HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 24 September 2008

The SPEAKER (Hon. J.J. Snelling) took the chair at 11:00 and read prayers.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.

(Continued from 23 September 2008. Page 191.)

Mr GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel) (11:03): I am pleased to join with my colleagues on both sides of the house to make a contribution to the motion for adoption of the Address in Reply. I, too, congratulate the Governor, His Excellency Rear Admiral Kevin Scarce, on the manner in which he carries out his vice regal duties in South Australia and the good work his wife, Mrs Scarce, also undertakes in her role in supporting His Excellency in that.

I will speak on a range of issues in the next few minutes, the first being the recent result of the Mayo by-election. It was only in the last sitting of the house a fortnight ago that in some bizarre manner some members of the government claimed in an odd way a victory for the Labor Party. How can a federal seat being retained by the Liberal Party be some sort of victory for the Labor Party? The result in Mayo was as anticipated. We all knew that the margin may well decrease over that previously enjoyed by a very popular, well-known federal member, Alexander Downer. The claim from across the other side of the house that it was some victory for the ALP is a complete misrepresentation of the facts.

We only have to look at the reality of its situation: the Labor Party did not have the guts or fortitude to run a candidate, because it knew it was on a hiding to nothing if it had run a candidate, and the increase in the votes to the Greens and the Independent candidate from the Lower Lakes area—

Members interjecting:

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: I know her name, but I do not need to mention it in the house. The result was that the hard-core, rusted-on Labor vote would never go to the Liberal Party: it was split between the Greens and the Independent candidate. If you look at the 2007 general federal election results in terms of the combined ALP/Green vote, it is not a lot different from the Green/Independent split vote. For members opposite to claim that it is some sort of victory for them and a defeat for the Liberal Party is completely wrong. We knew that it would be a close contest, for a range of reasons that I do not need to canvas this morning. We knew that the contest would be close, and that is what transpired.

I congratulate Jamie Briggs, our successful candidate, on winning the seat in difficult circumstances, and there were some reasons behind that. I understand that the declaration of the poll took place yesterday. I want to extend my hearty congratulations to Jamie Briggs on retaining the seat. I know Jamie very well. I lent some assistance in relation to his campaign, and I know that he will work extremely hard to ensure that he becomes a good federal member of parliament; and I know that, when the next federal election is held some time towards the end of next year or early in 2010, he will be re-elected and consolidate his position as the federal member for the seat of Mayo. Having made those comments, I will now turn—

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: —to the issue of water. We know that water—

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: You've gone to water!

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: Talking about water, Mick, why don't you dry up! It would be a great benefit to all of us if you just dried up. We know that water is the No. 1 priority here in South Australia. There has been an enormous level of debate in relation to water, and one of the major factors in the Mayo by-election was the plight of the River Murray and the Lower Lakes. In relation to that, I want to congratulate the member for Hammond on his promotion to the shadow ministry. The member for Hammond has done an outstanding amount of work in relation to the Lower Lakes

and the River Murray. I know, and all the members on this side of the house know, how hard he has worked.

Members interjecting:

Mr VENNING: Mr Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Standing order 137 relates to 'persistently and wilfully obstruct the business of the house', and I ask you to rule accordingly.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Members on my right will come to order! Give the member for Kavel a fair go. The member for Kavel.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: He needs protection!

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I do need protection from that extraordinarily bad Attorney-General on the other side of the house. Members on this side of the house know that the member for Hammond has done an extraordinary amount of work in relation to the Lower Lakes and the River Murray issue. He has got across all the aspects of it and has an extremely thorough knowledge of the issues and concerns, as well as knowing the actual amount of water that is being held in the catchments further up in the Murray-Darling system.

We know that debate is raging about all those related issues. I want to congratulate the member for Hammond on his promotion into the shadow cabinet. It is a worthy decision by the leader. In relation to the desalination issue, what an interesting turn of events we have seen over the last couple of days. It is clearly obvious that the spin doctors—that multitude of spin doctors—hired by the state Labor government went into hyper-overdrive on Saturday and Sunday as a result of the headline in Saturday's *Advertiser*. They have gone into hyper-overdrive so that the Premier can come out in the media on Monday with the earth-shattering announcement that—

Mr Venning: The revelation!

