia Pacific Women's Business Council; she was listed as one of the five most powerful people in higher education in the country by the Australian *Financial Review* magazine; and, in 2005 she was named South Australian of the Year. Professor Bradley's many years of experience as a teacher, lecturer, principal, researcher and policy leader have helped focus attention on matters that are of importance to her. One of these—perhaps the most significant—is the area of educational access and equity.

The past 15 years have witnessed astonishing growth at UniSA. Student numbers (both domestic and international) have increased in their thousands. The university now has more than 34 000 students in South Australia and overseas. Professor Bradley has played an instrumental role in expanding educational opportunities to students who, a generation ago, may not have considered university an option. The University of South Australia's core values include a commitment to access and equity. The university's Establishment Act states that a function of the university is to provide such tertiary education programs as the university thinks appropriate to meet the needs of groups within the community that the university considers have suffered disadvantages in education.

The member for Morphett referred to the material that was provided to those of us who were able to attend the celebratory dinner. That material contains a very persuasive section about the activities of the university in providing access and equity and the way in which it has changed the lives of so many people. I suggest members might take the opportunity to read the section entitled 'Achieving Inclusion in Australia's Universities'. I am sure the library will have a copy of this publication. In walking the talk on this issue, Professor Bradley and UniSA have been leaders in providing opportunities to students from diverse backgrounds, including indigenous students, students from rural areas, students from a variety of socioeconomic backgrounds, and students with disabilities.

The University of South Australia has an active presence in our city's east and west ends, enhancing the city's cultural life and adding to its vitality. Of equal importance is the university's regional presence in Whyalla and Mount Gambier, and therefore its engagement with local communities. UniSA's Mount Gambier centre delivers courses in nursing, social work, business, and management information systems. Its Whyalla Centre for Regional Engagement delivers courses in areas of business and enterprise, nursing and rural health, and social work and rural practice. UniSA's commitment to programs for distance learning students reflects Professor Bradley's practical commitment to educational access and equity. The presence of the university in these regional centres will contribute to major transformations economically, socially and culturally in years to come. That is a significant legacy in itself.

Professor Bradley has been an inspirational and impressive leader on many issues in higher education throughout her time at UniSA and previously, and has seen the university evolve in the areas of infrastructure, innovation and research. For example, research income has tripled and the number of research institutes has increased from two to eight, notably the university's Ian Wark Research Institute, which is recognised worldwide as a centre of research excellence. In 1999 the institute gained recognition as the government-sponsored Australian Research Council (ARC) Special Research Centre for Particle and Material Interfaces. It is now also the headquarters of the Australian Mineral Science Research Institute. Under Professor Bradley's tutelage, UniSA has become a leading provider of offshore education, while playing a fundamental role in the shaping of education as an export industry.

In May 2007, at a dinner to celebrate the achievements of Professor Bradley, as has been mentioned, it was announced that the forum in the new Hawke building would be named the Bradley Forum to mark Professor Bradley's enormous contribution to the university. It is testimony to Professor Bradley's many achievements that only a few can be mentioned here today.

I commend the University of South Australia for its significant contribution to the higher education sector in our state. I thank, on behalf of the government, Professor Bradley for her outstanding service and her defining role in delivering 15 years of success and achievement for the University of South Australia. On behalf of the government, I wish her a fulfilling and stimulating retirement. Having delivered the thanks from the government, in the brief time available I would like to mention a couple of the personal observations I have from my time working with Professor Bradley.

The first one that comes to mind is the way she consumed books. It is almost as though she just looked at the book and its cover and could talk eloquently and interestingly about its contents. Whether it was a murder mystery or an academic tome, she grasped it so quickly. She was also very good at connecting the dots. When there were a number of different events going on around, she was able to find whether or not there was a common theme that enabled any issues to be tackled differently, by seeing just where the connections were. She overcame systemic discrimination in her career, having been only the third woman to become a vice-chancellor, but she experienced much systemic discrimination before that. Her battle to be recognised within the university community was significant. She overcame it, and she helped others to overcome these problems also.

Time expired.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher): As someone who worked at the antecedent organisations that led to the University of South Australia, I feel some obligation to contribute to this motion. The University of South Australia has sprung from the amalgamation of a CAE and what was the Institute of Technology. But, going back even further, I guess it began as Western Teachers College, and that had premises where the Remand Centre is today. I do not know whether that says anything. It also had premises off South Road and adjacent to South Road. There are a few little snippets of trivia that come to mind when looking at those antecedent organisations. The then director of Western Teachers College sheltered from the rain one day in Gawler Place when the Lotteries Commission had its headquarters there. Normally he was not a gambling person, but he bought a ticket and won first prize in the lottery. That same director, when it was suggested that in creating the Underdale Campus there should be an arboretum, said, 'We cannot afford to build anything like that.' We never got to build anything like that. Anyway, Western Teachers College went on to become the Adelaide College of the Arts and Education, a CAE and then, ultimately, it amalgamated with the Institute of Technology.

One of the great strengths of those antecedent organisations was that they had people who had a teaching background who made excellent lecturers. Sadly, that is one of the things that I think is going to be reflected in university lecturing from now on, that you will not have that same wonderful history of people with a teaching background and teaching methodology who can really impart knowledge and skill to students. Things have certainly changed.

There were some interesting experiences in those early days. In the science faculty they used to have a cage with reptiles in it, dangerous reptiles like killer snakes and brown snakes. There was a chap who worked there who was like a caretaker, and they said to him, 'Look, it's coming up to the vacation, we want you to keep an eye on these snakes and do whatever you need to do with them. It's quite safe to put your hand in the cage because they've all been defanged.' Well, the poor chap did that, but unfortunately they were not defanged. He did not get bitten, but for all the holidays he had been putting his hand in the cage with the brown snakes and the tiger snakes—and fortunately did not get bitten, but it was a bit of a cruel joke. On another occasion, on a science camp down the bottom of Yorke Peninsula, one lad thought he would be smart and put a sugar bag on his head to scare the women—the sort of thing you do when you are a young male and a bit silly. Unfortunately for him he did not realise someone had put a snake in the bag—they had collected it earlier in the day—and when it was pointed out to him that he had this sugar bag on his head with a snake in it, he removed it very quickly indeed!

More importantly and more seriously, I think the University of South Australia has made and is going to continue to make a very significant contribution to life in South Australia. In fact, I was the minister at the time who was a guarantor for the cheque from Westpac, I think, to help fund the initial North Terrace construction, and I am pleased to say the university, to my knowledge, has never defaulted on that, so I have not been hauled up before the securities commission or anywhere else.

There were some fantastic characters who formed part of the heritage of what is now the University of South Australia. I used to lecture with a chap by the name of Graham Smith—some of you may have known him. He was a very strong Marxist and a member of the Communist Party; a wonderful lovely man. It was in the days before there was child care. He and I used to lecture in a subject which is now part of the school curriculum called society and the environment—we created it—and he used to lecture with his baby daughter under his arm because there was no childcare facility. So things have certainly improved in that regard.

There were a couple of villains down at Underdale. The art department made a huge life-size white elephant that they put in front of the administration building, which was not appreciated by the director or by the administration—but there were people down there who had a sense of humour. At another time the whole property at Underdale was put in *The Australian*, listed for sale as a bargain property, and that also did not get the approval of the director; he was not amused. It is a long time ago, but I was there when a riot almost broke

out when Sir John Kerr rocked up on campus. At that time Gough Whitlam's contribution—and I know he is getting on in age now—to making university education more accessible and affordable I think is one of the greatest things that was done. Sadly, it has been essentially undermined in recent times and we have gone the opposite way, contrary to what is happening in countries like Eire, where they have made it easier and cheaper for students to access tertiary education.

I have always disagreed with HECS. I believe that if you have a fair tax system—we do not quite have one but, if you do, the more you earn, the more tax you should pay. I am happy to pay for an education at university to which I did not have to contribute directly at the time. So, it was a volatile experience, with Sir John Kerr being attacked, and almost physically. I think he would have been if people had not been restrained. We can thank Gough Whitlam for putting a lot of money into higher education, and it is interesting to reflect that Sir Robert Menzies was also a great champion of universities but, in recent times, for reasons that escape me, we now seem to have a policy of trying to make it harder for poorer students to get into university and to gain a professional or other skill base.

The University of South Australia has done a lot of good things. I personally do not agree with the idea of having something named after a Prime Minister while the Prime Minister is alive. I do not wish Bob Hawke anything untoward but I would be equally opposed if, for example, another university wanted to create the Howard Centre. One may have already done it, but I do not think it is appropriate to do so because it does convey a sort of political impression and is not the right thing to do. However, it exists and there are some excellent people who work in the Hawke Centre, including various professors of economics, many of whom members in here would be well aware of. There are a couple of not so good things that the University of South Australia has done in recent years.

One was the destruction of the Salisbury campus, of which I do not think the financial implications have been settled yet. At the end of the day, the University of South Australia will get less than $2 million for all of that property and the heartache that it inflicted on the northern suburbs. Likewise at Underdale, the destruction of wonderful facilities for the sake of $30 million, including selling off the linear park (which the government then had to reclaim), I thought was outrageous behaviour by the council of the day of the University of South Australia. It demolished an almost brand new Aboriginal studies building and a nursing facility that was at least on a par with the most modern in the state. They were destroyed, along with the home economics training facilities and technical studies that were purpose built, yet I see in the paper recently the university claiming credit for reintroducing home economics!

Yes, the students have to go to Mawson Lakes for theory and find a place in TAFE for the practical. It was all there at Underdale and, sadly, with that short-sighted decision, that has all been destroyed. So, in praising the university for the good things it has done and is doing, you have to be honest and say that some mistakes have been made. I think that the destruction of the Salisbury campus and the Underdale campus have to come into the category of negatives. Importantly, the university should not forget that, ultimately, universities are there as part of the search for truth and to impart knowledge and skills, and they should not be tempted to go down a path of merely seeking money, which is an attraction for all universities and, in the process, short-changing students by having tutorial and other class sizes far too large.

Universities should protect their integrity and not sell themselves short by simply going on a money chase and giving up their fundamental purpose, which is the search for truth and imparting knowledge and skills. I commend the new Vice-Chancellor of the university, Peter Hoj, who is an outstanding academic who I am sure will provide great leadership for the University of South Australia into the future. I wish the university well and am sure that it will go from strength to strength.

Ms CICCARELLO (Norwood): I think my colleagues on both sides have outlined in detail the great contribution that Professor Bradley has made, and I would like to add just a few words. Professor Bradley is another of the many illustrious constituents of Norwood and a woman who has certainly brought great changes to tertiary education. She needs to be admired for her sensible approach to things and also for the fact that she has recognised that we now live in a global society and has opened up the university not only to our regions—and I think many of our country regions benefit from their association with the University of South Australia—but also a great focus on international students, and it is important that we have so many international students participating at UniSA.

With our global economy, it now means that we can establish links with other countries through having students here in South Australia. Having travelled to several countries, I can say that UniSA is recognised in many countries overseas for its innovative approach to education. Professor Bradley will be a loss to our universities, but I am sure that she will continue to contribute to the educational life of South Australia. She has had to fight many battles in her life to bring about changes, but all our students and educational institutions have benefited from her untiring efforts.

Motion carried.

GOVERNOR, RETIRING

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett): I move:

That this house congratulates Her Excellency Marjorie Jackson-Nelson AC, CVO, MBE, on her distinguished role as Governor of South Australia over the past five years.

This motion is one that I move with great enthusiasm and the utmost sincerity. I first met Mrs Jackson-Nelson, as she then was—never plain Mrs Jackson-Nelson; she has never been plain. She has always been an example to us all. I first met her a number of years ago when she came to my veterinary clinic with her daughter, who was a very good friend of one of the vets I employed. It was a real thrill for me to meet Mrs Jackson-Nelson and to know some of the history of this outstanding woman. To have her there in my veterinary clinic and be able to talk to her was something that I will always remember.

She has never been plain Mrs Jackson-Nelson. She is an outstanding role model for us all. As Governor, I know that she has been extremely hardworking, and she is a credit to that position. I have had the pleasure of meeting and talking with a number of governors over the years. I pay particular tribute to Her Excellency because she often has not had people on whom she could rely or back her up. Her Excellency Marjorie Jackson-Nelson, in carrying out her duties, has gone above and beyond. Likewise, the Governor's Deputy, Mr Bruno Krumins, has done an absolutely wonderful job.

In 2006, when I was the shadow minister for sport and recreation, I made a speech at a Sports SA sponsors and members breakfast in which I congratulated the Governor on her contribution to sport. In that speech, I reflected on some of the wonderful things the Governor has done. I was looking at the post-nominals AC, CVO, MBE after her name. Most people did not know what they stood for, so I put them right. I said that they are not just another lot of 'pommie gongs' but that AC stands for Aussie champion; CVO, champion volunteer organiser (and we know about her outstanding work with the Peter Nelson Foundation, with millions of dollars having being raised); and MBE is for mother, businesswoman and an example to us all—and, indeed, our current Governor, Her Excellency Marjorie Jackson-Nelson, is an example to us all.

If members go to the Governor's website, they will find quite a comprehensive biography of Her Excellency. I will not read it all, but it is there for everyone to read and I encourage all members to read it. We know that Marjorie Jackson-Nelson was born in Lithgow, New South Wales, but we claim her as our own; she is a dinky-di South Australian. When you look at her performance as an Olympic athlete you can understand why she is referred to as the Lithgow Flash (a reference to the town of Lithgow) and now she is referred to by us all, in a very friendly way, as Governor Flash. Marjorie Jackson-Nelson's Olympic record is outstanding. She won two gold medals in Helsinki in 1952 and seven Commonwealth Games medals between 1950 and 1954. She won every state and Australian title for the 100 yards, 100 metres, 200 yards and 200-metre sprints. Marjorie was the first Australian woman to win an Olympic gold medal for track and field and the first Australian (male or female) since 1896 to win an Olympic gold medal on the running track. During her athletic career, Marjorie Jackson broke world sprint records on 10 occasions. In 1952, she was recognised as Australia's Sportsman (although it should have been 'Sportsperson') of the Year. I am not being sexist in any way, but she was the best sportsperson (male or female), and you can see that has been recognised when you look at her track record.

In 1953, Marjorie Jackson married Peter Nelson, an Olympic cyclist. Following his death from leukaemia in 1977, she launched the Peter Nelson Leukaemia Research Fellowship and has since dedicated herself to raising funds to sponsor research into fighting this disease. Based here in South Australia, her single-handed campaign in this area has involved thousands of hours of work speaking to groups across Australia. Perhaps after the presentation from the Juvenile Diabetes Research Fund this morning, we can second the Governor to help that organisation in her spare time after she retires as Governor.

In 1986, Adelaide's Lord Mayor held a civic reception to honour Marjorie Jackson-Nelson's achievements in raising $1 million for leukaemia research; I understand that the amount raised is now in the many millions of dollars, and I wish her well in that research. The funds raised have been used to sponsor a leukaemia laboratory in Adelaide and, more recently, for the appointment of a second researcher at the Flinders Medical Centre. In 1986, during South Australia's sesquicentenary celebrations, a plaque was laid in North Terrace, Adelaide, honouring Marjorie Jackson-Nelson as a great South Australian. She might have been born in New South Wales and she might have been called the Lithgow Flash, but she is our Governor Flash, and we honour her as a great South Australian.

In 1988, she was nominated by the Governor-General and the Prime Minister as one of 20 living members of the 200 great Australians recognised by the Australian Bicentenary Committee. In 2001, Marjorie Jackson-Nelson became a Companion of the Order of Australia and, as Governor, was appointed a Commander of the Royal Victorian Order by Her Majesty the Queen on the occasion of the royal visit to Adelaide in February 2002. Some of her business highlights go right back to the Olympic period in the 1950s. We remember Marjorie Jackson-Nelson's wonderful speech at the state dinner in honour of her retirement. I must admit there were a few teary eyes in the place because, if nothing else, this Governor speaks from the heart. I know my wife was almost in tears, moved by Her Excellency's sincerity and genuineness.

The list of Marjorie Jackson-Nelson's career highlights is too long for me to mention in the short time I have today. However, I understand that one career highlight that does not have a date next to it refers to way back in the early 1960s. I know a bit about this because Her Excellency's children were at the Sports SA breakfast, and one of her daughters told the story about the time the Jackson-Nelson family had a clothing and sporting goods retail shop on Unley Road, where Marjorie worked to try to keep the household going and also to pay for her various interests. A woman came into the shop and stole a blouse, and Marj saw her running out of the shop carrying this box containing the blouse. The silly woman did not know that she was about to be chased by one of the fastest women on earth, and it was only a few yards down from the shop, in the middle of Unley Road, that Marj and this woman were tugging over this box containing the blouse, and Marj won. I do not know the end of the story, but I guarantee that, if the woman had known she was about to be chased by one of the fastest women in the world, she would not have even thought about stealing the blouse, let alone running off with it.

The complete and comprehensive list of Marjorie Jackson-Nelson's career highlights goes way back to 1982 when Marj was the Women's Section Manager of the Australian Commonwealth Games. I was very pleased to see the Premier announce at the dinner that Marjorie Jackson-Nelson would be accompanying the Australian Olympic team to Beijing next year.

It is necessary not to politicise the Governor's position, and all members of parliament should be aware of that. The present Governor, Marjorie Jackson-Nelson, has never shown the slightest political bias in any way, shape or form. She has been an absolute example to us all, in both private life and public life.

Her deputy, Mr Bruno Krumins, is also retiring. Bruno has done an absolutely wonderful job, and I know that there have been many times when, because of the stresses and strains of the job, Her Excellency has been unwell and Mr Krumins has stood in, and it has been a delight to deal with him. He is a gentleman, and he will certainly be missed. He will be recognised as having contributed in an outstanding way to the history of South Australia.

Marjorie Jackson-Nelson will go down in history as an outstanding Governor. Rex Jory wrote an excellent article in *The Advertiser* recently, talking about some of her attributes. I recommend that members go to the Governor's website, check *The Advertiser* and have a look at some of the things that this amazing woman has done, not only for herself in achieving her personal goals in the Olympics, but also for the Leukaemia Research Foundation on behalf of her husband,

Peter, and all South Australians. I extend my most sincere congratulations, and those of the Liberal opposition, to Her Excellency Marjorie Jackson-Nelson and I wish her a very pleasant retirement. I am not sure whether she is in my electorate, but I wish she was.

Ms BREUER (Giles): It is with pleasure that I rise to support this motion of the member for Morphett, because I think Her Excellency Marjorie Jackson-Nelson put the 'excellent' back in 'Her Excellency'. She has been a wonderful advocate and ambassador for South Australia. She has warmed the hearts of many South Australians. Unfortunately, I was not able to go to her state farewell but I would have loved to be there. I heard it was a wonderful night. I remember that she came to Whyalla a couple of years ago. Each year I have a fundraiser for breast cancer research and we were honoured to have Her Excellency there. Everybody who was at that dinner, which was a women's dinner, was touched by how warm and friendly she was. We all took delight when she won a raffle prize and got very excited about that when she picked out something for one of her young grandchildren. Afterwards, everybody said how warm and wonderful and human she was.

A lot of people get a picture in their mind of a governor and we do not know too much about them; we see them only on television or driving past in a big car. Her Excellency was out there mingling with people, and I think it is amazing that we never think of her as Her Excellency Marjorie Jackson-Nelson—it is always Marj. That is just how she has portrayed herself and how the people of South Australia feel about her. I think she has probably been the most loved Governor we have ever had in this state, and we all wish her well in the future. We know that we in this state are not going to lose her, and we would welcome her in here at any time. We look forward to meeting her at various functions, and I hope that she has a happy and long retirement. Knowing her, I am sure that it will not be a quiet one; she will still remain busy. She will always remain in the hearts of South Australians.

Mrs GERAGHTY secured the adjournment of the debate.

GOVERNOR-DESIGNATE

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett): I move:

> That this house congratulates Rear Admiral Kevin Scarce AO, CSC, RANR on his appointment as Governor and wishes him a successful tenure.

I rise to congratulate the Governor-Designate Rear Admiral Kevin John Scarce AO, CSC, RANR. I have met Kevin Scarce on a number of occasions but only briefly, and he has always impressed me as a forthright, charming man of considerable intellect. Without doubt, he will be an excellent governor for this state. He has a hard act to follow, but I know that Rear Admiral Scarce will do an excellent job. He is a northern suburbs boy. He was born in Adelaide in 1952—a very good year, I must say. He spent his early childhood in Woomera, but then he was educated at Elizabeth East Primary School and Elizabeth High School. I went from Elizabeth South Primary School to Salisbury Primary then to Salisbury High. My brother and my mother still live out at Elizabeth and, certainly, with roots like that, you remember where you have come from and the people you have seen on your journey of life, and I guarantee that Kevin Scarce will be, like Her Excellency Marjorie Jackson-Nelson, a people's governor.