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: The revelation—another historic announcement, a world first, and all that sort of—I was going to use an unparliamentary word! He came out with all that sort of nonsense that the desalination plant will be commissioned a year earlier than anticipated.

Goodness me! I wonder whether that announcement would have been made had that headline not appeared in Saturday's paper. I doubt whether it would have been there. I think that the government boffins, the spin doctors and all the crew behind the scenes (and we know an enormous amount of expenditure is given to that level of staffing) went into hyper overdrive over the weekend to come up with those nice images we saw on television, with the pipe sticking out of the seabed dispersing the saline water and so on. It was all very nice imagery, but I really doubt whether it would have eventuated had that headline not appeared in Saturday's paper. What a fantastic day it is to be alive today, when we have another headline in the national paper, *The Australian*, stating what the recent—

Mr RAU: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, I am being distracted from the honourable member's speech by the member for Schubert being on the phone.

Mr Venning: It's an internal phone.

Mr RAU: It is still very distracting. I feel as though I cannot concentrate properly.

The SPEAKER: There is no point of order. The member for Schubert is using an internal phone, and he is entitled to do that.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: There is actually a standing order in relation to raising frivolous points of order; perhaps the member for Enfield should be aware of that standing order, too. Nevertheless, what a great day to be alive: it is springtime, there is sunshine outside and we have another good result in the opinion polls on the front page of *The Australian*. Obviously, that is sending shock waves through the government.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: I was out doorknocking last night.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: Even the Attorney-General is worried about his seat! Even he says he is out doorknocking, holding street corner meetings and the like to maintain his margin. It gets back to the fundamental issue that this government is all about spin. It is all about talk and no action. We see the latest slogan trotted out. It used to be, 'We're concentrating on law and order, education and health.' They have abandoned all that completely. The slogan now is, 'Action now for the future.'

Ms Chapman interjecting:

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: The deputy leader raises a very good point. I have been to a couple of functions sponsored by government departments where this slogan 'Action now for the future' has been run out on banners and so on. All the new programs that are launched at these functions are rebadged, slightly rejigged existing programs called 'Action now for the future.'

As the leader pointed out quite accurately and appropriately yesterday, we should have had 'action now for the future' seven years ago, when the government first came into office. We are playing catch-up at the moment. I can tell you from our feedback from constituents that they do not buy any of this 'action now for the future'. It is simply another failed attempt at spin and trying to con the voting public that it is doing something.

We have known from March 2002, when this government came to power, that it is all about talk and no action, and we are seeing the results of that.

Again, I want to comment on water issues specifically relating to electorates in the Adelaide Hills, in the western Mount Lofty water catchment area. We have heard continuously that, in relation to trying to waterproof Adelaide—and those catchy sort of phrases—the government is going to look to double the capacity of the Adelaide Hills reservoirs. I am at a bit of a loss as to how that will be achieved—and I have raised this in the house previously.

I have attended meetings conducted by senior departmental officers in relation to the prescription of the western Mount Lofty Ranges water catchment region that the Hills catchment is at capacity in relation to supplying metropolitan Adelaide with potable water. This is straight from the mouth of a senior departmental officer. So, how can the government come up with a policy that it is going to double the capacity of the reservoirs in the hills when, currently, the reservoirs are at capacity? We cannot get any more water, particularly with climate change upon us. The prediction is that we are going to get less rainfall. Even if the capacity is doubled and even if one does the mathematics and pushes up the walls of the dams, builds on top of the Kangaroo Creek wall and pushes up the bank of the Millbrook Reservoir, and so on, how will one catch more water if it does not rain? And how would one catch it if we are already at capacity?

Again, this highlights this government's flawed decision-making processes in developing policies to resolve the crisis we have with our fresh water needs. It highlights the flawed manner in which this government goes about its decision making.

Some other matters concerning water go to the very issue of the decision to prescribe the western Mount Lofty Ranges water resources. I have spoken about this matter in the house on a number of occasions. The decision has been made to prescribe the resource, whether or not we agree with it. However, in the government making that decision, there is a process that is undertaken to develop what it calls a water allocation plan.

There was a real concern amongst all the industry groups within the Adelaide Hills, and I do not think I am overstating the fact. All industry groups that rely on water resources in the Adelaide Hills were concerned about the way the government was conducting itself in developing the water allocation plan. I shared those concerns, so much so that I moved a motion in the house and spoke to it, highlighting the concerns of my constituency and those of other members who represent the Adelaide Hills region—a vitally important region to this state. I moved a motion in this house, raising those issues of concern, particularly the way that the department and the departmental officers were going about determining the actual extent of the resource in the catchment.

I think I am a fair person, and I give credit where it is due. I like to think that in some small way I assisted the industry groups in the Hills in promoting their concerns and bringing that matter to the notice of the house, and I am pleased that the government officers have listened to those concerns and have extended the period for producing a draft water allocation plan. Initially, the department was proposing that the plan be produced by June (from memory, as I do not have the notes with me).

As I said, concerns were raised about that time frame, which was cramming up the groundproofing work that needed to be done to prove what the department thought were the facts on the extent and sustainability of the resource. Extensive groundproofing had to be done—monitoring bores and a whole range of on-the-ground work—to prove the theory of what the government officers believed.

I give credit to the government officers for delaying that process. They have been more consultative in their approach to these matters and it is likely, judging from the meeting I attended several weeks ago, that the draft plan will be out towards the end of this year or early next year. That is a good outcome, but it is the result of community pressure. We have seen other positive results from community pressure, none less than what we have seen with the country health plan. I congratulate the deputy leader on the way she led that campaign, following which we have seen what has eventuated to be a backflip in relation to the government's policy on country health.

Returning to the issue of water, it is pleasing that the time line in relation to the consultation and other investigatory issues has been extended for the development of that draft water allocation plan. If you look at all those issues in total, you come back to the basic principles and needs of infrastructure, and we have heard a lot about how poorly this government has acted in developing infrastructure within the state. In relation to transport infrastructure, the member for Morphett has highlighted the fact that the government is looking to buy these clunky 30 or 40 year old trams from a country in Eastern Europe which was under the USSR communist regime; they will be brought over to try to meet the needs of the ever-increasing demand on our public transport system.

I digress to say that on the radio this morning I heard that the Minister for Transport is looking to take out some seats from trains so that we can fit in more passengers. The feedback from the community, which the particular radio station sought, was extreme disapproval of that policy. I think the government still has an enormous amount of work to do in remedying the issue of public transport.

In the few minutes I have left to speak I will continue to focus on issues in my electorate of Kavel. Again, it is the quite relevant topic of development and planning assessment, and all those matters that relate to development application—planning issues and the like. We see the continued residential development within the townships of Mount Barker, Littlehampton and Nairne in my electorate. Quite a large development is being undertaken at the moment on the southern area of Mount Barker, where over 800 new homes are to be built.

Some concern has also been raised about where further expansion of residential areas may go in around Mount Barker. There has been some reporting in the local newspaper, *The Courier,* that wealthy developers have their sights set on some land. You need to know the lie of the land in that local area, but it is east of Bald Hills Road, running up to the base of what they call the Summit, which is the base of Mount Barker itself. It is my view that that land is sacrosanct in terms of preserving it for agricultural production.

The very aspect that people like, that people look to enjoy in moving to the Adelaide Hills, is the open space that the Hills offer. If the government and local government continue to allow increasing expansion of town boundaries, obviously houses will occupy these areas of agricultural operation. What will eventually happen if this development is allowed to proceed in an unabated manner is that the very thing that attracts people to the Adelaide Hills, which is the open space, will be destroyed. The very thing for which people come to live in the Hills and enjoy will no longer be there, obviously, if this continued residential development is allowed to occur.