Kevin Scarce has had a distinguished naval career, which he started when he joined the Royal Australian Navy in 1968. After graduating from Naval College, Kevin Scarce served on HMAS *Sydney* in Vietnam and then he undertook courses in the United Kingdom in 1973. I am not sure whether my oldest brother, Malcolm, was under Rear Admiral Scarce on the HMAS *Sydney* in its tour of Vietnam, but he certainly was there as well. That is yet another link to my family. I hope that I have a close association with the new governor. In 1975, Kevin was posted to HMAS *Watson* where he married Elizabeth Anne Taylor. In 1977, he participated in the Queen's Silver Jubilee celebrations in the United Kingdom at Spithead when he was serving on HMAS *Melbourne*. The HMAS *Sydney* and HMAS *Melbourne* were the two aircraft carriers that the Australian Navy had and, for Rear Admiral Scarce to be on our two biggest ships (our flagships at the time), it is an indication of his competence.

On completion of the cruise, Kevin was posted to the RAN Staff College Project to establish the first naval staff course in Australia, which commenced in 1979. The family then moved again, as happens in military life, to Washington DC in 1979 to serve at the Australian Embassy. On return to Australia in 1982, Kevin completed further specialist supply training before being posted again to sea on HMAS *Perth* as the supply officer. Promoted to commander in 1985, Kevin undertook one of his many postings to the Canberra region where he undertook a variety of specialist logistic roles until 1987. In that year the family moved again, this time to the Nowra area of New South Wales where Kevin was appointed as the supply officer at naval air station on HMAS *Albatross*. Following a year's study at the University of New South Wales ADFA campus, where Kevin completed a Master of Management Economics degree, he was promoted to captain and posted to fleet headquarters as the fleet supply officer. He remained in this role until a further posting to Canberra in 1993.

In 1994 the family moved back to Washington DC where Kevin completed his Master's Degree in National Security Strategy at the War College, US National Defence University. Kevin took command of HMAS Cerberus in 1995, where he remained until promoted to Commodore in 1997. Later that year Kevin was appointed as Flag Officer Naval Training Command. The family moved twice in 1999: to Sydney early in the year where Kevin was posted as Commodore Logistics, responsible for supporting the fleet at sea, and then back to Melbourne in December after being promoted to the rank of Rear Admiral, where he assumed the duties of Support Commander-Navy.

From 2000 until 2003, as head of maritime systems in the Defence Materials Organisation, Kevin was responsible for the acquisition of all Australian Defence Force ships and submarines, and the support of these vessels and their equipment through life. Immediately prior to retiring from the Royal Australian Navy in 2004 at the rank of Rear Admiral, he briefly led the Defence Materials Organisation. This organisation, which is widely dispersed throughout Australia and overseas, had 8 000 staff spending more than $6 billion annually in acquiring and supporting the entire Australian Defence Force military platforms and equipment. We can see why the government selected Kevin Scarce to be the leader of the lobby group for the air warfare destroyers and the defence procurement committee. He has done an excellent job.

Following his retirement, Kevin formed and led the South Australian government team charged with expanding the

state's defence business opportunities. As it states on the Governor's website—from which this material is taken and which I encourage people to read—it was successful in obtaining the air warfare destroyer contract in Adelaide in May 2005 when the federal government awarded the contract to the locally-based Adelaide Submarine Corporation. The state's $250 million package of infrastructure, skills development and attraction was integral to this approach, but I think if Kevin Scarce had not been there nothing would have happened. It was his know-how, experience and contacts that convinced the federal government to give Adelaide the air warfare destroyers.

In 2006 Kevin became an adviser to the corporation formed to deliver the state's shipbuilding infrastructure and skills commitment, and was a member of the Port Adelaide Maritime Corporation Board. He was also chairman of the board of Foundation Daw Park, a volunteer organisation that generates funding for medical research for veterans and older Australians.

Kevin and his wife Liz have two children. His daughter Kasha (born 1978) works as youth counsellor with Boys Town in Sydney and his son Kingsley (born 1980) is a lieutenant in the Royal Australian Navy. The website states that Kevin is a keen golfer with aspirations well beyond his ability. I know he has a golfing handicap but there are no handicaps to his being an outstanding governor for us all in South Australia. I wish Kevin and his wife Liz well in their term as Governor. I look forward to attending the State Dinner in my electorate in a few weeks time at the Stamford Grand.

Mrs GERAGHTY secured the adjournment of the debate.

TAXATION, MOTOR VEHICLES

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr M.L.J. Hamilton-Smith:

That this House condemns the state government for the excessive and unfair tax taken from South Australian motorists and notes that—

(a) taxes on motorists have increased over the five years of the Rann Labor government by 21 per cent;
(b) the Rann Labor government receives at least $300 million per annum of GST revenue from petrol sales;
(c) South Australian motorists also pay $386 million for compulsory third party insurance; and
(d) Victorian motorists are paying up to $750 less for stamp duty than their South Australian counterparts.

(Continued from 21 June. Page 533.)

Mr KENYON (Newland): I will move through a few of the points made by the member for Waite when he moved his motion. Taxes on motor vehicles comprise registration fees, stamp duty on new motor vehicle registrations and transfers, and the ESL on mobile property. It is the case that, at the time of the 2006-07 budget, tax revenue from motor vehicles was forecast to increase by 21.4 per cent over the five years from 2001-02 to 2006-07. This is equivalent to an annual compound rate growth over the period of 4 per cent, which is only slightly stronger than the annual inflation rate over the same period.

Growth in motor vehicle registration revenue reflects the annual indexation of registration fees as well as the underlying growth in stock of registered vehicles. So, the dollar amount the government receives is not just from putting up the cost of registration but also reflects the fact that the number of cars on the road has increased and therefore there are more registration fees. Fee indexation is based on a composite index of wage and price movements. I seem to recall, and I stand to be corrected if I am wrong, that the formula used to raise fees and charges across government was devised by the former Liberal government and has just been maintained by the current government. So, it is somewhat ironic that the member for Waite should come in here and criticise a formula that his party invented—and implemented, no less.

Growth in motor vehicle stamp duty revenue reflects growth in the number of new motor vehicle registrations and the transfers of used vehicles, as well as the growth in the average value of motor vehicles being registered for the first time, or because of ownership changes. I wonder whether part of that is the effect of the modernisation of the cars being driven on our roads as a result of economic growth over time, which is reflected in an increase in value of the fleet. Revenue collected from ESL on motor vehicles has lower growth because ESL charges are a flat $24 per car and per larger motorcycle, and those charges have remained at the same level since 2000-01. Revenue growth in the ESL component reflects the total stock and the increase in the number of cars on the road.

The second point made by the member for Waite was about GST revenue. Information on GST revenue categorised by product is not available, but rough estimates on fuel sales indicate a figure of around $300 million per annum for South Australia. However, it is not particularly meaningful to attribute GST revenue to particular activities or products. I think the Treasurer has made the point previously, and it needs to be made again, that, as petrol prices go up, thus increasing GST revenue, sales of other goods and services tend to contract a little bit and, obviously, the GST collected on those items is reduced. So, on the whole, it is not unfair to say that the GST collected probably is not largely affected by rises in petrol prices because of the effect on the wider economy. It is also worth noting that, at the time of the introduction of the GST in 2000, the prevailing rate of commonwealth excise on petrol was reduced so that when GST was applied there would be no impact on prevailing petrol prices.

Some points made by the member for Waite about compulsory third party insurance were quite interesting. He complained about the amount paid per car, which is $386. The compulsory third party insurance premium for a non-ITC entitled class 1 passenger vehicle located within insurance rating district 1—and that really means a private passenger vehicle located in the Adelaide area—in 2006-07 is $371, not the $386 mentioned by the member for Waite. That is down from $375 in 2005-06 and $385 in 2004-05. That means that compulsory third party premiums have been reduced over the course of the last two years. They have reduced each year over the last two years, and that is to be commended. On average, CTP premiums have reduced by 2.7 per cent in 2005-06 and a further 0.9 per cent in 2006-07, bringing the average premium level in 2006-07 to $349.30, and we must not forget the 30¢.

Some comments were made about Victorian and South Australian comparisons and the stamp duty payable in various states, particularly Western Australia and Victoria. Following recent budget announcements in those states, it is the case that new motor vehicle registration fees will be higher in South Australia relative to Victoria for vehicles less than $57 000 and relative to Western Australia for motor vehicles up to $32 000.

It should be noted that Victoria is funding its reduction in motor vehicle stamp duty by abolishing its petroleum subsidy schemes. Obviously, subsidy schemes are designed to reduce fuel costs, particularly for those in rural areas of the state. I wonder whether the Liberal Party is advocating a reduction in fuel subsidies, because that is how it was achieved in Victoria. The member for Waite comes in here and suggests that we should make changes to our stamp duties, but one of the ways of funding those is by reducing fuel subsidies, which I do not think will go down too well in the electorates of the member for Hammond, the member for Schubert or the member for Flinders. I do not think that they would be too pleased with a reduction in fuel subsidies. I wonder whether the member for Waite is actually advocating a reduction in fuel subsidies. I do not think we would support that in this state because, invariably, it is the members of the rural community who are most affected by those subsidies.

Members interjecting:

Mr KENYON: If members of the Liberal Party want to come into this place and advocate a reduction in rural fuel subsidies, they should have the courage to say so. They should come in here and do it and not make sly comments about stamp duty. They should have the courage of their convictions and come in here and advocate it, but we do not see that. We do not see any plain speaking from the Leader of the Opposition. We do not see people coming in here and saying, 'This is how we are going to fund it.' It is just the usual whining about how we should do this and, 'Wouldn't it be nice if we could do that? Wouldn't it be great if we could do it this way, or wouldn't it be great if we could pay less tax?' There is no indication of any sort of responsibility, courage or actual policy—just whining and whingeing about paying stamp duties where they know that, if they wanted to do that (but they probably will not), they would have to cut rural fuel subsidies.

Mr VENNING (Schubert): I will not let a speech like that go totally unchallenged because it was a lot of drivel. I support the motion of my leader. It is a very relevant motion. South Australian motorists are being harvested, with a 21 per cent increase since this government was elected five years ago. Country people pay an even higher price because most of them must have two cars per family because there is no option: there is no public transport, and they cannot catch a bus or a taxi. They pay a double whammy because they must have two cars, or at least one per adult person in the house. Petrol is dearer in country regions, and $300 million from GST comes back to the state government. How much of that does it spend on the state's roads—$14 million.

An honourable member: Over four years.

Mr VENNING: Yes. It is a disgrace. The $386 for compulsory third party insurance is far too high, particularly as Victoria has a cheaper regime. It will cause all sorts of problems. The harvesting by the speed cameras and the amount of money that comes in from them has not even been mentioned. I know that you say it is avoidable, but the cameras are put there to reap money for the government. All this would be sort of palatable if the money went back into our roads but, as we know, they are in an absolutely deplorable condition. As we come to a federal election, obviously roads will be an issue—as they ought to be.

Mrs Geraghty interjecting:

Mr VENNING: If the member for Torrens would allow me at least to think without harping and carping. I did not interject while she was speaking. I think that the motion is extremely relevant.

Mrs Geraghty interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr VENNING: I think that it is quite wrong that motorists are being harvested and absolutely taxed out of their motor cars. I would not mind if a large proportion of the money went back into the roads they drive on. The bad roads are costing us lives and time. This morning, I wasted half an hour of my day caught up in traffic snarls. This sort of thing is avoidable and is costing everybody. We are not spending money where it ought to be spent. We are wasting it on public relations outfits. We ought to be spending it on things like this. You are going to pay the price. What will you leave the people? What is your remedy? How do you solve the problem? You solve it by putting on toll roads. Are toll roads the answer? Because that is what all of you are condemning South Australia to. For the record, are you in favour of toll roads? You had better say yes, because that is what you are going to give the people.

Mrs Geraghty interjecting:

Mr VENNING: Mr Speaker, I am being harassed.

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the member for Torrens.

Mr VENNING: People must think ahead. You are condemning the state to a regime of toll roads purely because you are not spending any money on roads. You are collecting it off the motorists. You must put it back to where it has come from, that is, back on our roads.

Debate adjourned.

[Sitting suspended from 1 to 2 p.m.]

KANGAROO ISLAND FUEL PRICING

A petition signed by 1 274 residents of South Australia requesting the house to urge the government to examine all state fuel taxes in an effort to establish fair and equitable pricing for Kangaroo Island on all fuels was presented by Mr Pengilly.

Petition received.

SCHOOL FUNDING

A petition signed by 215 residents of South Australia requesting the house to urge the government to reject cuts to public school and preschool budgets and ensure funding of public education to enable each student to achieve their full potential was presented by Mr Venning.

Petition received.

BIRD DESTRUCTION

A petition signed by 12 residents of South Australia requesting the house to urge the minister to repeal the proclamation permitting unlimited destruction by shooting by commercial horticulturalists of the Adelaide and yellow rosellas and the musk and rainbow lorikeets was presented by Ms Bedford.

Petition received.

MODBURY HOSPITAL

A petition signed by 1 476 residents of South Australia requesting the house to urge the government not to proceed with the closure of Modbury Hospital's paediatric and obstetrics services was presented by Ms Chapman.

Petition received.

HOSPITALS, NEW

A petition signed by 127 residents of South Australia requesting the house to urge the government to invite the people of South Australia to have their say regarding the renaming and relocation of the Royal Adelaide Hospital was resented by Ms Chapman.

Petition received.

CLERK, RETIREMENT

The SPEAKER: I draw to the attention of members that the retirement of the Clerk of the House of Assembly, Mr David Bridges, will become official on 17 August during the break of parliament. It is therefore my intention over the break to begin advertising and the process of recruitment for a new Clerk of the House of Assembly.

URANIUM EXPORTS TO INDIA

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: It has been reported today that the federal Howard government is again looking at the option of selling Australian uranium to India. As the state with the world's greatest known uranium resource, I would like again to state to this house that this government's strong position is that any country that signs up to buy Australian uranium must be a signatory to the International Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty. India is not a signatory to that treaty. As I understand it, current commonwealth government law prohibits the sale of uranium to countries that have not signed the treaty.

It is vitally important to the future of this industry and this state that any uranium exported is for the peaceful use of nuclear energy. Any move by the Howard government to overturn federal law and allow Australia to export uranium to India, which has not signed up to the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, would undermine the treaty itself. As far as I am concerned, that is an unacceptable consequence. The Prime Minister needs to explain the difference between this and his stand nine years ago when India tested five nuclear bombs underground, prompting the same testing from its neighbour, Pakistan. Indeed, the Indian government at the time tested its nuclear weapons close to the Pakistani border, not far from Jaisalmer in Rajasthan, which I have visited. Perhaps the Prime Minister can explain the difference between his stand in 1998 and his stand today. *The Australian* of 13 May 1998 (just after that nuclear event) quotes the Prime Minister as saying that India's actions were:

> . . . an ill-judged step which could have most damaging consequences for security in South Asia and globally.

Mr Howard also said:

> What the Indian government has done is to play fast and loose with international safety and security.

He described the Indian government as fast and loose, but now he wants to sell our uranium to India. The Prime Minister continued to 'deplore and condemn absolutely' what India had done and said that it was an 'irresponsible genuflection to transient domestic political popularity. . . It is the most deeply disturbing development in every sense of those words'. The Prime Minister went on to say:

> Once you have nuclear weapons in the hands of two countries next door to each other who have. . . fought conventional wars with each other within the last 50 years, once those two countries have nuclear weapons the danger of something happening is much, much greater.

Today it appears that the Howard government is saying India should be exempt from the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, which seeks to contain the threat of nuclear weapons by:

- ending the spread of nuclear weapons;
- promoting the peaceful uses of nuclear energy under effective international safeguards that prevent misuse; and
- encouraging negotiations to end the arms race with a view to general and complete disarmament.

Rather than undermining the intent of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, Australia should be showing leadership by using its vast reserves of uranium as leverage to strengthen the secure and safe use of uranium. There is a case for reform of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty which began in 1968. Australia should be using its influence in this area to bring more countries into effective arrangements against nuclear proliferation and towards eventual disarmament. This government has welcomed India's recent commitment to meeting international nuclear safeguards, and its insisting that it is not a proliferating country despite its strategic nuclear weapons program, but the fact remains that it is not a signatory to the Non-Proliferation Treaty.

The bottom line is this: for years Australia has preached to the world that we would sell our uranium only to countries that signed the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty. As I understand it, that is not only international law, but also it is Australian law. It just beggars belief that now the Howard government wants to sell uranium (our uranium) to a country that the Prime Minister himself accused of being fast and loose just a few years ago in terms of international safeguards.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

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

Regulations under the following Act—
Development—Open Space Contribution Scheme

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

Natural Resources Management Council—Report 2005-06
Regulations under the following Act—
South Australian Health Commission—Prescribed Incorporated Health Centres

By the Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries (Hon. R.J. McEwen)—

Regulations under the following Act—
Forest Property—Fees

By the Minister for Consumer Affairs (Hon. J.M. Rankine)—

Regulations under the following Act—
Liquor Licensing—Gifts

By the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education (Hon. P. Caica)—

Department of Further Education, Employment, Science and Technology—Report 2006—Addendum to section E.

VISITORS TO PARLIAMENT

The SPEAKER: I draw to the attention of members the presence in the chamber today of delegates from Elders Limited, guests of the member for Adelaide.

QUESTION TIME

NORTHERN EXPRESSWAY

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Leader of the Opposition): My question is to the Minister for Transport. What is the current status of the Northern Expressway project? In particular, are all parties in agreement with the proposed route and alignment?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Minister for Transport): My understanding is that the route has been selected by a process after lengthy consultation and an environmental report. The City of Playford had some argument about that and spent $30 000 of its ratepayers' money commissioning an independent report, which found that the route and our process were correct. I think it may need to explain that matter to its councillors. The process is that we are now talking with the commonwealth. My understanding informally is that we have a proposal for funding the route. If there is any person, other than certain locals, who has a problem with the route, it has not been communicated to me.

DIABETES TYPE 1

Ms SIMMONS (Morialta): Will the Minister for Health explain to the house who are the very special guests in parliament today?

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Minister for Health): I recognise the honourable member's interest in this area, acknowledging her involvement with the parliamentary diabetes support group. I thank her and other members of this place, including the member for Morphett, and members in the other place who have supported the visit today by young people who have type 1 diabetes. In fact, we were lucky enough to have with us in parliament today 40 children who have juvenile or type 1 diabetes. They were here to raise awareness of the daily struggle which children and families face who manage this chronic disease. This event follows others in Queensland and Canberra, where members of parliament have had the opportunity to hear first hand about juvenile diabetes.

Earlier today I was delighted to meet Josh Brown, who was one of the young ambassadors here today, and his mother Kay. Josh was diagnosed when he was seven years old and he has now lived with the disease for almost 10 years. Josh told the assembled crowd at the front of Parliament House earlier today how the disease affects not only his health but also his lifestyle. In particular, many people believe that children, such as Josh, with type 1 diabetes must have had a poor diet and no exercise. These misconceptions are not true and make life difficult for families such as the Browns. While type 2 diabetes can be caused by poor diet and a lack of exercise, it is a very different situation for type 1 diabetes. In fact, we do not really know what causes type 1 diabetes, but we do know that approximately 140 000 Australians suffer from type 1 diabetes, with about five new cases being diagnosed every day.

There are two main things that governments need to do to combat this disease; first, to improve medical care; and, secondly, to increase medical research. Under the South Australian Health Care Plan, we are taking a new direction in health care by promoting wellbeing and detecting illness early and, through the GP Plus health centres, the new children's centres, family home visiting and upgrades to major hospitals, we have the opportunity to bring real benefits to the lives of the children who were here today. We are also undertaking a review of our medical research in South Australia in order to maintain our standards of research excellence for the future; and I was pleased to meet with John Shine and Alan Young who are conducting the review for us.

Currently, South Australian clinicians are leading the way in islet transplantation research. These transplants will give diabetes sufferers a temporary reprieve from their symptoms and offer new hope for an eventual cure. There has been progress and I am confident that more progress will be made in the future. A century ago sufferers of type 1 diabetes would starve to death within weeks of having the disease. However, due to advances in medical technology children can now live a fairly normal life.