It is my personal belief that the land east of Bald Hills Road should be maintained for agricultural activity. There are vineyards there, and there is also the state's (if not the nation's) largest brussels sprout farm. At certain times of the year I understand that they export in excess of 30 tonnes of brussels sprouts into the UK market per month. The growers provide shipments not only here in the national market but also in the international market. Where will those people go? They will sell their land—they will obviously get a packet for it from the developers—and they will pack up and just retire. But where does that put the state's capacity for producing food? I suggest that it certainly would have a negative effect on the state's ability to continue its very strong and proud reputation of being an extremely valuable food producing region in this country.

In the final couple of minutes that I have left, I will touch on a really quite important area of need—I do not let pass these opportunities to raise them here in the house—and that is the critical need for a second freeway interchange at Mount Barker. Obviously, with the current development being undertaken within that tri-town district of Mount Barker, Littlehampton and Nairne, there is a real need for a second interchange to be built on the freeway.

The Liberal Party has committed to building that second freeway interchange on assuming government. That is a stark policy difference. The government is prevaricating about it; it is saying, 'No, we're not going to do it yet. Maybe in the future, down the track, 10 years, 15 years, on the

never-never,' like all the other projects they have in place on the never-never, but this party has made the commitment that it will be built.

Time expired.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (11:32): First of all, I congratulate the Governor on his opening of parliament and his address to a joint sitting. I understand that it was the first address of His Excellency Rear Admiral Kevin Scarce, Governor of South Australia, to a joint sitting of a parliament. I think he conducted himself well. He gave us a bold plan to follow and, of course, has set the agenda for the parliament in its remaining 18 months before the March 2010 election. In that election, the people of South Australia will decide whom they wish to govern this great state.

The Governor set out bold initiatives, bold plans to waterproof our great city and to make sure that our human critical needs in water are taken care of. When I say human critical needs, I am talking about drinking water, something we often forget. We use these terms like 'human critical need' and wonder, 'What does that really mean?' It means that, when South Australians turn on a tap, they get fresh drinking water—something we take for granted in the 21st century; something we all think is an inalienable right—and, of course, the government is planning for that. We are fast-tracking the building of the desalination plant. We are extending the capacity of our reservoirs. We are investing in our state's future.

In another bold move, the government is going to electrify rail in South Australia, something which has been long overdue and which the previous government talked about but never did. This government is acting. One of the boldest initiatives, I think, is the government's decisive action in taking away planning approval from the Adelaide City Council for all developments over $10 million. This is bold, and this means that this state is on the move again. On the move!

Mr Venning interjecting:

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: I never heard of the former member for Enfield being described to me as a mate of mine. I do not think he would say that. In fact, I think that, if the member for Schubert said that outside this chamber, he would be sued for defamation by the former member for Enfield, current councillor Ralph Desmond Clarke. This bold initiative will stop developments in the city being politicised. The people of South Australia are sick and tired of seeing decisions politicised. When we need development in this state, we need to act. We are not the east coast of Australia: we are the southern states. In the southern states, we need to encourage development, and this government has acted.

Of course, the other great thing is that South Australia is on track to take part in the largest growth in the minerals boom and exploration that this state has ever seen. I think that generations from now people will look back at this time and say that this was the time when South Australia truly took its place in the country as the mining capital of Australia.

In fact, just recently, the Hon. Paul Holloway MLC, Minister for Mineral Resources Development, Leader of the Government in the upper house, was inducted into the Mining Hall of Fame. That is a great honour to be given to a member of parliament or, indeed, anyone. This country used to ride on the sheep's back but now, of course, it has become a great exporter of minerals to feed the world's thirst for these commodities.

I have noticed that members opposite have a newfound bounce in their walk. There is a certain swagger around the corridors. There is a certain swagger among them as they are walking around, measuring the drapes in the Premier's office, getting out colour charts and talking about what colour they would paint the offices. The member for Waite has been talking about putting a new set of curtains in the Premier's office, changing them to a dark Liberal blue.

The arrogance of members opposite has stunned me, as they swagger down the corridors and talk about what they are going to do; which public servants are in their sights and who they will sack. I understand they have a hit list of public servants—CEOs—they are going to fire. I understand they have a hit list of schools they are going to close and police stations they will move.

I also understand that the opposition is already planning to punish those who have spoken out against them in the last eight years. We are going to return to the bad old ugly days, when the then minister of transport, Diana Laidlaw, prioritised infrastructure by electorate rather than by need. We are going to return to the bad old days when the then government planned all their spending on where they needed to win votes rather than basing it on need.

I see opposite that the ones yelling the most are the beneficiaries of the latest Liberal Party reshuffle. I congratulate the member for Hammond. I notice he has a new shirt on because the other one was covered in blood yesterday. The member's blood was all over him, covering him from head to toe. He walked in covered in blood and with a huge smile on his face. What is the crime of the member for Finniss? He voted to oust the former leader of the opposition and voted for the new leader. I am not sure how the member for Hammond voted but—

Mr Pederick: It was in the paper; I voted for the new leader.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: He voted for the new leader—there you go! So it was a contest of two loyalists and he sacked the one who was loyal to Vickie and kept the one who was loyal to him. I have noticed also that there was a lot of speculation about Labor's reshuffle—about how it was a missed opportunity and how the Leader of the Opposition was crying about discontent in Labor ranks about no promotions. There is no discontent on this side about those things. However, I noticed yesterday, with his reshuffle, that there was only one change: he sacked a loyalist and appointed a new loyalist—that is it! And they have the gall to attack us.

The member for Schubert, the Opposition Whip, is a loyal soldier and one who has never been more proud. He is a proud servant of the Liberal Party; so much so that he has dipped into his own pocket to help the Liberal Party in times of need. I know he would be embarrassed to hear me to say so, but it is all on the up and up; he has declared it all. I am not accusing him of any malpractice. He is someone who has been there for them in their time of need.

He has run successful businesses—businesses that have not gone bankrupt. He has always been there and looked after his family and looked after the Liberal Party. In fact, his family have been proud servants of the Liberal Party, but what reward does he get? He is a proud advocate of the Barossa. There has never been a prouder advocate of Australia's premier wine region. The member for Schubert often brings in interstate and international visitors. The first thing he does is put on a display of what South Australia has to offer. At whose expense? His own.

He is a great advocate for his community and a great advocate for the Liberal Party—but what reward does he get? He gets rumours about deselection, he gets rumours about his retirement. They know they cannot beat him in his electorate; they have to get him to do it voluntarily. Thankfully the member for Schubert has a very strong ally in his lovely wife, a woman who would make Janette Howard look like a shrinking violet. I am glad and proud that the member for Schubert will be here in the next parliament. I hope he gets the rare fortune of being able to choose the timing of his own exit, rather than what happens to most of us and rather than what the member for Finniss had done to him by the member for Hammond yesterday.

In my old football days my mother would always complain that she could not get the blood out of my football guernsey because it soaked in too much, and I understand that to get blood out of a shirt what the member for Hammond should do is just throw that shirt away. Get a new one. The member for Finniss is not hurting though, because he knows that treachery and treason never do prosper. He knows that, and he knows that his time will come again.

I am glad to see that the old divisions in the Liberal Party have not washed away completely, that the old rifts are still there—the wets and the dries. It is still there festering away. When these polls come out that they have all jumped on—when the new swaggers walk in, measuring drapes in the Premier's office and behaving arrogantly about what they are going to do, who they are going to sack, and what funding they are going to cut—you will notice ambitious backbenchers who are not yet in the shadow ministry realising that they had better get there pretty quickly, they had better get there pretty fast, because, if they are not there at the election and the Liberal Party manages to pull off a win, they will miss out completely. So, I think we will see a lot of infighting to come.