On behalf of the parliament, I thank the Juvenile Diabetes Research Foundation for its efforts in raising awareness of this disease. I know that the foundation and many members of parliament are attending a dinner in parliament tonight to further consider some of these issues. I also acknowledge the enthusiasm shown by my parliamentary colleagues in forming the Parliamentary Diabetes Support Group, which is chaired by my colleague in another place, the Hon. Russell Wortley, and the deputy chair is the Hon. John Dawkins. Finally, thank you to the children and their families who were involved with Kids in the House for sharing their stories with us today. It was a privilege to meet this inspiring and really beautiful group of young people.

NORTHERN EXPRESSWAY

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett): Is the Minister for Transport aware of public concerns about conflicts of interest involving Mr Luigi Rossi, the project director of the Northern Expressway development? I refer to a statutory declaration from a landowner along the proposed Northern Expressway route, which I am happy to make available to the minister and which raises concerns about whether Mr Rossi has family connections with adjacent landowners who are in a position to benefit from the proposed route.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Minister for Transport): I am not aware of any person having any conflict. I think it is regrettable, if that is the case, that the first time we should hear an allegation made about a public servant it is made in this place and not to me. I am most happy to check into this, but I will find it extremely regrettable if that is true of a public servant who has worked for us, and for the previous government, for a number of years. All I can say is I sincerely hope there are proper grounds for doing this, because I can say that matter has never been raised with me—that is, the matter of Luigi Rossi having a conflict because of some family involvement. I will say that there was a thorough process for the selection of the route—and I will repeat that: there was a thorough process for the selection of the route—and that process went through consultation and an EIS. As I said, because of hostility to the chosen route from Playford council, the council commissioned an independent expert to look at the route, and I am told a letter was sent to me; but I guarantee I have not seen it. It may well be in the process, but I have not seen it as yet.

Mr Hamilton-Smith interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Can I tell the Leader of the Opposition, on this the last day of parliament, when he has failed to lay a glove on anything else, this is the difference between us and them. When we were in opposition we went

after ministers and premiers, and we got them. We did not go after public servants. I just say to you, having raised this matter in parliament and having brought—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I hope you are taking great pride in what you are doing today. Having raised this matter in parliament, I sincerely hope you have something to back it up. What I will say is this: having been through that process, the council which was hostile to it commissioned an independent expert, spent $30 000 on it, and the independent expert said it is the correct route and the process was correct. That is what I know. I will certainly, as a matter of priority, investigate the allegation the opposition has raised—in its desperation, because it has done nothing this week—but I do hope that it has not smeared a public servant for no reason. I think that would be a very unfortunate thing.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I have called the house to order.

INTERNATIONAL SOLAR CITIES CONGRESS

Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens): My question is to the Minister for Education and Children's Services. What is the government doing to ensure that the South Australian public will benefit from the International Solar Cities Congress being held in Adelaide next year?

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH (Minister for Education and Children's Services): I thank the member for Torrens for her question. As members would know, Adelaide has secured the 3rd International Solar Cities Congress, which will be held next February. As the government is keen to make sure that the messages about the event can reach all South Australians, we have devised a program of public involvement that should spread the message wider than a congress otherwise would, which would generally just reach the attendants and those speaking at the conference.

One of the Capital Cities Committee's projects has been to develop a free green festival, in fact, where all South Australians can learn how to conserve their use of water and energy. I am pleased to inform the house that this event will be staged in Adelaide next February to coincide with the International Solar Cities Congress. It is expected that 25 000 people will attend the Adelaide Green City Festival which will be held on Sunday, 17 February—the opening day of the International Solar Cities Congress. The festival will promote sustainable living, and will have experts on hand to offer tips and advice.

People have never been more aware of environmental issues such as climate change and global warming and, in particular, are anxious to find out what they can do as individuals within their own homes and within their businesses to minimise the impacts of these changes. It will mean that on this day there will be information about water and energy efficiency in homes and businesses, rainwater catchment and reuse, solar water heating, photovoltaic cells, and how to stay cool in the summer without using airconditioning. The congress will also put Adelaide and South Australia's green credentials on the map. It will bring more than a thousand delegates and show off our renewable energy initiatives, including our solar mallee trees, our mini wind turbines, our solar lights, our massive investment and high incidence of wind power, as well as our large numbers of PV cell installations in domestic locations.

The Adelaide City Green Festival has been developed between the Alternative Technology Association, the ANZ Solar Energy Society and the Capital City Committee, with the latter providing $40 000 to support this festival jointly with the Adelaide City Council. It is proposed that the festival will take place throughout the CBD, and a variety of stages, activities and stalls will be on show for the public. Adelaide is certainly leading the way in developing and demonstrating sustainable lifestyles, and the festival will further showcase both the efforts of individuals and residents but, most importantly, the government and business as well. I encourage you to put this date in your diary and encourage your constituents also to attend.

NORTHERN EXPRESSWAY

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett): My question is again to the Minister for Transport. Has the minister investigated complaints against Mr Rossi and, if so, what were the outcomes? The opposition has been advised that the minister was informed of the conflict of interest of his project director, Mr Luigi Rossi, by letters to him dated 5 July 2007, 17 July 2007 and 19 July 2007—on three occasions.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Minister for Transport): Can I say that one thing I am extremely confident about is that when we get to the bottom of this it is going to reflect poorly not on me but extremely poorly on the opposition. I hope to have a little further information for you by the end of the day.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I am told that a landowner has written to the department, making allegations about Mr Rossi that he is related to two individuals whose property did not go through. I would have thought that was a little bit hazy in itself as a conflict, and that those matters have not gone through to me, but through to the Office of Infrastructure, which is currently looking at it. But I can say, from what I can tell to date, that Mr Rossi has said he is not related to the individuals. Of course, there is the chance that Mr Rossi is not telling the truth. I know Mr Rossi, and I have absolutely no reason to believe that he is anything but a decent, hardworking public servant—who worked for your side as well. But I can tell you that, if he is telling the truth and if he was once a Liberal voter, I suspect he will not ever be again.

ADELAIDE CABARET FESTIVAL

Mr KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens): Will the Premier, as Minister for the Arts, update the house on the outcomes of the 2007 Adelaide Cabaret Festival?

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Minister for the Arts): Thank you very much, and I know the member behind me is someone whose own cabaret performances have been renowned; in fact, he is known to be a frequenter of cabarets. This year was the seventh Adelaide Cabaret Festival. Let me say—because we are different from the other side of the house—that I today want to place on record my congratulations to the former minister for the arts, the Hon. Diana Laidlaw. Just as we conceived a range of things, such as the Adelaide Film Festival and so on, it was the idea of a group of people who went to see Diana Laidlaw, and she backed it when she was in office. I think that it is very important for members of parliament on both sides to acknowledge

initiatives of the other side of politics. So, congratulations to Diana Laidlaw. I know that she is held in great regard by members opposite, as she is on this side.

The Adelaide Cabaret Festival presented 11 nights of performances and over 430 performers (220 of whom were South Australian) in 180 performances at eight venues within the Adelaide Festival Centre. The aim was to present a world-class traditional and contemporary cabaret and to stimulate and nurture a distinctive Australian voice of cabaret. What is more, this cabaret festival had something for everybody. The program included 28 international guests, 12 of whom were exclusive to the Adelaide Cabaret Festival and on their first visit to Australia.

The stellar line-up of local, national and overseas talent came from as far away as New York, London, Paris and Berlin, and as close to home as Mount Gambier, the Riverland and the APY lands in our state's north. Seventeen new shows were created especially for the festival this year, which is a major achievement for any arts festival. Total attendances, at ticketed and free events, were 48 000. The Adelaide Cabaret Festival increased its ticket sales from 55 per cent of capacity in 2006 to 71.5 per cent in 2007. The festival was also more affordable and accessible, with the net average ticket price being $28, down from $30 in 2006. Affordability is an important issue. Eighty-one per cent of tickets sold were purchased before the festival started, reflecting the trust and value audiences now place in the programming choices of the artistic director. Patrons recognise the uniqueness of the Adelaide Cabaret Festival. They are becoming increasingly knowledgeable about the genre of cabaret and have developed a sense of ownership of the event over the years.

Critics and audiences agree that the Adelaide Cabaret Festival is the best of its type in the world and that it has helped to reinvigorate the art of cabaret worldwide. I particularly enjoyed the opening night 'ASO plays cabaret' performance, with the amazing clarity and passion of Maude Maggart, who was fantastic. I know that the Leader of the Opposition is a great supporter of French existentialist philosophy, and I am sure that he would have also enjoyed Maude Maggart and Caroline Nin's tribute to Marlene Dietrich. The festival's masterclasses and music theatre workshops always play an important role in the program, having helped to nurture the talents of many local and interstate performers and composers over the years. The masterclasses continue to attract interstate visitors to the festival and, in 2007, this component of the program achieved record attendances.

Once again, the festival received generous reviews. I know that members opposite, particularly the Leader of the Opposition and the shadow minister for the arts, would have read the London-based publication *The Stage Online*. It commented that the festival:

> . . . is not just a showcase for work created elsewhere but a developmental platform too, where artists can stretch themselves—and each other. They learn, and they teach too.

The Australian wrote:

> The Adelaide Cabaret Festival. . . has become a defining destination for the international arts community.

Artistic Director Julia Holt and the staff of the Festival Centre are to be congratulated on again setting a very high standard. We can all be proud of the way in which the Adelaide Cabaret Festival has built and maintained its reputation as an international event. I congratulate all those involved, Julia Holt and our dear ex-minister for the arts, Diana Laidlaw.

Honourable members: Hear, hear!

NORTHERN EXPRESSWAY

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett): My question again is for the Minister for Transport, who I understand is looking forward to the question. Does the minister approve of his officers using bullying tactics against members of the public? The statutory declaration to which I referred earlier outlines a conversation with Mr Rossi and Dr Joe Ceravolo in which Mr Rossi stated, 'If this is the way you want to play the game, you've seen nothing yet.' Dr Ceravolo has also stated in the statutory declaration that he was shocked by the response and felt threatened.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Minister for Transport): I want to go through this very calmly and give as full an answer as I can. There is no doubt that Dr Ceravolo has taken great pains to demonstrate his disapproval of the Northern Expressway going through his land. He has made that very clear on a number of occasions. He has become quite agitated about the fact that the route cannot change, and I have sympathy for him, but we have greater considerations than Dr Ceravolo. We have to consider the best route for South Australia. I will correct one small thing that I said, although I am not sure it is a correction. Apparently, the connection between Mr Rossi and the alleged family is that Mr Rossi has an uncle who married a daughter of a family out there. I do not know if that makes him related. I do not think it does, but I am not an expert on distant genealogy, or whatever it is called.

The truth is that Mr Rossi has never had any discussions with that family about the route and, above all—and this the key point before we smear any more public servants—I am advised by the head of the Office of Infrastructure that the route was decided before Mr Luigi Rossi was put in charge of it. One change to the route has been made since that time, at the request of Mr Rossi, and it disadvantaged the family that he is alleged to be related to and, I am advised, advantaged the Ceravolo family. They may not see it that way, but my advice is that the route was set before Mr Rossi was put in charge of it.

Never mind your statutory declaration: we will provide the honourable member with ample evidence and, if my advice is wrong, I will certainly be most upset with them, but my advice from the most senior level is that the route was set before Mr Rossi was put in charge and that the only minor alteration to that route has been to the disadvantage of the family he is allegedly related to, with whom he has never had discussions. What that means is that, without the member for Morphett ever seeking a response from me or from the office, he has been quite happy—and I want everyone to note this. Since Martin Hamilton Smith became Leader of the Opposition, he asks every single question in here on every issue, but no: when there is muck to be raked he sends someone else out. This is pure muck.

I have no reason ever to suspect anything of this person. He deserves better than having his name dragged through here before there is an inquiry. The Office of Infrastructure under Rod Hook advises me that it has received these letters from Mr Ceravolo, has investigated them and believes that they come to absolutely nought, for the reasons that I have set out. Coming to the material of this question, the Northern Expressway is of enormous benefit to South Australia and to

the movement of freight. We cannot build a new 23-kilometre road without upsetting some people, but for small-time political purposes to come in here, have a crack at me, have a crack at the Premier, have a crack at these guys—we are used to it. Mr Rossi is not here to protect himself. Thankfully, I am but, frankly, I just think you are a desperate, desperate mob.

SPORT AND RECREATION, REGIONAL AREAS

Ms BREUER (Giles): My question is to the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing. What is the government doing to help South Australians participate in sport and recreation in regional areas? This is an important question to me, my being well known for my sporting prowess.

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT (Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing): The honourable member has an active interest in this topic. The government recognises the importance of supporting regional recreation and sport programs and services. We have in a place a range of initiatives that aim to foster a strong, vibrant and innovative sport and recreation industry. For example, in the last financial year the government contributed over $470 000 to support eight active community field officers working in partnership with regional and rural councils on Eyre Peninsula, Upper Spencer Gulf, Outback Far North, Mid North, the Riverland, the Murraylands, the South-East and Onkaparinga Southern Fleurieu, including Kangaroo Island.

In order to employ officers across the state, this partnership approach has enabled a significant expansion of a range of programs and services throughout regional South Australia. It has enabled the expansion of coach education, officiating training, and general volunteer support training, as well as participation programs. These active community field officers, in conjunction with local government, are funded to work closely with regional active recreation and sport providers, schools and other key agencies to promote and coordinate the implementation of programs and initiatives that increase community participation in sport and physical activity.

In addition to this the government supports a number of community recreation and sport networks across regional South Australia. Community members typically involved in these networks include: sport and recreation clubs, health agencies, local government, state sporting associations, schools and school councils, disability action groups, women's advisory committees, local tourism agencies and local businesses. A number of other strategic partnerships have been formed in regional South Australia to increase regional involvement in active recreation and sport programs and services in areas such as the Murraylands, the Riverland, Eyre Peninsula and the South-East.

The Office for Recreation and Sport also communicates regularly with local government through the Local Government Recreation Forum and quarterly enews letters. The Local Government Recreation Forum provides a mechanism for information exchange, professional development and advocacy for local government professionals who are involved in the provision of recreation and sport opportunities for their community. We are continuing to work hard to expand opportunities for South Australians to participate in sport and recreation, including the member for Giles.

HEALTH AND SAFETY WORKPLACE PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop): Can the Minister for Industrial Relations confirm that the development of the Health and Safety Workplace Partnership Program, which delivers $3 million of taxpayers' money to unions, was carried out solely within the minister's office without any consultation?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT (Minister for Industrial Relations): This question has been asked before by the honourable member in various forms and guises. I can announce that that grant money has been allocated. It was allocated by an independent panel made up of Mr Rod Bishop, Mr Adrian Dangerfield and Ms Juanita Lovatt.

Mr WILLIAMS: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, my question was quite specific. I ask you to bring the minister back to the relevance of the question. I think it is standing order 98.

The SPEAKER: Order! I do not uphold the point of order.

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: As I said, this money has been allocated by that panel. I can announce that a range of unions will share in that money. As I said before, this Health and Safety Workplace Partnership Program is very important. It will serve the community very well. This would have been an opportunity for the opposition to reach out with the hand of kindness to the trade union movement.

SCIENCE, RESEARCH AND INNOVATION

Mr RAU (Enfield): My question is to the Minister for Science and Information Economy. What is the state government doing to boost the contribution made by science, research and innovation to the economic and social wellbeing of South Australians?

The Hon. I.F. Evans interjecting:

The Hon. P. CAICA (Minister for Science and Information Economy): Yes, Iain.

The Hon. I.F. Evans interjecting:

The Hon. P. CAICA: Iain, clearly, you do not understand. I thank the member for this question and acknowledge his understanding that science and innovation are critical to sustaining our economic and social wellbeing. Science, research and innovation make a substantial contribution by enhancing the international competitiveness of our enterprises, by sustaining our environment and by creating a healthier community. In recognition of this, the state government is investing more money in science and research to ensure that South Australians are well positioned to optimise the significant flow-on benefits from work undertaken in these fields.

A demonstration of the state government's commitment to science is through the Premier's Science and Research Fund. Since it was first established in 2003-04, this fund has provided over $10 million to boost the contribution that science, research and innovation makes to our state. I have previously informed members about the four projects that were funded last year supporting cutting edge developments in the areas of:

- conducting polymers;
- visual digital media;
- a new wind tunnel to support defence and aerospace research; and
- the use of yeast strains to value-add to Australian wine.

In addition to these, the fund provided significant financial support for a strategic project to develop a multigenerational cohort study entitled, 'Building a Fit and Healthy South Australia'. This study, led by Professor Robyn McDermott from UniSA, will provide a data platform for future health research in South Australia and will raise our state's profile in the field of intergenerational health.

I am also pleased to inform members that this year will also see a bold new direction for the Premier's Science and Research Fund, and an increase in funding from $3 million to $4.2 million per annum. Round 5, which opened in mid-July, will emphasise support for collaborative research and projects specifically in the defence and advanced manufacturing sectors. This new focus on leading-edge infrastructure and world-class research teams will help our state to attract and retain leading scientists and help to build our international competitiveness.

In addition, the Sustainable Energy Research and Development Grants Program (formerly known as SENRAC), worth $222 000 per annum, has been incorporated into the Premier's Science and Research Fund. This will allow us to streamline the assessment and monitoring process while still maintaining our support for research and development in sustainable energy. The new direction of the fund has the potential to deliver significant economic, social and environmental benefits for South Australians, and it will almost certainly help to raise the profile of our outstanding scientists who are competing so successfully on the world stage.

HEALTH AND SAFETY GRANTS

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop): Again, my question is to the Minister for Industrial Relations. Why was it necessary for 12 cabinet documents to be created on the subject of the $3 million funding package to unions, and who generated those documents? Information obtained by the opposition under freedom of information laws indicates that the only documents held by the government on the development of this program are one parliamentary briefing note and 11 cabinet documents.

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT (Minister for Industrial Relations): Mr Speaker—

Mr Williams: Where is the consultation?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Williams: Who did you talk to?

The SPEAKER: Order! The minister has the call.

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: Thank you, sir. We have identified the key areas of manufacturing, community services—

Mr Williams: Who is 'we'?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: —the government—the wholesale and retail trades, construction, transport and storage where 83 per cent of workers compensation claims are made. Why would you not want to make workplaces safer? This is part of a range of policies that this government has put in place since first coming to office, whether it be a greater number of inspectors or money in this particular area to make workplaces safe. That is what this is about. It is about keeping South Australians safe at work.

PROMOTIONAL PRODUCTS

Mr KENYON (Newland): Will the Minister for Consumer Affairs inform the house about advice received today concerning problems with a promotional giveaway?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Minister for Consumer Affairs): I thank the member for Newland for his question and I am sure that, being a parent of young children, he will be quite keen to have the information on this product give-away. Today I have received advice from the Commissioner for Consumer Affairs that bicycles, including children's bicycles that have been used by Medibank Private as part of an insurance promotion, are the subject of safety concerns. I understand that, as a result of this promotion, Medibank Private has given away more than 6 000 bicycles, with about 5 000 of those being adult bicycles and 1 000 being children's bikes. I am particularly concerned about children's bicycles which are potentially dangerous because of their oversized pedals and crank mechanisms being too close to the ground. This could pose a real safety risk because these bicycles lean from side to side when they are ridden. On investigation, the Office of Consumer and Business Affairs also found that the bicycles do not meet mandatory labelling requirements under the Australian standard, and that is why the adults' bike is also the subject of the recall.

Medibank Private has advised that customers who have received faulty bicycles will be contacted and informed of the details around the recall. Those who took advantage of this bicycle give-away will receive adhesive labels which will need to be put on both bikes plus an additional page for the instruction manual. More importantly, they will also be warned about the dangers of the children's bike and they will be urged not to allow young ones to use it until the pedal mechanism can be replaced. New pedal mechanisms will be sent out in the next few weeks along with advice on how they can be fitted. I am advised that anyone who is not confident about fitting the new mechanisms themselves can take the bike to a bicycle mechanic and present the mechanic's receipt to Medibank Private for reimbursement. If anyone needs any further information about recall or dangerous items, they can contact the Office of Consumer and Business Affairs or look at the website which has very generalised information about product recalls.

SAFEWORK SA ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop): My question is to the Minister for Industrial Relations. Who decided that the program under which unions were provided with $3 million of taxpayers' funding would not be referred to the SafeWork SA Advisory Committee? The opposition is in possession of a document from the Executive Director of SafeWork SA, Michele Patterson, to the minister's office and, among other things, it states:

> Under the Occupational Health, Safety and Welfare Act 1986 the SafeWork SA Advisory Committee (the Advisory Committee) has the function to promote occupational health, safety and welfare (OHS&W) programs and make recommendations with respect to the making of grants in support of relevant projects and activities. SafeWork SA understands that it was not appropriate for the program to be considered by the Advisory Committee.

Why not? Who made that decision? You are breaking your own law.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT (Minister for Industrial Relations): If my memory serves me correctly, you were critical when we took the legislation through the parliament to establish the SafeWork SA Advisory Board. The opposition is now critical of this scheme, when we are trying to make workplaces safer. If you consult, they will rubbish you.

If you make a decision, they will rubbish you. What this is all about is making workplaces safer.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for MacKillop will be quiet when I call him to order.

FOOD AND WINE TOURISM

Mr BIGNELL (Mawson): My question is to the Minister for Tourism. What initiatives are planned to maintain and enhance the state's position as a leader in food and wine tourism?

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH (Minister for Tourism): I thank the member for Mawson for his interest. Of course, his electorate encompasses some very fine food and wine areas, but it is only one of the areas that make South Australia a great food and wine destination. That idea is not mere rhetoric: it is authentic. Not only do we produce fine food and wine, but also we have the capacity through high-level research, our Plant Functional Genomics Centre, Waite, gastronomy courses and cookery courses to support the industries through academic research and training in a range of institutions at tertiary level.

As a government, we promote very extensively the brand of food and wine being integral to South Australia, not only through PIRSA, DTED and health promotion but also through tourism. We have provided $900 000 over four years in the 2006-07 budget to further strengthen South Australia's reputation for food and wine. These funds are being used to support two events—the Adelaide Food Summit and the World Food Exchange. As members would know, Tasting Australia is our premier food, wine and beer event, not only in South Australia but also Australia. It is being held this year between 13 and 20 October. The theme this year will be 'Australian food, wine and beer experience—10 years and growing'. Tasting Australia showcases the very best Australia has to offer in food, wine and beer, as well as intellectual gastronomic discussion; and I am sure the member for Mawson would be part of that, as he would in the activities around hospitality, travel and lifestyle. This year, well-known chefs Antonio Carluccio, Madhur Jaffery, Rick Stein and Rachel Allen will be attending. Tasting Australia 2007 promises to be a huge drawcard for discerning tourists who enjoy the finer things in life.

Added onto the Tasting Australia event this year will be the first summit, which will bring together the world's foremost authorities on things culinary. The Adelaide Food Summit chairman, Dun Gifford, is the founder and CEO of Oldways Preservation and Exchange Trust—the Boston-based food and nutrition think tank. In addition, there will be celebrated food authorities, including the academic Professor Tim Olds, Stephanie Alexander and Rosemary Stanton. In addition to promoting South Australia, the World Food Exchange will be promoting the concept of ecologically sustainable produce and, increasingly, consumers around the world expect their food to be sustainable, not only in the way it is produced but also in the way it is marketed and the logistics involved in getting it to table. This event will support those ideas. In addition to the summit, the food exchange will work on those sustainability issues, so that the World Food Exchange and Tasting Australia will work in concert with the SATC product development wing with marketing activities and be used to boost food and wine tourism.

In 2006-07 the SATC worked closely with Tourism Eyre Peninsula, for instance, and the Smartvisits Solutions organisation to provide funding to develop the Eyre Peninsula seafood and aquaculture trail attractions pass. I know that many members have heard me talk about the aquaculture trail before, but that will not stop me. As members know, it has the innovation of bringing together the food and production area of the industry with tourism so that marketing can produce food to table experiences. The tourists can go to oyster farms, tuna farms and even swim with kingfish and tuna—which is a great experience.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH: You can even hand feed the fish, as well as going to a range of observation points where you can look at sea lions, swim with dolphins or watch whales. Having an attractions pass is a great idea because it makes a tourism week of it for a family; and I recommend that members try this activity. In 2007-08 the SATC is also developing a new wine and food tourism strategy to replace the successful 2003-2008 strategy. An important component of this will be the development of a new *South Australian Wine and Food Guide*, which will be a great contribution to regional tourism, as well as the McLaren Vale area. The state government will continue to showcase South Australia's authentic food and wine tourism experiences, as well as our world-class produce. Our marketing of food and wine tourism is based in authenticity not just hype. The state government is working with producers, marketers, exporters and the industry as a whole, because tourism is good for product development and sales.

MEMBERS' INTERESTS

Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder): My question is directed to the Premier. Has the Premier raised with the Minister for Forests the appropriateness of his chairmanship of the Penola pulp mill select committee, given concerns raised by the public about potential conflicts arising from undisclosed financial gifts the minister has received from stakeholders within his portfolios?

The Hon. R.J. McEWEN (Minister for Forests): I thank the member for the question and point out, of course, that it is a select committee of the house—it has nothing to do with the Premier—and that the person who nominated me to chair the committee was the member for MacKillop.

GP PLUS NURSES

Ms THOMPSON (Reynell): My question is to the Minister for Health. While the provision of general practitioners is fundamentally a federal government responsibility, what is the state government doing to provide assistance for GP practices in areas of workforce shortage?

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Minister for Health): I thank the member for Reynell for her question. I know that this is a very big issue in her electorate, as it is in the south generally. Recent figures from the Southern Division of General Practice show that in parts of Reynell and Mawson there is only one GP for every 5 521 people. A GP shortage is defined as an area where there is one GP for every 1 408 people, or more. So, some suburbs in the south have a GP shortage almost four times that.

Mr Hanna interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. HILL: Yes, it is not just in the outer southern area: there are other parts as well and, of course, in

the northern suburbs also. As the member indicated, general practitioners have always been a federal government responsibility. However, as part of our health care reforms, the state government is stepping in to support struggling GPs in the community, and we are recruiting and training a number of GP Plus nurses—in fact, 50 nurses—who will be mobilised to work across Adelaide supporting our busiest doctors. This $8 million program over four years will reduce the burden on doctors in GP clinics in areas of high demand or in areas where there are high rates of chronic disease. The nurses will assist with wound care, immunisation and pathology collection and also help coordinate the care of patients with chronic diseases. This is of particular importance. After the subsidy period, either the practice employs the nurse directly or the nurse returns to a pool and their skills can be exercised in another practice.

This morning, I had discussions with some of the nurses and the people managing this program and I am advised that up to 80 per cent of nurses are, in fact, being employed by the practices. I am pleased to be able to report that, so far, 32 practice nurses have been recruited in the Central Northern Adelaide Health Service area and another 17 have been trained in the Southern Adelaide Health Service area. Eight practice nurses who have graduated have subsequently gone on to be employed directly by GP clinics in the south as a result of the program. As I said, this morning I met some of the newest practice nurses being trained for the program, and I was very impressed by their enthusiasm for the program and, indeed, their desire to help others.

By providing access to more health services in a GP clinic setting, we may ultimately see a reduction in hospital attendances, both because of the early intervention to stop illness and also because people can receive the attention they need without having to go to hospital. We know that more people are going to the emergency departments of our hospitals each year—something like 16 000 more this year than last year. There are multiple reasons they are going there, but one of the reasons is they cannot get in to see a GP. In areas where there is a shortage of GPs, putting nurses with the GPs to help spread the services further means more people will be able to see GPs, which will take the pressure off the acute services and, in addition, the nurses will be able to keep well people who have chronic diseases so they are less likely to have acute incidents which require their going to hospital departments.

We are working very closely with the SA Divisions of General Practice, and I thank them very much for taking on a strong role in relation to this program, and also the metropolitan health regions for promoting this initiative and recruiting the nurses.

MEMBERS' INTERESTS

Mrs REDMOND (Heysen): Will the Minister for Forests clarify for the house when he sought advice regarding his gifts or donations from former speaker Dr Bob Such? The minister said in the house yesterday:

> I have now indicated to you that I chose in 1999 and 2002 to put my donations down as gifts. In 2006, after I had received advice, which has now been supported by Crown opinion, I chose not to.

But in *The Advertiser* on 5 July, Mr McEwen used a different time frame where he said he was 'disappointed' with Dr Such for not recalling a conversation he said he had had in the past two months.

The Hon. R.J. McEWEN (Minister for Forests): As much as this question has no real relevance because, of course, it has already been established quite clearly that a donation is not a gift and therefore none of us has to declare a donation as a gift, what has equally been established is that, if you wish to take the broader interpretation, everybody—absolutely everybody—is captured, so no-one can single me out which, of course, has been the strategy for a number of weeks. We all know now that the advice we have is that it is appropriate to take the narrow definition, which is the advice I had on a number of occasions.

Mrs Redmond interjecting:

The Hon. R.J. McEWEN: I am getting to your answer, madam.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Heysen has a point of order.

Mrs REDMOND: The point of order is the relevance. Nothing the minister has said so far has anything to do with the timing of his advice from Dr Such.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There is no point of order.

The Hon. R.J. McEWEN: It is background, as is my challenge to the leader on a number of occasions over recent days, which is: has he and all his team breached the Australian electoral act by failing to honour the legal responsibilities under that act in terms of their filed declarations? We are all waiting, Mr Speaker, and I am sure that one day in the future he will answer that. I put that challenge to the member for Schubert some time back. I said, 'Come on down.' I put that challenge to the member for Unley. I said, 'Come on down.' I am now quite happy to put that challenge to the member for Heysen and say, 'Can you guarantee to this house that your branch has honoured the requirements under that act?' because they will struggle to do it. Let us come back to the detail now.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. R.J. McEWEN: I never once said, and I never once gave a time line in terms of when Dr Such had this discussion with me. What disappointed me very much, though—and I have raised this question with the author of that article in *The Advertiser,* and to date she has not responded—and what amazed me was that at the very time people were looking at an article in *The Advertiser* that had a cross across my mouth, and reading in that article that Bob—

The Hon. G.M. Gunn interjecting:

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

The Hon. R.J. McEWEN: People were reading in that article that Bob Such was quoted as saying he had never—they were the words in the article—had a discussion with me in relation to his interpretation of whether or not a donation was a gift, and therefore was required as part of the declaration. He told Kym Wheatley he had never had that discussion. Kym Wheatley alerted me to that and I rang her. When she rang me I said, 'Look, this is totally untrue.' I then rang Dr Such and said, 'We have a problem here. Could you please actually contact the journalist?' The next morning I am reading the article where she says he has never discussed this with me, but at 9.28 on the same morning on a radio program he not only says he did discuss it with me—he could not say otherwise, of course, because I was sitting between him and the next Independent member along, one Kris Hanna, when we had this discussion, so I had a witness. Furthermore, he actually said on radio—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. R.J. McEWEN: Continuing the discussion, which began at 9.28 a.m. on the radio program, Dr Such not only confirmed that he had had this discussion with me—contrary to what had been reported in *The Advertiser* on the same morning—but he also confirmed that the advice he gave me was exactly as I had quoted and exactly as indicated in the legal advice that was then received.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. R.J. McEWEN: I just told you that.

PUBLIC SECTOR PAY INCREASES

Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder): Can the Treasurer provide details on what impact the recently negotiated wage increases for a range of public sector employees will have on the state budget for 2007-08 and across the forward estimates?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Treasurer): In keeping with the traditional reporting of wage outcomes by previous governments, we will have a midyear budget review that will give the bottom line performance of the government to 30 December, and we will update it in the budget for next year.

Mr Griffiths interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Yes; we have. I know exactly. We have a midyear budget review process, and the value of these wage negotiations is made known; that is obvious.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: The value of the wage outcomes is made known. The impact it has on the budget bottom line will be revealed in the 30 December midyear budget review. That is what every government forever has done. I do not see why you would do it any differently. The budget continues—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Treasurer will take his seat for a moment. The Treasurer is giving a straightforward response. If members on my left have other questions they want to follow up with, they have time to do so. It is not necessary constantly to interject on the Treasurer.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: There are two times at which the budget results are made public: the midyear budget review and the budget itself. Of course, we have the end of year results as well. We do not give a month by month update on the fluctuations in the budget bottom line because there are a whole lot of impacting factors that would make it a meaningless number. Because you have receipts of commonwealth moneys, a whole lot of programs and capital works projects, you can really do only two time snaps a year to get a proper assessment.

However, the budget still remains on track. It remains in surplus, but we will as a government continue to have a very strong position in relation to wage outcomes. We will give fair wage outcomes, but we will not give excessive wage outcomes. Members opposite have been continually calling for higher wage outcomes than we as a government have been prepared to negotiate. I do not think that a day or a week goes by when members opposite, particularly the shadow health minister, are not saying that we should be paying more for wages. We will continue to have a very strong discipline towards wage outcomes.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Sorry?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I am quite comfortable with the budget setting. There is no deviation from the budget that came down in June. It is on track and in a very strong position.

WASTE LEVY

Mr GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): Will the Minister for State/Local Government Relations explain to the house the connection between elected members' allowances in local government and increases in waste levies collected by councils for the state government? On 4 July 2007 during the estimates committees, the minister said:

> The increase in the cost of the waste levy is in the near vicinity of the increases in council allowances across South Australia, but we have not heard from local councils quite as much about the impact of that.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Minister for State/Local Government Relations): This is a really interesting issue that we have been dealing with. We have heard and I am sure people have seen over recent weeks a lot of complaints in regional media, in particular, by councils claiming cost shifting by the state government onto local councils and concern about the doubling of the waste levy. Some reports have actually been accusing the state government of shifting a $10 million increased impost onto local councils. That is simply not true. Local councils pay about one-third of the $10 million increase in waste levy, so they are up for a $3.5 million increase in their waste levy.

The connection to council allowances is simply this: they have been complaining about the incredible impost this increase in the levy is going to have on local ratepayers, which I understand is a few cents a week. The increase in council allowances across the state is, as I said during estimates, in the same vicinity, around $3 million. In fact, in some council areas we have done a comparison and the increase of the council allowances has a greater impost on council rates than the waste levy does—and I would be happy to go through the comparisons of the increase of the waste levy as opposed to the council allowances for each council. However, I am sure that people are keen to leave the chamber and get on with their work, but the whole purpose in my equating those two costs on local councils and local ratepayers is just to bring some perspective to the argument and actually to show some comparison.

JAMES NASH HOUSE RELOCATION

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Minister for Health): I lay on the table a statement made today by my colleague in another place (Hon. Gail Gago) about the relocation of James Nash House.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

MINISTER FOR INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS, MEMBER'S COMMENTS

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop): Today the Minister for Industrial Relations was given the opportunity to show that this government was not involved in a gross rort, but the

minister has failed miserably. We are all aware of that minister's incompetence, which has been demonstrated over many years now: an incompetence that has caused his Premier to strip from him just about every responsibility that he has had in the five years of the Rann Labor government—transport, water, admin services and gambling. The minister has been left with two small responsibilities: industrial relations and sport; and one has to ask why.

It came to the opposition's attention earlier this year that secretly the minister had drawn up a plan to deliver $3 million to his union mates. He purportedly put out a press release on 16 December last, a press release that nobody else in the world was aware of until it was presented to the SafeWork Advisory Committee in early February. As a result of that and of the inability of the minister to answer satisfactorily the questions that I put to him earlier in the year, I instituted a number of FOI requests and they have been quite revealing in the lack of information that is held by SafeWork SA, WorkCover or, indeed, by the minister's office.

I put in an FOI request to SafeWork SA asking what documents it held with regard to this program, because I wanted to get my head around where the idea came from and what advice it had given to the minister. Quite frankly, the opposition is wondering why $3 million of taxpayers' money is being directed towards employees and, more particularly, employee associations that have no statutory obligation for OHS training, yet employer associations that do have statutory obligations are denied access to this grant program. That is why we are trying to get our head around this.

Surprise, surprise! SafeWork SA wrote back to me to say that it was never consulted and did not know anything about it. The advisory committee, which I asked the minister about today, the committee that he set up a couple of years ago through the legislative process—he told the parliament that it was important to have this committee—was totally unaware of it. Michele Patterson, Executive Director of SafeWork SA, in the quote that I read out earlier in question time to explain one of my questions, identified that it was the function of the SafeWork SA Advisory Committee to advise, particularly regarding these sorts of grants. However, she went on to say that SafeWork SA understands that it was not appropriate for the program to be considered by the advisory committee. What is going on here? Why was it not considered appropriate, and who made that determination?

Today I have written to the Acting Auditor-General and asked that the Auditor-General look into this matter. There is no ordinance within the minister's office, SafeWork SA or WorkCover regarding the need for this particular program. This program has apparently been established completely within the minister's political office. He said the decision was made by government. He was wrong; it was made by the Executive Government, by the minister, his personal political staff and the cabinet. That begs the question of where the fiercely Independent members of cabinet were on this particular decision.

Amongst other things, I have also asked the Auditor-General to make a determination as to whether there was a potential for a conflict of interest, because, as we know, the unions that are the recipients of this $3 million are largely donors to the Labor Party. If this was a bona fide operation, the minister would have first ensured that he was at arm's length and we would not have had a determination that was unnecessary for the advisory committee to look into the matter.

Time expired.

FEDERAL AND STATE TRADE MINISTERS MEETING

Mr O'BRIEN (Napier): On 15 June I represented the Deputy Premier at a meeting of federal and state trade ministers in Canberra. The purpose of this meeting was to brief state trade ministers on the various free trade agreements currently being negotiated by the commonwealth and to seek input from the states. I understand that these meetings should be held every six months, but in this instance a period of 18 months had elapsed between meetings. I make this point in the house because one of the matters discussed on 15 June has significant implications for the South Australian economy and for Northern Adelaide, not least of all my electorate of Napier.

This matter should have been brought before the South Australian government and the Victorian government much earlier than it was. It also displays a certain ineptitude on the part of the commonwealth that I hope is now being rectified. As members are aware, Holden is a major exporter of cars to the Middle East. In fact, this export trade underpins the financial viability of the Elizabeth plant. Exports account for about one-third of total production which last year amounted to 46 000 vehicles. Of this number 31 000 (68 per cent) went to the Middle East. What was revealed at this meeting of trade ministers on 15 June was that the commonwealth commenced negotiations for a free trade agreement in the Middle East with the wrong entity and that, as a consequence, it risks missing out on a regional free grade agreement to our competitors.

Rather than commencing negotiations with the Gulf Cooperation Council, which collectively represents the economies of Saudi Arabia, the United Arab Emirates, Bahrain, Kuwait, Oman and Qatar, Australian negotiators have wasted time in discussions with the United Arab Emirates, an entity bound to collective agreements with the Gulf Cooperation Council. The Gulf Cooperation Council is reportedly in negotiations with the United States, Japan, China and ASEAN. With the high Australian dollar and the possibility of any one of these competitors locking away a free trade agreement in advance of Australia, this places in extreme jeopardy Holden's access to this crucial market.

The potential impact on Toyota's Victorian operation is even more profound. The South Australian and Victorian delegations made our concerns known to the federal minister, the Hon. Warren Truss, and the key negotiators from the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade. I also sought and received a briefing on the day on this particular matter. Inept handling of this matter by the commonwealth, and the fact that South Australia and Victoria were not informed earlier because of the failure of the commonwealth to call meetings on a six-monthly basis, deserve to be noted on the public record.

Toyota has now become aware of this debacle and has publicly stated that Australia should speed up talks and sign an FTA towards the end of this year or early next year. Exports are the lifeblood of the Australian automotive industry, a lesson that has only just been learnt by Ford. Ford has announced its decision to close its Geelong engine plant, with a loss of possibly 600 jobs. In the past few days, the company has also announced a commitment to spend $180 million for the production of a small vehicle—the four-cylinder Focus—with which Ford has an expectation to double its exports and thus ensure its ongoing financial viability.

Now, Ford, along with Toyota and Holden, will be relying on the sure-footedness of the commonwealth on free trade matters. My constituents in Napier have a great deal riding on the timely and successful outcomes of negotiations with the Gulf Cooperation Council. Minister Truss is the responsible minister with a problem that he must quickly rectify.

NORTHERN EXPRESSWAY

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett): Today I want to continue providing the house with further information on the questions I asked the Minister for Transport in question time. I remind the house and those who read *Hansard* that this is not about a deteriorating situation between a senior public servant and a resident affected by land acquisitions. This is about a minister who is just not in charge of a situation. In estimates, this minister made the supreme admission that, while he was not responsible for costings of a project, he is responsible for his department. I think they were his exact words; it is all in *Hansard*.

Even today the minister said that he did not know about this issue and then later he said that he did. We have three letters written to him. He even wrote back to this constituent. Let me read the statutory declaration from this resident at MacDonald Park. The statutory declaration states:

I, Dr Guiseppe Ceravolo, Managing Director, Ceravolo Premium Wines, Suite 16, 172 Glynburn Road, Tranmere, South Australia, proprietor and lessee of property and vineyards on Andrews Road, MacDonald Park, make the following declaration under the Statutory Declarations Act 1959.

At approximately 10.30 a.m. on Tuesday 17 July 2007 I received a call on my mobile phone from Mr Luigi Rossi (Department of Transport, Energy and Infrastructure).

Mr Rossi is the Project Director for the proposed Northern Expressway.

I am an affected landholder along the proposed route for the expressway.

Mr Rossi was abusive and very angry at me and his voice and tone conveyed a strong feeling of anger.

I made notes as we spoke.

Mr Rossi said, 'Joe, I cannot work you out—how can you be so unprofessional and unethical? You have gone behind my back to the minister and told him about the letter we sent out to everyone regarding other interested parties. I had explained to you what had happened about the dates and I have apologised in my email to you. What are you trying to do?'

I said, 'I'm sorry, but I have been completely ethical and professional about all that I have done and said and I have told you on numerous occasions that I will continue to do everything possible to ensure I get the best outcomes for my family. I intend to continue to write to your minister and the federal ministers to show that you have not followed due process and have not been fair in the way this Northern Expressway has been handled right from the start.'

I continued and said, 'I accept your apology for giving the wrong dates in the letter you sent out, but that apology went to me because I tackled you on it. What have you done or said to all the others along the route who got exactly the same letter? I merely asked the Minister—'was this a genuine mistake or was it designed to elevate the stress levels'—as you are well aware there are some people out here who are about to crack'.

Mr Rossi said, 'If this is the way you want to play the game—you have seen nothing yet.'

I was shocked by the response and felt threatened.

I said, 'Luigi, you and the Minister have a lot of power and you also have the Land Acquisition Act behind you. I just wish you would stop hitting all of us over the head all the time. Just remember—no matter what the outcome of this will be, we will be the losers no matter what the compensation will be.'

Mr Rossi then said, 'No matter what you do, the end result will be the same. It's time you started co-operating so that we can get on with it.'

I then said, 'I have decided that I need to get a few things in writing from you and/or the Minister and since you give us no information, I have every right to write to the Minister. One of the things I have asked you on a number of occasions is:
'Are you in any way related to the Notos who own land along Heaslip Road, Angle Vale and Curtis Road, Munno Para West?'—and you have refused to answer that in writing.'

Mr Rossi said 'You know I am not related to them—I have told you that on the phone before'.

I said 'I want that in writing. Will you give me that in writing?'

Mr Rossi said, 'No, I won't do that. I do not have to do that.'

I then asked Mr Rossi, 'Luigi, do you know a gentleman whose name is Gerry Rossi?'

He said, 'Yes, he is my uncle.'

I said 'Tell me, what is the maiden name of the lady Gerry is married to?'

He said, 'Noto.'

I said, 'That is precisely what I wanted in writing because it may explain why you insisted that the expressway must go through our vineyards when the land adjacent is vacant land owned by the Notos.'

I added, 'It also may explain why the yellow route along Heaslip Road which is shorter was not given the appropriate consideration it deserved.'

He said, 'I had nothing to do with the selection of the route. I took over as Project Director after that was all stitched up.'

I said, 'You were working for the Transport Department at the time.'

He said, 'Yes, I was.'

I said, 'Have a good day' and hung up.

That is dated 23 July 2007. It is certified and witnessed by Mr F. Verlato, a commissioner for taking affidavits in the Supreme Court of South Australia.

This is yet another example of where this minister has not had his eye on the ball. He is not in control. He wants to take every opportunity to review this terrible situation and to speak to Dr Ceravolo to give Dr Ceravolo all he wanted, which was a fair hearing—a fair go—nothing more, nothing less. What do we see? We have seen bullying and threats. Even today, as the minister walked out of this place, he said, 'I hope you have sought legal advice.' This is not coward's castle: this is where the truth comes out and, if this is the place where it has to come out in this way, shame on you, minister.

Time expired.

RESIDENTIAL VILLAGES

Mr BIGNELL (Mawson): I rise today to sound a warning to people, particularly older South Australians, who might be thinking about moving into residential villages. An 81 year old woman came to see me last week after she was evicted from Village Life at Hackham. The people who run the village did not give her a reason; they just gave her 90 days to vacate the premises. She feels that she is being victimised because the management there thinks that she is the ringleader of a group of dissident elderly people in this village. She had the temerity to complain that the chicken was not cooked properly once and that it was pink. She was told by the management that if she did not like the food, she could move elsewhere, and that there was nothing wrong with pink chicken and that her fear that she might get salmonella poisoning was an old wives' tale.

As we saw in a recent case in Victoria several elderly Victorians died in a retirement village because of a food borne disease. This woman was quite within her rights to complain about the food. Three of her friends moved out before being given eviction notices because they felt so bullied and intimidated by this group, which is called the SCV Group. It owns 104 villages around Australia including Village Life at Hackham. I have spoken to the state manager who says that he has no problem. He can sleep quite comfort-

ably at night knowing that he has evicted an 81 year old woman, who moved into that village just 2½ years ago with the thought that that would be her final residential address. She moved into this village after selling the large family home and her furniture after the death of her husband when the lawns, the garden and the house became too much for her. She thought that it would be where she would see out her days.

For someone, who was born and brought up in the Depression and who lived through a world war and who did so much like so many of her generation to build this great country, to be treated in this way is an absolute disgrace. I was there yesterday and her neighbour two doors down (who turns 97 in two months) was sitting there clutching her cat as removalists packed her furniture into a removal van. She also has had enough of being bullied and being treated as a second-class citizen by the people who manage Village Life at Hackham. I have been told by the family of the 81 year old woman that she, like other residents of this village, pay $225 a week to live in the village, yet the company has told them that for each resident of the village there is a budget for their food of just $5.86 per day—just $5.86 for three meals when these people are paying $225 a week to live in the village!

I have spoken to management, and the state manager has said that they have changed the way in which they serve their food. They will now give them frozen food, such as pies. They say that, hopefully, that will alleviate some of the concerns and meet health regulations. The state manager has told me that, hopefully, they will now meet health regulations, but, when the 81 year old woman complained, she was told that there was nothing wrong with the pink chicken, that it was an old wives' tale she had come to complain about.

This woman, who is a former bookkeeper, a mother and a grandmother, ran the retirement village's social club and she came to see me in April. There had been stories on ABC Radio and in interstate media about Village Life homes and people interstate being evicted. I checked this out with management and I also checked out those media reports. I found that the people here were safe from that particular round of evictions. I gave about 15 copies of a letter (written on my letterhead) to the lady so that she could distribute them to her friends and other residents of the village, so I hope that what was done to reassure these elderly South Australians was not seen by the management of this village as some sort of a political move by the 81 year old woman, and I hope that she has not been punished for spreading what was meant to be a reassuring word to her fellow residents.

I condemn the SCV Group and the people who run Village Life, and I send a warning to anyone who is thinking of moving into this village or any other village operated by these people around Australia to investigate the situation first. People of this age deserve far more respect.

CFS FIRE TRUCKS

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond): I want to bring to the attention of the house a couple of events that have happened in the Hammond electorate. Yesterday a local manufacturer missed out on a major $4 million CFS contract, and about an hour ago it became obvious that Murray Bridge will get the relocated James Nash House facility. Dr Tony Sherbon did honour his commitment that the mayor would know an hour before the media. He said he would notify him before it came out in the media and he gave him a full hour's notice, so we must give the government some credit for that. It is a little better than the notice they got in the Murray Bridge area as far as the prisons were concerned, where we all had to read the paper—but that is this government, which is not really worried about regional communities in South Australia.

In relation to the South Australian Country Fire Service 2007-08 fire appliance build tender contract, Moore Engineering got confirmation yesterday that it was not successful in respect of 29 vehicles, including 22 type 3 4 vehicles and seven type 3 4 vehicles, although it has been lucky enough to get the tender for 10 Toyota landcruiser vehicles valued at about $500 000. These vehicles will be built in New South Wales by a company called Varley, which is well and good for that company. I know that we have signed a national agreement not to discriminate between the states, but we ought to look at what this government is doing for employment, jobs and growth in this state.

In relation to the prisons and the mental health facility, it is all right to place these facilities in my electorate but the government has not provided the opportunity for a priority contractor to build the new CFS fire trucks. I have information that 10 trucks were built in Queensland and delivered in December and January, but it is only in the last couple of weeks that three of those trucks have entered service. These trucks had an average of 150 faults. That is why it has taken so long for them to get out in the field.

So, it will be interesting in the longer term to see who will be asked to do the warranty work on these trucks. If Moore Engineering in Murray Bridge decides to branch out into other work because the South Australian government did not assist them with this contract, they might be looking elsewhere to get that work done. Let us hope that it was not just over the Treasurer's desk and a matter of a fistful of dollars, because they will pay in the end if the warranty work cannot be done. If it is anything like the Queensland experience, there will be rather a lot of warranty work. There will be up to 30 full-time jobs lost at Moore Engineering. It was making plans and was just going through the public consultation process to expand its plant and put up another manufacturing facility on the site. That will all be put on hold now, and it is a tragedy, when it has been a priority client.

In my remaining time I want to give a history of Moore Engineering. It was established in 1976 and employed a specialised workforce of between 30 and 50 people, dependent on prevailing contractual agreements and requirements at the time. Its commitment to the local community is unquestionable. The company continually involves itself in supporting local sporting groups (the speedway, football and netball clubs) and is an ongoing support base for the voluntary sector of the community, involved with groups such as Trees for Life, the Anti-Cancer Foundation and the local fundraising B&S ball.

Also, in its commitment to the community, Moore Engineering always endeavours to use local suppliers and contractors wherever possible. A substantial amount of this work initially used to come from the emergency services sector. The company has developed a substantial network of diverse working relationships within the emergency services organisations and believes that in the longer term it will get more of this work.

Moore Engineering has built more than 400 units of varying types of emergency vehicle for the CFS, MFS and the State Emergency Service, as well as the resource sector in mining. The company is dedicated to providing an ongoing high quality service for the South Australian emergency service sector. It continues to provide a 24-hour on-call

breakdown service, including a large range of spare parts for all makes and models of vehicles. I believe that these may be necessary when the other trucks finally come on line.

Time expired.

KIZZEY'S STORY

Mr PICCOLO: This morning, and also this afternoon from the minister, the house heard the stories of young people learning to live with type 1 diabetes. We heard how diabetes affects the lives of young people and their families. They were stories of both suffering and hope—the hope that a cure for type 1 diabetes will be found and these young people will one day be able to live a normal life. Last week I had the privilege of meeting three year old toddler Kizzey Dodd. Kizzey, her dad Steven and mum Michelle came and saw me to make me aware of a rare disease that Kizzey has to live with. The Dodds live in my electorate in Munno Para. When you look at Kizzey she presents like any other bright toddler full of life and vigour. It is not until you hear her story that you get an understanding of the harsh hand that she has been dealt. Kizzey suffers from cystinosis. She is the only known sufferer of this disease in South Australia, with about 33 cases Australia-wide. While its rarity is a blessing, it is also a huge burden. It is difficult to diagnose. While research is progressing, more is required. The support group for the families of sufferers is based in Perth.

The non-medical bills for Kizzey's care are huge. She requires, because of her illness, to have her nappy changed 25 times a day. Mum Michelle is unable to work outside the family home as she has to dedicate her whole life to caring for Kizzey. While the Dodds, like other parents, look forward to the day she starts school, they are, understandably, concerned whether Kizzey or the school will be able to manage her illness. She needs around-the-clock care because dehydration could be fatal. The support group raises funds to help finance research, support families to travel for treatment, get together to share information, and to educate health workers about the disease. On Sunday 12 August, the family are holding a golf day at Hamley Bridge to raise funds to support the work of the association.

What is this disease? I am told that it is a metabolic disease characterised by the abnormal accumulation of the amino acid cystine in various organs of the body such as the kidneys, eyes, muscles, pancreas and brain. Different organs are affected at different ages. The disease is inherited in an autosomal recessive fashion which means that each parent of a child with the disease carries one defective gene and one normal gene. Kizzey's parents themselves have never had any signs of the disease.

There are three clinical forms of the disease: infantile, late onset and benign. The latter form does not produce kidney damage, but infantile and late onset does, but later in life. Infantile is usually diagnosed between six and 18 months of age with symptoms of excessive thirst, urination, failure to thrive, rickets and episodes of dehydration. These symptoms are caused by a disorder called Renal Tubular Fanconi Syndrome, or a failure of the kidney to reabsorb nutrients and minerals. As a consequence, these important molecules are lost in the urine. Children with the disease also have crystals in their eyes and an increased level of cystine in their white blood cells. Without specific treatment, these children will develop end-stage renal kidney failure at nine years of age.

If patients receive a kidney transplant and reach adulthood, the new kidneys generally are not affected. However, without this cysteamine treatment they can develop complications in other organs due to the continued accumulation of cystine throughout the body. These complications can include muscle wasting, difficulty in swallowing, diabetes and blindness. As a consequence, life expectancy is not very high. Not all patients develop these problems. However, the systematic treatment of the Faconi Syndrome is essential. The urinary loss of water, salts, bicarbonate and minerals must be replaced. Most children receive a solution of sodium and potassium citrate, as well as phosphate, and some others receive vitamin D. The aim of the specific treatment of cystinosis is to reduce cystine accumulation in the cells. The goal is achieved by this treatment, which has proven effective in delaying or preventing renal failure. Cysteamine improves the growth of children affected by the disease.

Much remains to be learnt about this disease. Investigators have recently isolated the gene causing it, and they are now analysing the mutations of individual patients. Other investigations are trying to determine the best therapies for each complication. I would urge members to support research into this disease.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON THE PENOLA PULP MILL AUTHORISATION BILL

The Hon. R.J. McEWEN (Minister for Forests): I move:

That standing orders be so far suspended as to enable the report of the Select Committee on the Penola Pulp Mill Authorisation Bill, on being adopted by the committee, to be presented to the Speaker prior to the next sitting day, along with the minutes of proceedings and evidence, and that the Speaker be authorised to publish the report in accordance with the provisions of the Defamation Act 2005 within one business day; further, that should the report be published pursuant to this order, it be deemed to be taken into consideration pursuant to standing order 346 as an order of the day for 11 September.

For the full confidence of the house, and for the reassurance of those opposite, I bring this motion to the attention of the chamber with the full support of the entire select committee, who voted unanimously on this matter and requested that, on their behalf, I bring it to your attention.

Motion carried.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (REAL ESTATE INDUSTRY REFORM) BILL

Consideration in committee of the Legislative Council's message.

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

That the disagreement to amendments Nos 1 and 9 of the Legislative Council be not insisted on.

Mr PISONI: I suspect that the motion means that the minister accepts the amendments from the upper house. I am very pleased that she is doing so because it brings to an end a 5½ year saga of dealing with these reforms to the real estate industry. It has taken this length of time to bring in legislation that is workable and that will benefit consumers, the business community and the community at large. The amendments from the upper house received an overwhelming majority of support. The Liberal Party and the Independents put forward a number of amendments to the bill. It is obvious that the

government, with its lack of experience in business, had a lot of difficulty getting the formula right for this measure to be workable. I am very pleased to be here representing the opposition and to say that we were very pleased to work with the Independents and get a result that will work for all the stakeholders involved in this bill.

What needs to be remembered about legislation for the protection of consumers is that it works only if businesses can work with it; if they cannot, it does not work. I think that it has become obvious to me now that the minister was not getting the right advice in the first instance, particularly when she was running around, insulting the industry, calling them robber barons and being very difficult to deal with on these two important issues.

We have situations where we do not require registered plumbers or electricians and so forth to manage a business, because they employ people to do that work for them. I think the benefit of this will be seen in the longer term, because it means that, if we have a husband and wife team and the wife is out doing the business, she is the one selling the properties, she is the registered real estate agent, but she might not be a business manager or might not have the time to manage the business, so the other partner (the husband or wife) can then manage the business, hold the business name, employ the staff and pay the payroll tax, which is at a very low level in this state, with a threshold of $504 000.

The last thing that businesses want in this state is more bureaucracy and more regulation. I do not know how this government has run this through the 'red tape-ometer.' Perhaps that is why it agreed to the amendments. Perhaps the wheels fell off the 'red tape-ometer' when the government ran this through and it could see that, if this did go through without the amendments that make this workable and fair for all involved, it would have been a very cumbersome and difficult bill to administer and a large burden on the small business operators. Nobody likes rogues, and the good thing about this is that it will keep rogues out of the industry. The Real Estate Institute has told me that it is very pleased with this, as have consumers.

The amendments have made this workable, and I think that the minister has actually thought about this and this is why she has backflipped on it. What was the benefit to consumers in her insistence on not accepting the amendments on the advertising rebate? The advertising rebate is there for everyone to see. It becomes part of the negotiating tool. If the Liberal Party and the Independents in the upper house had agreed to the illogical and ideological view of the Minister for Consumer Affairs, it would have been the thin end of the wedge for the private enterprise system in South Australia. Stalin's Russia would have loved legislation such as the minister was proposing, because it could interfere in family businesses by imposing such draconian legislation.

If the government had a single business person sitting around the cabinet, it would understand that the effect that the minister was trying to achieve through draconian legislation will happen anyway now because of the disclosure and because it becomes part of the negotiation process. Everyone can see, the vendor can see, just what margins are being made by the real estate agent. Let us not forget that the real estate agent is not buying the real estate at retail and marking it up: he is buying it at a discount and he has the option of marking it up if he wishes to. The flexibility that we have now in the system gives the vendor and the agent the ability to negotiate what will work best for them. Of course, we know the Labor Party's attitude to individual negotiations: it does not like them. It likes to be in control.

The Labor Party is a party about controlling other people's lives, and this was a blatant attempt to control the business lives of this group. From the minister's own admission in describing them as robber barons, you can see the respect that she has for business people. Who is going to be the next victim? When there are changes to the used car legislation, let us see her get out her baseball bat then and give them a whack so she can gain some political points and try and make herself look good amongst her cabinet colleagues. But I am pleased to have seen this. I believe this is the fifth backflip for the government this week, and I am happy to stand here and say that I am pleased with the result that we have here, because we have now got legislation that will, of course, protect consumers and keep the rogues out of the industry. But it does not over burden the industry, and nor will there be ramifications for other industries. But do not forget that this legislation does give the minister a chance to review in two years' time. The minister was predicting that the world would cave in if these amendments were allowed. We can remember that she said she was not backing down on this. There was a media release: 'I am not backing down on this.' Well, I am certainly pleased that she has, and I accept her backdown in a gracious manner.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: The motion that I moved is worded in a particular way, for very good reason. Can I just reiterate what it says, that the disagreement to the amendment is not being insisted on, as opposed to being embraced or accepted, as the member for Unley would have us believe. This is a really important piece of legislation. This is our last sitting day of parliament for some considerable time. The people of South Australia are very much looking forward to the reforms of this legislation and I think it is incumbent on this parliament to get it through on the last sitting day of parliament and not hold it up further, when we know, quite simply, that the numbers in the Legislative Council will not allow this to happen. These amendments have clearly been supported by Nick Xenophon and Family First in the upper house. I am pleased to say that the Democrats and the Greens, in having the opportunity to further think their position, actually did not support these particular amendments, and saw what the government was about, but unfortunately we have not been able to achieve the support of Family First and/or Nick Xenophon. So I think our responsibility in getting this legislation through is paramount.

Section 10 of the Land Agents Act currently requires the business of a land agent to be properly managed and supervised by a registered agent who is a natural person. The bill proposed by the government attempted to make it clear that that management and supervision requirement of the act apply to each place of business operated by an agent. The reason for this is concern about offices being staffed solely by junior sales representatives and trainees. And despite accepting the amendments put by the Liberals I want to reiterate the points made in this house, and in another place, that the amendment has three fundamental flaws which have simply been ignored.

Firstly, it has no limits on either the size and/or location of the offices to which it will apply. In other words, it allows, for instance, the largest metropolitan office to be supervised and managed by a junior sales representative. Secondly, the proposed amendment has no vetting on who would be allowed to undertake the roles, because the person has to be nominated in writing to the commissioner. In other words, the

commissioner is not able to reject a person so nominated. You do not have to be a genius to recognise the potential for abuse here, and yet the opposition seems to be happy with that concept. This amendment will simply allow any person to supervise and manage a land agent's business. We have not insisted on those amendments.

The Hon. I.F. Evans interjecting:

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: That is quite different, I think you will find. It could, for example, allow an unqualified person convicted of fraud to supervise and manage a land agent's business. Finally, the amendment needs to be clearer in defining what is either a permitted or not permitted activity that could be undertaken. Without this role definition, it could be possible to have an unqualified person supervising and managing a land agent's business, and that unqualified person may overstep the mark—for example, lead to unqualified people making important representations about land. The very purpose of the government's provision was to ensure that all officers were properly supervised. This amendment of the Liberal Party has put this provision in jeopardy.

In relation to the amendment moved by the Hon. Nick Xenophon, the bill as proposed by the government was to require land agents to pay benefits received from third parties to consumers. The practical effect of this amendment is that now land agents will be able to keep advertising rebates and other benefits instead of passing them on to their clients. A whole range of spurious arguments have been put forward to support this significant watering down of the bill, none of which, I believe, have any real validity. For instance, it was said that it would be costly and difficult to calculate and pay the rebates to their clients. That is almost laughable because, as one land agent recently said to me and to the Hon. Nick Xenophon, it would be a simple accounting function that could be done by any first year accounting student.

Another argument put forward in support of this amendment is that consumers can vote with their feet. In other words, if land agents refuse to return rebates to their client, they can choose another land agent. The assumption implicit in that argument is that consumers have the power to negotiate with land agents about who keeps the advertising rebate. That is a completely unrealistic understanding of the bargaining power of a large number of people selling their homes. People selling their house for the first time are at their most vulnerable because of their lack of experience in dealing with real estate agents, and often they will not feel confident or knowledgeable enough when undertaking the negotiations. The government's proposals gave them an added layer of protection, and that has now been ripped away.

The opposition also made much play of the 'buying at wholesale/selling at retail' notion, and that somehow real estate agents could be equated with plumbers or painters. As has been pointed out on numerous occasions, that is arrant nonsense because it fails to recognise that agents owe special fiduciary obligations to their clients when acting on their behalf. This obligation is recognised in both common law and criminal law. Then there was the bizarre idea that the requirement to return rebates to consumers would somehow disadvantage small agents. I have yet had it explained to me how a smaller agent, who receives a rebate of only 5 or 10 per cent, is in a better position to undercut a larger agent who receives a 30 to 40 per cent rebate. In fact, the government's provision would have been in the small agent's interests because it would have made the playing field more level.

The biggest problem is that this amendment will allow some problems to continue unabated. For instance, it encourages agents to undertake extra advertising in order to maximise the rebate because the more advertising they encourage the bigger rebate they get. The government's proposal would have removed the incentive for agents to sell excessive advertising. Now there is no brake on the agents to be temperate about the amount of advertising they recommend to their clients. The plain fact is that all of the doom and gloom that the opposition and the real estate industry have spouted about the government's position is simply disproved by the Victorian experience.

Victoria has had such a ban on rebates for some years. I think that if what had been proposed was so dreadful, we would have had loads of stories about how bad things were in Victoria, but we have not had any such stories. That is because the Victorian experience has been a success. Consumers have had an extra layer of protection, and the whole process has been open and transparent. The situation now is that the Hon. Nick Xenophon, Family First and the Liberals have not supported consumers with this amendment. Instead, they have sided with large real estate agents who now will continue to pocket hundreds of thousands of dollars to the detriment of South Australian home owners.

Motion carried.

CRIMINAL LAW (SENTENCING) (DANGEROUS OFFENDERS) AMENDMENT BILL

Consideration in committee of the Legislative Council's amendments.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: We are dealing with the schedule of amendments made by the Legislative Council. I understand that six amendments are on the schedule and we are moving to agree with all of them. I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendments be agreed to.

The CHAIR: Is the member for Heysen happy to deal with the amendments en bloc?

Mrs REDMOND: I am happy to deal with these amendments en bloc. I want to put a couple of comments on the record and make a comment on one amendment in particular, and possibly even ask one question of the minister. Of course, this bill has been around the place for some time, it having been introduced on 8 February, and I think I spoke to it fairly early on. It has taken some time in the Legislative Council, and I understand that there has been a number of permutations of various amendments. Indeed, I think the passage of one particular amendment was described as 'tortuous' by the Hon. Robert Lawson in the other place.

The bill has essentially been supported by the opposition but with considerable misgivings and, certainly, the Law Society strongly opposes the bill. Both its Human Rights Committee and its Criminal Law Committee provided lengthy reports, explaining why they were concerned, and I must say that I share some of their concerns. The fundamental issue that gives rise to these concerns, to my mind, is the degree to which an individual or individuals can be singled out for special treatment by a legal system. The behaviour of some people is so bad and their criminal acts so abhorrent that the community sees the need to protect itself from them in an ongoing way. However, the question is whether we should have laws that stipulate that such people should never be released.

Last night or the day before in the Legislative Council the Hon. Robert Lawson talked about the Victorian Sentencing Advisory Committee and its consideration of such a regime.

That committee came to the view that, in fact, it was better to allow the potential for people to be released but to keep them under strict conditions as to parole and supervision. I quote from that committee as follows:

> We accept that this is a difficult issue, and the question of whether continuing detention is introduced in Victoria is properly one for the government.

That is the approach it took. In fact, its approach was along the lines of what our Law Society would prefer.

Regarding the specific amendments, I want to comment on only one, and that is amendment No. 4 which introduces section 32A under the heading 'Mandatory minimum non-parole periods and proportionality'. Bearing in mind that we are only dealing with offences at the very serious end of the spectrum, one of the things which gave some comfort to us on the Liberal side in supporting this bill was the fact that, in its original form, the regime gave a fair discretion to the judiciary because there was a discretion which allowed them to reduce the mandatory penalties provided, if they were satisfied that exceptional circumstances existed.

That seemed to many members of the opposition to provide at least a sufficient discretion to allow the individual circumstances of each case to be taken into account but, of course, 'exceptional circumstances' was not defined. What concerns me about this new provision—in particular, subsection (3)—is that it has the effect of so constricting the discretion that it almost disappears. To explain, subsection (2) of section 32A provides:

> In fixing a non-parole period in respect of an offence for which a mandatory minimum non-parole period is prescribed, the court may—
>
> (b) if satisfied that special reasons exist for fixing a non-parole period that is shorter than the prescribed period, fix such shorter non-parole period as it thinks fit.

That sounds as though there is a fair bit of discretion, but subsection (3) provides:

> In deciding whether special reasons exist for the purposes of subsection (2)(b), the court must have regard to the following matters—

that is fine, but then it says—

> and only those matters.

This is where it becomes extremely restrictive regarding the only things to which the court can have regard. The things to which the court must have regard are stipulated, as follows:

> (a) the offence was committed in circumstances in which the victim's conduct or conditions substantially mitigated the offender's conduct—

that takes into consideration no-one other than the victim; it cannot be someone else involved in the fray or anything like that, and the offence must have substantially mitigated the offender's conduct—

> (b) if the offender pleaded guilty to the charge of the offence—that fact and the circumstances surrounding the plea—

of course, at the moment, under our sentencing regime we already take account of the fact that someone has entered a guilty plea—

> (c) the degree to which the offender has cooperated in the investigation or prosecution of that or any other offence and the circumstances surrounding, and likely consequences of, any such cooperation.

Those things seem to me to be so confining that they take away too much of the discretion, so I am not altogether comfortable about them. In a discussion on this, the Hon. Robert Lawson said:

> We believe that one undoubted effect of this clause, especially in relation to homicide cases, will be far greater use of the mental impairment provisions so as to thereby escape a sentence of life imprisonment. That will have an adverse effect on the wider system, and it will also have the effect of reducing the number of guilty pleas because the impossibility of your achieving fewer than 20 years is remote.

My concern is simply that, whereas we came into the original arrangement on the basis that the court had a reasonable discretion, that has now been narrowed by creating this new statutory regime that says that we can have regard to these matters and only these matters. I think that that is unnecessarily restrictive on the court. Nevertheless, as I said, we will support it. It is the government's prerogative to introduce this regime.

My question relates to subsection (4) of section 32A which deals with all these things that I have just been talking about, namely, the mandatory minimum nonparole periods and proportionality. Subsection (4) provides:

> This section applies whether a mandatory minimum non-parole period is prescribed under this act or some other act.

I am curious as to what other act the minister might be contemplating to stipulate nonparole periods and mandatory minimums.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: As the Acting Attorney-General, I normally like to keep a lofty distance from these ordinary mundane parts of the legal system. I am advised that there is no act at present and that there is none contemplated, but it does take into account that this government or a future government may contemplate another act which imposes a mandatory minimum sentence. I think I have answered that quite well in the circumstances.

Motion carried.

JULIA FARR SERVICES (TRUSTS) 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. Clause 3, page 2, after line 6—
Insert:
designated date means 1 July 2009;

No. 2. Clause 4, page 2, after line 23—
Insert:
(4) Subsection (3) will expire on the designated date.
(5) On and after the designated date, references in section 69B of the *Trustee Act* 1936 to the original purposes of a trust will, if relevant to an application under that section, be construed after taking into account the operation of section 5 of this Act.

No. 3. Clause 5, page 3, line 3—
Delete 'or patients' and substitute:
, patients or other recipients of services

No. 4. Clause 5, page 3, line 4—
Delete 'or patients' and substitute:
, patients or other recipients of services

No. 5. Clause 5, page 3, line 7—
Delete 'residents or patients, or classes of residents or patients' and substitute:
residents, patients or other recipients of services, or classes of residents, patients or other recipients of services

No. 6. Clause 5, page 3, after line 12—
Insert:
(la) IFA must, in acting under subsection (l)(c), make a nomination that accords, as far as reasonably practicable, with the spirit of the original testamentary disposition, trust or fund.

No. 7. Clause 6, page 4, after line 29—
Insert:
(10) This section will expire on the designated date.

No. 8. New clause, page 4, after line 29—
Insert:
6A—Maintenance of purposes
Subject to any variation of the terms of a trust under section 6 or the Trustee Act 1936, JF A cannot apply any trust or gift for a purpose that is outside the ambit of an object of IF A existing—
(a) at the time of the commencement of this Act; or
(b) at the time that IF A becomes the trustee or receives the gift (as the case may be),
whichever is the later in the circumstances of the particular case.
No. 9. Clause 7, page 4, line 32—
Delete paragraph (a)
No. 10. New clause, page 4, after line 37—
Insert:
8—Annual report
(1) The administrative unit of the Public Service that is primarily responsible for assisting a Minister in relation to the provision of disability services in the State must include in its annual report for each financial year a statement that sets out, insofar as is reasonably practicable, the following information, as at 30 March of the financial year to which the report relates, with respect to the persons who are residents of the Fullarton campus on 30 June 2007:
(a) the number of persons resident at the Fullarton campus;
(b) with respect to the persons resident at a place other than the Fullarton campus, a broad description of the nature of their accommodation;
(c) during the preceding period of 12 months—
(i) the processes used to plan and implement the relocation of any person to accommodation other than the Fullarton campus;
(ii) the number of persons who returned to accommodation at the Fullarton campus, and the circumstances of their return.
(2) A report under subsection (1) should be prepared in a manner that does not identify a particular person.
(3) In this section—
Fullarton campus means the property that has, until 30 June 2007, constituted the main facility for the designated entities at the comer of Highgate Street and Fisher Street, Fullarton.

CRIMINAL LAW (CLAMPING, IMPOUNDING AND FORFEITURE OF VEHICLES) 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. Clause 4, page 4, after line 10—
Insert:
(2) However, a court must, in imposing another penalty on a person in relation to a prescribed offence, have regard to any exercise of powers under this Act.
No. 2. Clause 13, page 9, lines 22 to 24—
Delete 'on the ground that the making of the order would cause severe financial or physical hardship to the convicted person'
No. 3. Clause 20, page 14, lines 6 to 9—
Delete subsection (3) and substitute:
(3) A motor vehicle must not be sold under subsection (2) unless, not less than 14 days before the sale, notice of the sale was given to—
(a) each registered owner of the motor vehicle; and
(b) each holder of a registered security interest in respect of the motor vehicle under the *Goods Securities Act* 1986.
No. 4. Clause 20, page 14, after line 40—
Insert:
(6a) Despite any other Act or law, if a motor vehicle is sold under this section, the purchaser acquires a good title to the motor vehicle and any interests in the motor vehicle existing prior to the sale are discharged.
No. 5. Clause 21, page 15, lines 10 and 11—
Delete subclause (2) and substitute:
(2) The Magistrates Court may make an order under this section if satisfied—
(a) in the case of an application for an order under subsection (1)(a) or (b)—that the rights of the credit provider would be significantly prejudiced if the order were not made; or
(b) in the case of an application for an order under subsection (l)(c)—that the credit provider has suffered, or will suffer, loss as a result of the exercise of powers under this Act.

Consideration in committee.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendments be agreed to.

Mrs REDMOND: The first of these amendments was moved by the opposition in the other place, and I spoke to it during the second reading debate in this chamber. We did not have time to prepare the amendments, but they are amendments which I suggested to the Attorney-General. That is the only one of the three that we sought that was accepted in the upper house. Yesterday, I read through the other amendments which were moved by the government. They seem to be fairly technical amendments aimed at clarifying a couple of things. They do not substantively change what was in the bill in the first place but simply clarify the situation. They do not seem to make a substantial difference. I am happy to deal with all the amendments at once and I indicate the opposition's support for them.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: The honourable member is correct. The amendments do not change the substance of the law but merely clarify it, as she has indicated.

Motion carried.

COLLECTIONS FOR CHARITABLE PURPOSES (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 30 May. Page 212.)

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport): I indicate that I am the lead speaker for the opposition—and I suspect the only speaker—in relation to this bill, which the opposition will oppose. I want to run through the bill for the house because it is has an interesting history that needs to be recorded, and I will have a few questions for the minister in committee.

The house should not be confused by the title of the bill (which refers to collections for charitable purposes) and assume that it is about charities that have tax donee status under the appropriate federal legislation, because it has nothing to do with that at all. This act was established originally in 1930 and was called the collections for the unemployed act. It was amended in 1939 to its current title. That gives us a glimpse as to why this act was introduced in the first place. During the 1930s there was the Depression and a high level of unemployed people and there seemed to be a need at that point for some legislation to cover collections for those purposes.

I question whether we need the bill at all—or, indeed, whether we need the act at all—or whether we only need it to be an offence to collect for an organisation without that organisation's approval. I question whether that is the only offence we now need, and whether we need the rest of the act at all. But the government has had a review, Mr Speaker, as you are well aware, because I know you are an avid reader of government reviews. Legislation was introduced prior to the last election, and a review was conducted by the Department of Treasury and Finance. The minister's chief of staff,

Mr Paul Ryan, dutifully dropped the final report of the department at my office to make sure that I had an understanding of what the department had come up with in response to the review.

Why are we even talking about this particular bill? The reason we are talking about it is that primarily there were two events that caused some public outrage. One was the Rudy Giuliani event and the other was the Cherie Blair event, run by organisations that sought to make profit out of events. They got done over on the amount charged by the agents and representatives of the guest speakers and, as a result, there was some public outrage by the organisations concerned, and the government's response is before the house today. The government also says there is another reason, and that is there is some community concern that when people are doorknocking or phone collecting for organisations (some known as charities), there is a lack of disclosure or transparency about how much money is going into administration and how much is going to the charitable purpose.

I think it is interesting that we look at what is a charitable purpose under the act, because the bill does not change what is a charitable purpose. It is only collections for these causes that are covered by the act. No other collections are regulated. All other collections are unregulated. So, if you are collecting for the Port Football Club, even without its permission, it is totally unregulated; if you are collecting for your school, even without its permission, it is totally unregulated; and if you are collecting for your church, even without its permission, it is totally unregulated. But the parliament has decided previously to have, and the minister thinks we should maintain, a regulation that says if you seek to help someone by collecting money—if you seek to help the poor, impoverished and unemployed or, indeed, their children; or simply dare to assist or support someone in the armed forces; or if you seek to offer welfare to animals—for some reason you need to be regulated. For some reason, there has to be a higher standard on those collectors than on any other collector in the community. I must admit, I do not see the difference. But the government obviously does, because it has not sought to change the act in any way in regard to what is a charitable purpose.

So the collections we are talking about are not collections for charities that are registered under donee status federally for the purposes of tax. We are talking about collections by any body, incorporated or unincorporated, that seeks to collect money or property of any description or any amount for the following purposes: to afford relief of the diseased, disabled, sick, infirm, incurable, poor, destitute, helpless or the unemployed, or the dependants of such people; or to afford relief of stress occasioned by war, whether in South Australia or elsewhere; to afford relief, assistance or support to persons who have, who are or who have been members of the armed forces of Australia, or to the dependants of any of those persons; and the provision of welfare services to animals. It amazes me that we need a regulation to monitor the collection for those who wish to assist or support the armed forces or for those who wish to provide welfare services for animals or, indeed, for those who wish to help children of the unemployed. Apparently, they need to be regulated, but any other collection within the community does not need to be regulated.

I wanted to make that point clear to the house, because a lot of people, when they see 'charitable purposes', assume we are automatically talking about all charities and all charity activity. We are not. It could be the local cricket club that decides to run an event to support the local hospital. Then the cricket club would fall under this particular provision. If the cricket club is running a barbecue to support junior sport, it does not need to have any regulation or control. So, there is a clear difference, and I just make it clear to the house that what we are talking about is only those collections that relate to the purposes set out in the act which are defined as charitable purposes, so we should not be confused. It relates to anyone who undertakes those collections; they would need to be licensed.

The reason the minister gives in his second reading explanation is that there are concerns in the community about a lack of disclosure, particularly when people are doorknocking and collecting or phone canvassing. The minister's proposal is that the collector should have available certain information at the door or over the phone to answer questions in relation to where the potential donor can source the information. The minister claims also there is a need to clarify, in law, because apparently the charities are simply not capable of putting this matter into a code of conduct or practice. I should not use the word 'charities'; I should say that those who seek to make collections are not capable of doing this off their own bat.

We actually have to bring in a law to demand that people answer the question as to whether they are paid or volunteers, because apparently the organisations that seek to collect money cannot put into their code of practice, their employment contracts or their organisational structure the simple requirement that when you are asked, 'Are you paid or a volunteer?' you answer the question. Apparently that is just too hard so we actually have to regulate for it, which I find quite amazing.

The other reason given for introducing the bill—and I accept that this is not this minister's personal handiwork—is that it was first mishandled by Michael Wright as minister. It might have been Jay Weatherill, but certainly Michael Wright did the review initially, and it has now landed in the lap of this minister after the election, and he is really tidying up the other minister's work. But it is the government view.

The other concern the government seemed to have is that some issues were raised at the time of the tsunami appeal and the Eyre Peninsula fire appeal in relation to how much money collected would go to the charitable purpose. As I mentioned earlier, the Blair event and the Giuliani event also raised some concerns. The Liberal Party is not supporting the bill, because we think that it almost constitutes a nanny state approach; we think it is overkill with respect to the issue. We accept the fact that some of the points the government has put forward have some merit in that on occasions there has been some community concern, but is it rampant? I do not think so. The opposition believes that this is overkill and that it will actually hurt small charities quite significantly.

So, the bill provides increased disclosure; it suggests that the collecting organisations put more information on a particular website, which will be the commissioner's website; it requires that those collecting have certain knowledge as to where information can be obtained—in other words, the website address—and there should be an answer to the question whether they are paid or a volunteer. The government's argument is that this will add public pressure to maximise the amount going to the charitable purpose, and that is the aim.

I just want to touch on that for a minute. When the issue has been raised publicly in the media concerning how much money is going to a charitable purpose, as it has been from

time to time, that serves the purpose of bringing pressure to bear on the whole collection industry in terms of how much money goes to the charity in question. When I doorknock, people often thrust a $5 note in my hand and say, 'See you later,' thinking I am a charity collector—

The Hon P. Caica interjecting:

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: No, I give it back. The Liberal Party is about giving back money, minister. You will see the Howard government has been very good at that, and we give back a hundred per cent. I think the public are smart enough to ask this question: 'Which charity are you collecting for, and how much of what you are collecting goes to the charitable purpose?' If the person concerned cannot answer that at the door, the public do not donate; they get suspicious and do not donate. Any collecting organisation that has good practice—and I declare that I have been national president of Apex, which runs a charitable foundation—will tell you that is a given. You arm your collectors with the information to answer your potential donor's questions. So, I do not think we need to regulate that; I do not think we need a law to actually regulate that particular concept. I think in the marketplace the public can smell a rat, and they are smart enough not to donate if there is any suspicion.

It is the same issue in relation to events, in particular, the Cherie Blair event. I quote from *The Advertiser* on Thursday 10 February 2005, which talks about how minister Wright was going to review the act because of the following:

> Cherie Blair, wife of British Prime Minister Tony, arrived at the Adelaide Entertainment Centre to address 450 people who paid $195 a head. Cherie Blair has attracted controversy for the reported $60 000 fee she is being paid for last night's speech, one of five she is making this week to raise money for the Children's Cancer Institute of Australia. The events have been organised by Sydney public relation consultant Max Markson who told *The Advertiser* his fee for the Adelaide dinner was $20 000.
>
> In another development, Mr Markson yesterday met the QEH Research Foundation executive officer Maurice Henderson following his complaints about a dinner Mr Markson organised in 2003. Mr Henderson said that while his organisation had received only $20 000 from the event, the guest speaker, former New York mayor Rudy Giuliani, had been paid a fee of $300 000.

Because of those two events, the government has sought to bring in changes to the way events and fundraisers are conducted under this particular act. Mind you, if you are a sporting club and if Kevin Sheedy comes to South Australia and wishes to speak for the Port Adelaide Football Club, no-one regulates how much money goes to junior football, or to the sport of football, and how much goes into administration. If SA Great wants to run a luncheon at $200 a head, no-one regulates where that money goes. We rely on the good management of the administration. I understand why the act was brought in in 1939, but in 2007 are we really saying to the charitable sector that it is their sector, and their sector alone, that apparently this house does not trust? Oh, no, we cannot trust the Red Cross or the Crippled Children's Association, or whoever, to deliver the appropriate amount of money to their organisation, but for some reason we can trust the Crows, Port Power, SA Great or any of the church bodies! No-one regulates those, so why is it that this sector needs regulation? It makes no sense to me why this sector needs this level of regulation.

If the minister and the government want to put public pressure on those organisations, they do not need to do any more than let the media report them. As to the articles in *The Advertiser* about fees of $60 000 and $300 000, the average punter will not support those charities with their hard-earned dollars if they think that is unreasonable. There are plenty of charities or collecting organisations to which they can donate without having to have this level of regulation foisted upon them. I make those points in the lead-up to discussing this bill. The minister's second reading explanation is interesting and, in relation to events, it states:

> The Cherie Blair function raised the same disclosure issues for events and entertainment.

That is, the disclosure about how much is being paid in fees and how much is going to the charitable purpose.

> The amendments equally propose to improve transparency and consumer information in those circumstances. Specifically it is proposed to make it a requirement that when a charity sells tickets to an event the advertising and tickets must display the estimated amount and the proportion of intended sales revenue that will be provided to the specified charity.
>
> The Bill also includes amendments of a statute law revision nature to update the language of the 1939 Act.

So, in relation to events, according to the minister's second reading explanation, they will have on the ticket, for example, '22, 28.9 or 30 per cent of this goes to the charitable purpose'. In my view, that is a nonsense. We do not say to the Adelaide Crows that they have to put on their tickets that 30 per cent is going to football and 70 per cent to administration. We do not do it for the arts, for the ballet, for religious bodies, for environment groups or for any other sector, but we will do it for this sector. Of course, it also locks in that every charitable event has to have a ticket. You cannot have a 'pay at the door' function: tickets must be issued. That is the practical effect of the minister's second reading explanation.

I argue that, while it might have been a worthy bill in 1939, in modern South Australia in 2007 this bill is not needed and so we oppose it. I am disappointed that the government has misled the charities, and I will tell you how it has done so, minister, just so that you are aware. Your chief of staff gave me the Treasury report this afternoon (although I did previously have a copy). The Department of Treasury and Finance review mentions there will not be a requirement in the legislation to put the percentage going to the charitable purpose on ticket sales for events. It actually makes that commitment in September 2006 as the government's formal response to the review of its own legislation. In your own second reading explanation, that requirement stands. So, for nearly 10 months the charitable sector has been of the understanding that it had a commitment from the government that it would not be required but, in the second reading explanation, it is crystal clear that is the intent of the government. In my view, I think that the charitable sector has been misled on that issue, and I think that is indeed a pity.

Another issue I will take up during the course of debate is: what is entertainment? The way the government has drafted this bill is that, if any organisation, such as the Burnside Floral Society, wishes to hold an event and pay anyone (that is, entertainment) $5 000, a whole different regime of regulation is brought in. The question is: what is entertainment? Was Mayor Giuliani's speech entertainment? Is my speech here today a form of entertainment? I do not think so—or is it information? This becomes critical to the application of the bill and the act. If anyone is a guest speaker at a function, is that entertainment? If it is, the act applies to a whole different range of activity from having a band, for example, at a charitable event. So, if the Red Cross Charity Ball has a band, that is entertainment. However, is a guest speaker a form of entertainment or is it a way of informing people? That is not defined in this bill. It will come to light

further down the track why the definition of entertainment is critical.

Another question I have (and the advisers can scratch their heads about this one) relates to the $5 000 limit in relation to entertainment. Is that to an individual or to a group? If you are in a five-piece band, and the band's fee is $7 000, does the limit of $5 000 apply to the group as the entertainment or is it $5 000 per person? Another issue I think is unclear in the bill relates to what happens if a consultant is used to organise the event and the body that seeks to collect, through the entertainment, pays the entertainment nothing but pays the consultant, say, $100 000, and the consultant pays the entertainment. Do they fall under the act?

The reason I raise this question is that the newspaper article I quoted earlier states that Mr Markson received $20 000 while Mrs Blair received $60 000. So, the way around the legislation possibly—and this is what I want to clear up—for Mrs Blair to say to the charity, 'I won't charge you anything,' but the agents say, 'Our fee is $100 000 and for $100 000 I can get you Cherie Blair for nothing,' then Mr Markson simply pays Cherie Blair the $50 000 so the charity has actually paid nothing to Mrs Blair at all, so she falls under the $5 000 limit and therefore they do not have to disclose. There is nothing in the bill that stops the charity collecting group getting around the requirement of the regulation that way. While on the surface of it this bill seems a harmless piece of bureaucratic nonsense that the government wishes to foist on our charitable sector, it actually has some curly pieces that need to be dealt with in relation to what this actually means for our charitable sector.

I want to go through some of the clauses of the bill to give the minister a chance to prepare his answers when we come to the committee stage. Clause 4 of the bill deals with interpretation, and the government seeks to put in a number of new interpretations, the main one being that, for the first time, the government is going to define the word 'collector' and who is to be defined as a collector under this act. A collector is a person, which means any body, corporate or unincorporated, so it can be a company, an incorporated or unincorporated association or an individual person, but a collector acts as a collector if the person collects or attempts to collect money or property wholly or partly for a charitable purpose. So, even if 1 per cent of what you are doing is going to a charitable purpose, you are caught by the regulation.

A person also acts as a collector if the person obtains or attempts to obtain money wholly or partly for a charitable purpose by the sale of a disc, badge, token, flower, ribbon or other device. What is 'other device'? My interpretation of that as a lay lawyer is if you are selling anything else. It is undefined. If you are selling anything and if any part of that sale is intended for a charitable purpose, then you are caught by the regulation. The third way you can be deemed to be a collector is if you obtain or attempt to obtain a bequest, device or other grant of money or property wholly or partly for a charitable purpose. What I want to clarify here is that that means every staff member of an organisation that is seeking a grant. In other words, if you are an officer of a charity and you are writing a grant application, you are covered and you have to be licensed to apply, because it says that you are a collector.

I will read it for the member for Torrens. It provides that you are a collector if the person 'obtains or attempts to obtain a bequest, devise or grant of money or property wholly or partly for a charitable purpose.' So, every person out there doing grant applications that will cover any of those are purposes I mentioned earlier under 'charitable purpose' will need to be licensed under this provision, and I think there is a problem with that. It is overkill, in my view. The other day, SAFM had a lamington sale and all over Adelaide you could buy lamingtons for a charity. Under this provision, SAFM would need to be licensed to run that event. Why, I am not sure but, under this, because it is selling another device, in this case a lamington, then it would be caught under this provision.

Lawyers may well be caught under these provisions because lawyers ask people, when doing their wills, 'Are you interested in donating to this bequest fund or that bequest fund?' Because they are seeking a bequest on behalf of a charity, the lawyers will need to be licensed, because the definition this government wishes to use is that of any person who obtains or attempts to obtain a bequest for a charitable purpose. If you are a member of the Red Cross and you are a lawyer, and the Red Cross runs a bequest program, someone may come in and you say 'Do you want to be involved? Here is a leaflet about the Red Cross bequest program.' As soon as you do that, you are seeking to obtain money and you have to be licensed. That is what the bill provides. I think it is overkill and there are unintended consequences—I hope they are unintended consequences—in this bill.

It says that if you sell any device and any of the money is going to a charitable purpose, you will need to be licensed. With any business that runs an advertising program that says that a percentage of the sales will go to a charitable purpose, the retailer needs to be licensed. Is that really what the government intends? The other issue is things such as Lions mints. Lions are selling a device for a charitable purpose. Lions Christmas cakes, Rotary puddings: these things are selling devices for charitable purposes. Rotary clubs and Lions clubs are going to have to be licensed. Is that really what the government intends? Clearly, it is. This is not something thought up overnight: this is something thought up over 2½ years.

The government bill clearly provides that if you are selling a device to raise money for a charitable purpose, you need to be licensed. So, a Lions club selling Lions cakes for a charitable purpose is licensed. For what purpose, for goodness sake, are we seeking to put in that regulation? However, it does.

The other issue I raise is: do the staff need to be licensed? This bill says that anyone seeking to obtain money or property for a charitable purpose needs to be licensed. So, if I am the CEO of the Red Cross, and I am out there seeking money, do I as an individual need to be licensed or is it simply the Red Cross that needs to be licensed? Do the phone collectors working on behalf of Red Cross need to be licensed? Those are issues that are not answered clearly in clause 4, the interpretation. Clause 5, I do not have a lot of problems with, the minister will be glad to know.

New section 6 is divided into three or four sections. New section 6 deals with the licensing provisions, and there is already provision in the existing act for licensing. The government has rewritten it into modern English, but has still decided to license; it has not taken away the requirement to license. So, clearly, the government's view is that people need to be licensed, but only if they collect for certain purposes. I guess we have some issues in relation to new section 6(1), the wording of which is not clear to me. The wording I think allows someone to be registered as a collector, as long as they are approved by a charity even if it

is not the charity they are collecting for. I think the wording is a bit sloppy, and we will come to that during the committee stage.

The other issue is in relation to property. For example, my local Lions club runs a Lions mart, where people come and bring their old furniture. The Lions club on-sells it and the money goes into its service account, which is used for a range of community purposes, many of which will fall under the definition of charitable purposes. So is the Lions mart covered and does that need to be licensed? The definition of 'collector' is someone who is collecting property for charitable purposes. If the Lions club is collecting property, selling it and therefore gaining money for charitable purposes under its service account, is it covered by this particular piece of legislation? It is unclear to me.

I have raised the issue about what staff need to be licensed, and we will come to that during the committee stage. The other issue is that the government has put in a new provision in relation to what it calls 'unattended collection boxes'. I am assuming that an unattended collection box is the box of lollies that sits on the counter into which people can put their 20¢ and take three lollies or whatever. I think that is the 'unattended collection box'. There are some issues here in the way the legislation is drafted. Who is the collector for the purposes of collection boxes? Is it the business? The reason I ask that is because many of the organisations which run collections through unattended collection boxes by selling lollies, etc. actually rely on the business to refill them.

The Hon. P. CAICA (Minister for Gambling): I move:

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

Motion carried.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: So, if the business is actively involved in refilling the lolly box and taking the money out of the lolly box, then is it an unattended money box, is it an unattended collection point? Who becomes the collector at that point? Therefore, if someone is actively involved in refilling it and taking out the money and putting it under the counter or in the safe, and waiting for the charity to come around at the end of the week or the end of the month, is it indeed an unattended collection box? Is it an unattended collection box if the business is actively involved in servicing the collection box on behalf of the charity? That is unclear to me. I hope it is clear to the minister. The other issue in relation to collection boxes is: what is a public space? The law talks about unattended collection boxes in public. I can understand a reception counter being defined as being in public, because anyone can go there, but is the lunch room public, or is someone's office public, where the public cannot get general access? So what are you defining as public and what are you defining as not public? For instance, with a members only club that is not open to the public and open only to members, if an unattended collection box is put there is that covered by this particular provision?

The other issue is that the provisions of this bill will cover all of the RSL when they sell their badges and their poppies for ANZAC Day. You can go into the RSL and there is a tray of badges, you put in your $2 and you take the badge for ANZAC Day. That is an unattended collection box. The RSL clubs are going to have to be licensed, under this provision. I am not sure whether the government intended that, but that is the effect of the legislation. As one of the charities quite rightly pointed out, the legislation will apply broadly. For all the badge sellers on the corner of the Mall and King William Street, guess what—they are selling a badge and they will need to be licensed. For what purpose I am not sure, but Cherie Blair, in my view, has a lot to answer for, for foisting this on our local charities. I notice that some of the disclosures apply only to paid and not unpaid collectors and, in due course, I will be asking questions as to why there is a different penalty regime in relation to unpaid and paid collectors.

The entertainment provisions (new section 7) come about, as we know, from the Cherie Blair situation, and this is where this bill gets even more confusing. New section 7 is headed, 'Licence required in relation to certain entertainments'—just certain entertainments. Certain entertainments are if a charge is made for admission and any of the moneys go to charity—fair enough. The Slow Down at Adelaide Oval—when the old footballers run around on behalf of the McGuinness McDermott Foundation—will have to be a licensed event, because that is charging admission to a form of entertainment. I do not know why we would want to licence the football match, but if we need to licence it and the government thinks that, then I guess it will have its way. However, this is where the question of what is entertainment comes in. I think an interesting matter for the courts—if it ever went to the courts—would be: what is a form of entertainment? For instance, instead of seeking gifts for her birthday, my sister asked for a donation to certain charities. I wonder whether those sorts of things will be licensed under this legislation?

I think that a range of issues in relation to this legislation is overkill. I raised the issue earlier about whether the $5 000 figure relates to one person or to the whole band, but I will come back to that. The issue is whether it is paid just $5 000 in cash or $5 000 in benefit. For instance, I could say to the entertainment, 'Look, I won't pay you cash. What I will do is give you a $1 000 in cash but three nights at the Hyatt as part of the arrangement' or 'I will give you a holiday to Fiji as part of the arrangement.' So, the cash component is not $5 000 but, if you like, the gift or the total value of the reward becomes over $5 000 in value. Is that covered? The whole legislation to me is confusing. The whole legislation to me is an overkill.

I cannot believe this legislation. It is a beauty, actually. The act allows the minister to set a percentage of how much a charity can earn out of an event. The minister can say, 'Well, you want to run that event, but I think you're paying your entertainers too much' or 'I think you're not earning enough out of it so we will not licence the event.' Well, goodness me! We do not do that for any other event. If Business SA wants to run an event at $500 a head, or if the Liberal or Labor parties want to run an event at $10 000 a head, that is fine—unregulated. If the poor, old charities want to run an event, they have to get a licence. In my view it is legislation that is not needed. It might have been needed in 1939 when the Great Depression was on but, in my view, it is not needed today. I think there are other ways to tackle this issue.

I notice that an inspection regime has been drafted for the first time. Not only will we have this regulation tying up our charities but we will have inspectors running around spying on them. All they are trying to do is help good, old South Australians, but what we will do is spend our hard-earned taxes spying on our charities making sure they do the right thing. I will be asking the minister to give an undertaking that there will be no charge to the charities for the inspection regime—ever. Only yesterday we debated a bill in which this

government announced a policy of full cost recovery for administration for some services in relation to the gambling industry, and we need to make sure that no cost is charged to the charities for the inspection regimes.

When I get the opportunity in committee, the last thing I will ask is for the minister to provide to me a list of all the licences that have been issued under the act since the government was elected in March 2002 so that I can see the sorts of events that have been licensed over the last five or six years to work out how big this problem really is. If the house has not picked up on my view yet, it is really simple. I think the charities in South Australia do a damn fine job. I think they are getting done over because of two events: Cherie Blair and Rudy Giuliani. I think this legislation is overkill. If we talked to those in the charity industry, they would say that the organisation that ran those two events did not use best practice, and they paid the penalty for not using best practice. However, that does not mean that every charitable collection in South Australia needs to be put through this licensing regime. It does not mean that. There are other ways the matters can be dealt with. Simple public pressure through the media exposing the poor practice automatically puts pressure on the whole sector to better inform its donor base about how it administers its organisation and how much money goes to charity.

I should have made this point earlier because it is a little out of context in terms of where I am in the debate. However, I need to put it on the record. The other point to make is that a lot of charities run an event not to make money. I am running one tonight on behalf of my campaign committee—not to make money out of the event but to build a network, to promote a product and to build connections so that, in the future, when I do run an event I will make money or they will make money out of that event. If you say to a charity, 'You must disclose how much money you are making out of an event', they may say, 'Well, I'm making none.' Some may even run events at a loss quite deliberately to get a new donor base into the organisation simply to educate them about the product. So, you will actually damage the charity by saying, 'You must disclose how much you are making out of that event.' People will say, 'Well, if they're making nothing out of it, why would I support it?'

You would support it because you are educating a whole new donor base about the reasons they should support it in the future. I think the legislation is overkill. I am not proposing any amendments. I think the government has had two years to think about this. This is the form the government wanted and, if it wanted it in this form and the upper house so agrees, it will get it in this form. I think that this is unfair on the charities; I think it is overkill. It is not needed; in fact, I do not think the act is needed other than for one provision and that is, if you are collecting for a purpose or an organisation without its permission, that is an offence. But as long as an organisation authorises you, that should be good enough. Otherwise, if the government's approach is different to that view, the government needs to explain why it is not regulating the environment movement and how much money goes to those programs like the Wilderness Society, the conservation and marine societies and all those bodies.

Also, the government needs to explain why the political parties, the churches and sporting clubs are not regulated. Why is it that only this sector is regulated? The only reason this sector is regulated is that there was a depression back in 1939 and the legislation is a hangover from then. The only reason we are here now is that there have been two bad events in my 14 years here. Those organisations got done over publicly and they paid the price, but now the whole charitable sector will pay the price. I look forward to the committee stage.

The Hon. P. CAICA (Minister for Gambling): I thank the honourable member for his very interesting and succinct contribution. There appears to be an error to the extent that the second reading speech referred to by the honourable member relates to an earlier bill, but the bill is consistent with the final report released by the Department of Treasury and Finance. Specifically, for the record—

The Hon. I.F. Evans interjecting:

The Hon. P. CAICA: There has been an administrative error and, specifically to correct the record, I will read a section of the second reading speech as part of my summing up. On 14 November 2005, the Collections for Charitable Purposes (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill 2005 was introduced in the House of Assembly. This bill provided for increased disclosure requirements at the point of collection of funds. Debate on this bill was adjourned on 28 November 2005. Following the parliamentary debate on the Collections for Charitable Purposes (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill 2005, another round of consultation occurred with charity stakeholders to resolve issues raised. From this consultation it became clear that the Collections for Charitable Purposes (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill 2005 had disclosure requirements that were inconsistent across different types of collecting activities. This inconsistency, uncorrected, would result in duplication of effort and higher cost of compliance.

Following the second round of consultations, the introduced bill was redrafted to alter the focus of disclosure at the point of collection to the provision of information where the potential donor can find out more about the charity. The public availability of this information via the annual income and expenditure statement on the Office of the Liquor and Gambling Commissioner website also provides greater transparency. The annual income and expenditure statements, which are submitted by licensees, will be simplified for this purpose. Some events with high-profile speakers raise the same disclosure issues. The amendments equally propose to improve transparency and consumer information in those circumstances. Specifically, it is proposed to make it a requirement that, where a charity sells tickets to an event, the advertising and tickets must display where a donor can collect or request a copy of the last annual financial statement of the licensee and information on the fee paid to a speaker or entertainer at such an event, if any, when the fee is greater than $5 000. The amendment bill also includes amendments of a statute law revision nature to update the language of the 1939 act, as was pointed out by the opposition's lead speaker.

With that statement, I formally correct the record. Again, I thank the opposition member for his contribution. As I said, this bill proposes a minimum set of disclosure requirements for charity collections, powers for inspectors and a number of administrative and technical amendments. It ensures that potential donors to charitable organisations have access to relevant information about the charity and its performance and that donations can be made on an informed basis with confidence in the sector. These are minimum standards. It is anticipated that most charities—and, in fact, that was highlighted by the opposition's lead speaker—already comply or exceed the proposed disclosure requirements. However, for those that do not, it will lift them and the confidence in the sector as a whole.

The changes proposed in this bill were the subject of an extensive consultation process. Many submissions were received and carefully considered. I think it is a bit disappointing that the opposition has indicated that it will oppose improving the disclosure provisions for charitable collections. I will not go into detail now, because we will engage in debate in committee. I agree with the assertion that South Australians are astute and that they can tell the difference—or, in the words of the opposition's lead speaker, they can smell a rat—but we all know that some out there prey on the vulnerable. The honourable member highlighted the clause referring to what constitutes a charitable purpose, along with what constitutes the destitute and needy. In fact, they are exactly the type of issues that pull at the heartstrings of individuals.

I think it is somewhat naive to suggest that there are not people out there who do not prey on individuals because, quite simply, there are, and they will extract money from whomever they can whenever they can. This process, as much as anything else, is about protecting those who are the shining lights within the charity industry from the people in question—in fact, ensuring that those people are exposed. It is not about putting in more cumbersome or burdensome provisions on the charity sector: it is about ensuring, in particular, that the people who are making decisions about being donors to charities can have not only a view but an assurance that that money is going to be properly accounted for, that the process is transparent, and that the money they are providing is going to the purpose for which they are donating.

I think that is a reasonable thing. Mr Speaker, like you and other members of the house, I probably donate quite a bit of money to a lot of charities and organisations. I like to know that all that money is going to the charity to which I am donating—and, if not, I want to know that it is not. It seems a reasonable thing in a society like ours for that to be a minimum provision. What we have in a mature, well informed and astute society is a realisation and understanding of where that money in the form of a donation is going, and I think that is reasonable. That is the thrust of the legislation. I enjoyed the comparisons with the football club, which are not a charitable institution for the purposes of this exercise. As was pointed out by the lead speaker, this is about a sector that is extremely important to the people of South Australia, and we are keen to ensure that proper protections are in place to enable this important sector to go forward without being tainted. I think the honourable member would acknowledge that there are what he termed 'rats out there'. This measure affords protection from those rats.

I would like to make one other point in concluding my contribution. I will be careful about paraphrasing, but the lead speaker asked what on earth we are doing here with this particular bill. The matter was opened up in 1999, and the bill was No. 14 of 1999. In fact, it was a private member's bill that was introduced by the member for Torrens. I will not go into the detail, but the bill inserted a clause for the charitable purpose of the provision of welfare services to animals. I highlight the point made by the lead speaker—and I will be corrected if I am wrong—that there are certain aspects of this bill with which he does not agree and which he thinks are a nonsense.

Given the fact that there was a first reading, second reading and third reading and the bill went through committee, if these issues were of such concern—because the honourable member referred to clause 6, which has not changed but which brings the language into modern terminology—there was ample opportunity in 1999 to make amendments or repeal the bill, if it was so important and such a nonsense and an affront to the astuteness of the people of South Australia. But there was not one speaker from the opposition during that time in 1999. A lot of those bills which existed in 1999 have been translated to more modern language in 2007. My colleague and friend the member for Torrens says that Peter Lewis was opposed to it but when I read his contributions I note that he was not completely and utterly opposed to the bill. He supported the fact that the bill was there for consideration.

The government sees this bill as an important measure which relates to the transparency, accountability and, indeed, the protection of those people who work within charity industries. That is its thrust, direction and aim. It is about making sure that those people who purport to be collecting on behalf of charities meet certain requirements. I make the point that in 1999 it did not matter, but in 2007 it does matter. The thrust of the bill is to tighten up transparency and accountability. Certainly it is something that I want, and I believe it is something the majority of the community of South Australia wants. They want to ensure the money is going to good causes. I am disappointed that on this occasion we are not able to get the agreement of the opposition on this matter; I think it is a shame. Perhaps it does show clear policy differences between the opposition and the government, not just in this matter but in other areas as well.

Bill read a second time.

In committee.

Clauses 1 to 3 passed.

Clause 4.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: I am not legally trained like the minister's advisers. I am a humble builder by background but I want to ensure that I understand this. For example, I assume that the sale of Lions mints and cakes and Rotary puddings is covered by the definition of 'collector', because they are selling an object or device which raises money for a charitable purpose. I want to check that they are covered by this. I am not saying they should be but I want to check that the minister thinks they should be.

The Hon. P. CAICA: I am advised, and I am sure the member will be thankful about this, that no, they are not.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: As a supplementary question, can the minister explain how they fall outside the act? A 'collector' is defined as a person who obtains or attempts to obtain money, wholly or partly, for a charitable purpose by the sale of a disc, badge, token, flower, ribbon or other device. How is a Lions mint, Rotary pudding or a Lions cake not another device? Are we saying any food substance cannot be a device? What is a device?

The Hon. P. CAICA: I am advised, and it certainly makes sense to me, that a cake and foodstuffs and the like do not fall into that category. It is not mentioned there but I am sure the member has sold them because I know he supports the guide dogs, and that is a pen, for example. That is an example of 'other device'.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Madam Chair, we are getting into an interesting area here. Okay, so a pen is a device.

The Hon. P. CAICA: I use that as an example.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Yes, as an example. Is a book a device? I think it is totally unclear what the words 'other device' mean. I make the point, and we can sit here all night going backwards and forwards about what is a device and what is not, but I make the point that there is a whole range

of organisations out there that sell objects with some or all of the moneys going towards a charitable purpose, and I cannot see how they are not caught under the 'other device' category. I cannot see how the government is going to maintain an argument in court that says that if I buy a disc, a badge, a token, a flower, a ribbon, a pen or a ruler they are covered by the legislation but a book or furniture or other matters are not covered. Is there any better definition of 'device'?

The Hon. P. CAICA: I am advised that the items on the list do not have any intrinsic value. Of course, depending on the type, a pen may have some intrinsic value, so perhaps that was a bad example. I am advised that a cake and foodstuffs are not a device, and the member would be happy about that.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Madam Chair, that is interesting, because the minister is saying that a device is something that has no intrinsic value, but the legislation does not say that. You could pay $100 for a badge, and that is covered by the legislation. You could pay $100 for a ribbon. Nowhere in the collector definition does it say that it has to be of no intrinsic value. So, to me, the answer does not hold water. I will not hold up the committee but, between houses, the minister might want to look at that because I think the definition has some problems.

I want to make this crystal clear. There are TV adverts running at the moment for a major retailer that says a percentage of its sales of furniture will be donated to a charity. What the minister is saying is that because the furniture has an intrinsic value that is not covered by the legislation. But, God help me, if I want to sell a badge for the RSL, I am covered by the legislation. That makes no sense to me. If that is the advice to the committee, that is fine, but there is a major retailer out there as we speak advertising on TV saying, 'If you buy our furniture over a certain period of time, an amount will be donated to a charity.' Thank goodness the big retailers are not covered by the legislation, because we can trust them, can't we, Madam Chair? We all trust the big retailers. But, goodness me, if a charity wants to sell a damn ribbon, they are covered by the legislation. Well, we have the answer. I will go on to the next question.

The Hon. P. CAICA: Before the member goes on to the next question, as is my right, I understand, I will clarify some of the issues raised by the lead speaker for the opposition. The point I make is that this component of the act (and the particular clause to which the honourable member refers)—obtains, or attempts to obtain, money by the sale of any disc, badge, token, flower, ribbon or other device—is not changed by this bill. It is that which existed in 1999 when, of course, the then government saw no fit reason even to contribute to the debate or change whatever existed.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: On behalf of charities, I want to clarify this point. Just so the minister is clear for the rest of the debate, I could not give a stuff what happened in 1999. The reality is we have had a full review of this now—by the government, not by the opposition—and this is what we have before us. I want to clarify this on behalf of charities. When their staff approach people for money, are they caught under the definition of 'collector' under paragraph (c) where it says, 'any person who obtains, or attempts to obtain, a bequest, device or other grant of money', or indeed under paragraph (b) where they 'obtain, or attempt to obtain, any money, wholly or partly, for a charitable purpose'? Do individual staff members have to be licensed?

The Hon. P. CAICA: It certainly is that if a person falls within that section. I presume that you are talking about a paid collector or a volunteer?

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Say I work for the Red Cross, and I ring up someone as a salaried officer of the Red Cross and I say, 'Look, I'm ringing you because I'm seeking money.' Or it could be the CEO who approaches a sponsor. If a CEO approaches someone for money for a charitable purpose, does that person become a collector and therefore need to be licensed, even though they are already employed by the charity?

The Hon. P. CAICA: If they are collecting directly on behalf of the charity, they would identify that particular purpose, whether they be the chief executive of the Red Cross or the chief executive of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital Research Foundation.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: I misheard. Do they need to be licensed?

The Hon. P. CAICA: I am advised that they will not require a section 6 licence, but they would need to identify, for the purposes of the work they are doing that you identified, that they are collecting on behalf of the charity.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Just to help me understand this: are churches covered by this act? I am a regular churchgoer and we have Mission Sunday every fourth Sunday. I am donating to my church for mission work in war-torn countries, which is a charitable purpose under the act. So, in theory, are churches meant to be caught by this act under those circumstances? In other words, every fourth Sunday we have a mission collection. They are collecting to donate money to an overseas war-torn country. I am assuming that, the way this act applies, they are theoretically caught.

The Hon. P. CAICA: I am advised that if they are collecting for a specific charitable purpose, yes, they would be.

Clause passed.

Clause 5.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Section 6(1) provides:

> . . . a person must not act as a collector unless the person holds, or is authorised by the holder of, a section 6 licence.

The way that reads, the person does not actually have to be authorised by the group they are collecting for; as long as they are authorised somewhere as a collector. It does not actually say anywhere in the bill that collectors must be authorised by licence, so I could be authorised by the Red Cross—I am an authorised collector under the act—but it does not actually say that the person must not act as a collector for any other purpose other than that for which they are authorised. Is it open to me to interpret it in that way? Logic says that they should only collect for the organisation for which they are authorised. I accept that logic, but the way the bill is written, it does not say that and neither does the act. Section 6(1) provides:

> Subject to subsection (2)—

which is about who is not liable, so forget subsection (2)—

> a person must not act as a collector unless the person holds, or is authorised by the holder of, a section 6 licence.

There should be something in there that says that a person must not act as a collector for the purpose or for the organisation unless the person is authorised by the holder of that section 6 licence.

The Hon. P. CAICA: I seek some clarification. Are you talking about a paid collector or simply a volunteer collector?

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Either/or.

The Hon. P. CAICA: I am not confused. Quite simply, that section is stipulating that a person must not act as a collector unless that person, or the organisation on behalf of

which that person is collecting, is a holder of a section 6 licence.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Section 6A—and this goes to the question about whether staff should be employed—provides that a paid collector must not employ or engage another person. I think I have answered my own question, but I will ask it anyway. If the CEO employs paid collectors, does the CEO become liable to be licensed? Under this bill, as a paid collector, the CEO has to be. The CEO of every charity will have to be defined as a paid collector, and the paid collector must not employ or engage other collectors, unless they are licensed. One assumes that this means that every CEO will have to be licensed, otherwise they cannot employ or engage other people below them to be collectors.

The Hon. P. CAICA: I think that the member has answered his own question. In the example he provided, it would be the organisation itself that holds the 6A licence.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: I think that new section 6B, the unattended collection boxes, is confusing. The bill is quite specific. New section 6B(1) talks about a person who act as a collector by placing an unattended collection box in a public place. Who is the collector for the purposes of collection boxes when they are placed in a business and the business attends to the collection box? I will give the example of Lions mints. The Lions club has 25 members who all sell Lions mints. As Lions members, they take away their mints and place them in their business to support their local club. Who is the collector? I assume that it is only the person who places the unattended collection box in the business. If someone else in the business tops up the Lions mints, takes the money and all that sort of thing (in other words, services the unattended collection box), they are not covered in any way by this provision.

The Hon. P. CAICA: I do not think that what the member says is quite correct. A collector—that is, the person who attends to an unattended box, if that is the right terminology—will either be in the employ or acting on behalf of the licence holder or, indeed, hold a specific licence to do so themselves.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: This is where I think we have a problem because I do not think that is true. Lots of charities have these collection boxes, and a businessperson will place them there out of goodwill to support the charity, and they will service them. The bill is quite specific, whether by luck or design. It provides, 'A person who acts as a collector by placing an unattended collection box.' Is that the person who organises the placing or who physically places it? To use the Lions club example, the way it works is that they have a Lions mints roster, and many of the Lions club members will take the mints to their own businesses. Do those people become collectors and, therefore, need licensing under this bill?

The Hon. P. CAICA: In my office, I have a box that is unattended, as you would. The simple fact is that, in the interests of transparency and accountability, the requirement will be that that box must be marked, and in a reasonably prominent position, with the following information: the name and contact details of the holder of the section 6 licence under which the person is authorised to act as the collector. That person is authorised by the holder of the licence to act on their behalf.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: That is my point. You will impose on all those organisations a requirement they do not currently have, because they are largely informal arrangements where people simply assist out of goodness and wishing to support the local charity X, Y or Z. Now an authorisation regime will be put in place that I think will be a disincentive. However, you have confirmed what I thought.

The Hon. P. CAICA: Whereas the lead speaker of the opposition talks about encumbrance or imposition of a burden (and those may not be his exact words), I hark back to the things I have said previously—that the people who purchase chocolates, little bears, or whatever the case might be out of those boxes (and mostly for me it is chocolate), I think that I and other members of the public have a right to know where the money is going if it is purported, as is normally the case, that it goes to charitable purposes. It is about transparency and accountability. Unlike the lead speaker of the opposition, I do not believe that this is, again for the organisations we have consulted, an overly burdensome requirement upon them.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Under this whole provision, paid collectors suffer a fine or penalty regime; volunteer collectors do not. Why has the government decided to go down that path?

The Hon. P. CAICA: To clarify that particular point, the effort that has been undertaken since I have been minister and, indeed, the government, has been to work closely with the charitable sector to ensure that we have a system in place that they not only understand but also, in the main, support. We received three letters post the consultation phase. Quite clearly, there are requirements under legislation and, if those requirements are not met, penalties will be imposed. It is not the intention, of course, to seek those penalties as a first port of call. Our department will continue to work with charities to ensure that, if assistance is required, it will be provided. The simple fact is that this is aimed at those people out there who, unlike the member for Davenport, cannot smell a rat.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: In relation to the 'certain entertainments' and the prescribed amount which, if it is not prescribed, will be $5 000, is the government looking at putting in a prescribed amount and, if so, what is it to be? New section 7 of the act, which is clause 5 of the bill, deals with a licence being required in relation to certain entertainments. New subsection (5) deals with 'prescribed amount.' If there is no prescribed amount then automatically it defaults to $5 000. Is the government looking at putting in a different amount as a prescribed amount and, if so, what is it, and will it be the same for every form of event or are we going to have different prescribed amounts for different events?

The Hon. P. CAICA: Contrary to the honourable member's view, I think that the intention is quite clear: that it will be, as he mentioned, $5 000.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: So, $5 000 for every event. I want to understand how this is going to work. We have the Showdown in two weeks' time when Adelaide play Port, and, if they decide that they are going to donate a certain amount of the gate takings to charity, one assumes that that will need to be a licensed event under this provision, because the entertainers, the footballers, are getting paid more than $5 000. Do I have that right?

The Hon. P. CAICA: Would there not be an expectation that, if people are attending a football game and part of the proceeds or all the proceeds are going to charity, there would be an awareness in the people who are attending that match that that is the case? That would seem to me to be reasonable.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: So, they are going to have to be licensed. Why we want to do that, I am not sure. There is another issue: will the minister confirm whether the $5 000 is for the entertainment in total? In other words, does each

member of a five-piece band get $1 000, or is it per entertainer? Is it $5 000 in cash? Is it $5 000 from the charity or $5 000 in relation to the event? I gave the example of someone paying their agent and the agent paying the entertainer and, therefore, the charity not paying anything for the entertainment. Is it $5 000 from the charity? Is it $5 000 per entertainer? Is it $5 000 cash or $5 000 in any value?

The Hon. P. CAICA: If there is $5 000 or more from an event that is going to an entertainer, that would need to be disclosed.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Let me understand this: if it is $5 000 cash it needs to be disclosed; if it is $5 000 worth of free hotel rooms, it does not need to be disclosed. Was that the minister's answer—that it was cash? Let me give an example which was quoted in the newspaper. It is amazing that this was not fixed up in 1999 when your side reviewed it. It says here that Mr Markson was paid $20 000 and Cherie Blair was paid $60 000. If Cherie Blair got the $60 000 from Mr Markson and not from the charity, is she covered? Does it have to come direct from the charity?

The Hon. P. CAICA: To a very great extent it does not matter where Ms Blair (or anyone else) gets their money from. For the purposes of this exercise (and I am sure that you would largely agree with this point), if there is money going to entertainers and that money is being paid out of the proceeds of the event, that would be disclosed, and that is appropriate.

The CHAIR: Clause 5, for the third time.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: I have one last question, Madam Chair, and then we can go.

The CHAIR: That makes question 763, I think.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: I can speak for 15 minutes three times on every clause, Madam Chair, and I am happy to do that—I do not have a corridor event to go to. I want to be clear about this. The bill refers in new section 7(4)(c) to 'any other information prescribed by regulation', and this relates to what can be required to be put on tickets and advertising. I referred earlier to the minister's second reading explanation (which was on record and given to us by the clerks yesterday as the formal record), which mentions the percentage required on tickets and advertising. I want the minister to give a cast-iron guarantee to the committee that, under no circumstances, will the government require that to be done under new section 7(4)(c), which allows it to require anything by way of regulation. I was very suspicious when I saw the provisions referred to in the second reading explanation, because you can, by regulation, prescribe that any other information be on the ticket or in the advertising. The charitable sector were very nervous when they saw the minister's second reading explanation, knowing that that might be the intent. Will the minister give a cast-iron guarantee that it will never happen under his government?

The Hon. P. CAICA: I can give an iron-clad guarantee that it certainly is not the intention that that will occur. You know as well as I do (perhaps better than I do, because you are far more experienced and far more skilful and it is a pity that perhaps things have panned out the way they have) that any other information prescribed by regulation does not stop us from doing it. However, I am saying to you, as the minister responsible for this particular act, that that will not happen.

Clause passed.

Clause 6 passed.

Clause 7.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: You will love this one, minister. It took a lot of thought to get this one in, but we got there. This clause talks about the holder of a licence selling property for charitable purposes. The collector definition with which we dealt earlier under clause 4 talks about people who seek money for charitable purposes through the sale of property needing to be licensed. Can the minister confirm for me that there is no way real estate agents need to be licensed under this act selling property for charitable purposes?

The Hon. P. CAICA: I can tell the honourable member that I support this clause, and rightly so. If I was not a member of the board when it was selling tickets for the Queen Elizabeth Hospital Research Foundation I would have bought them myself. That charity has an enormous amount of profit in it. Real estate agents will not get caught by this.

Clause passed.

Clause 8.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Will the minister guarantee that there will be no charging regime back to the charities in regard to the inspection regimes?

The Hon. P. CAICA: Yes, I can.

Clause passed.

Schedule and title passed.

Bill reported without amendemnt.

The Hon. P. CAICA (Minister for Gambling): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

I notice that we have a couple of minutes. I would like to thank the opposition for its very thoughtful and considered contribution here today, and I do not mean that disrespectfully at all. Again, I would like to reinforce the point that this bill is about surety for the charitable sector. It is about ensuring that there is transparency and accountability and, in fact, that people providing their money in good will and good faith to charitable purposes (which we all support) goes to the cause and in the amount for which they deem appropriate. They now have the right to raise those questions, which is nothing less than appropriate.

Bill read a third time and passed.

ADJOURNMENT

At 6 p.m. the house adjourned until Tuesday 11 September at 11 a.m.