I heard the member for Kavel waxing lyrical about the Liberal Party's great win in Mayo and what a condemnation of Labor that was. I would like to inform the house that Labor has never won that seat; it has never held that seat. It has been a safe Liberal Party seat; so safe, that it was the seat of Australia's longest-serving foreign minister, a conservative, and it has been the seat of a former federal leader of the opposition. Traditionally these seats are not occupied by opposition parties.

The Liberal Party had a preselection process that was so dodgy, so unfair and biased, that one of the candidates who participated in the process had to resign his long-standing membership of the Liberal Party and contest that election as a Family First candidate—and I am talking about Bob Day. Bob Day ran as a Liberal candidate in the seat of Makin at the last federal election, where

he was defeated by Labor's very good candidate, Tony Zappia, the then mayor of the City of Salisbury. By any evaluation Bob Day has been a loyal member of the Liberal Party, but he said—openly and publicly—that the system was absolutely rorted. This is a man who has funded Liberal campaigns in the past, and funded them with his own money; not with public funding, not with going to dinners, but by writing big cheques to the Liberal Party. He quit that party in disgust.

I think the Liberal Party's result in Mayo is an indictment of how it is performing in the Adelaide Hills. The Liberal Party was outpolled at a number of booths by the Australian Greens—a party that it thinks is a minority party, a marginal party, a party that should not be taken seriously. Yet the Greens outpolled the Liberal Party amongst its core voters.

During the federal by-election campaign, you basically had to put a photo of Jamie Briggs on a milk carton to find him. The guy went missing; you never saw him anywhere; reporting to you live from a bunker somewhere in Mayo; not out there in the public at all. When Jamie Briggs was humiliated on election night by just scraping over the line and just winning, they claimed it a victory and attacked us for not running in a seat we have never held.

The Liberal Party in South Australia has serious problems; serious structural problems. It has an ex-leader on its front bench and its current leader at war with each other. The Liberal Party has the Hon. Rob Lucas sitting on the back bench in the upper house. No-one has told him the war is over; no-one has told him to stop fighting. He is running a rearguard action. He is not giving up; he is not retiring. He is running a guerrilla war from the back bench, and anyone who thinks he is not should speak to Martin Hamilton-Smith, because I have it on good advice that Martin Hamilton-Smith rings people and says, 'I can't control the Hon. Rob Lucas; he is a maverick. I can't control him; he doesn't listen to me.' You cannot run a government when you are so divided.

Given that Liberal Party members are measuring the drapes in the Premier's office and behaving arrogantly, as if they have already won the election, I just remind them that there is one thing South Australians demand from their governments, and that is good economic management. You know the old saying, 'It's the economy, stupid.' Never has anything truer been said about politics today. This election will come down to one issue: who is more capable of managing the state's finances. This election will be about that issue, and the issue of finances turns into how we spend that on infrastructure to cope with the mining boom and, secondly, how we deliver services to at an ageing community and encourage investment and growth. Those are the core issues.

What will stand out in stark contrast at the next election are three opposing ideas. First, you must run surplus budgets; you cannot and must not fall into deficit spending. The current Leader of the Opposition is raking up election promise after election promise that, quite frankly, will bankrupt the state. He has a transport plan which he has costed but has not given us a policy on, and then he tells us that he will give us the policy details after he wins the election. So, he has come up with a figure of how much it is going to spend—he will not tell us what he is going to spend it on—and then says he will give us those costings if he is elected premier. How can you trust a man with that sort of costing?

Secondly, South Australians know that services are important, especially in terms of one's health. We have a contrast like never before in any other election: a brand-new $1.5 billion stadium offered by the Liberal Party or a brand-new $1.7 billion hospital offered by the government. The opposition says that, if it wins the election, it will scrap immediately the building of the new hospital and then rebuild the Royal Adelaide Hospital, reducing its capacity by 30 per cent, extending the rebuild time by about six or seven years, reducing our capacity to deal with people who are ill. That is the stark choice: a stadium versus a hospital.

I have noticed a change in the Leader of the Opposition recently. He has gone missing. Angry Marty is gone; red-faced Marty is gone; the Martin Hamilton-Smith who was banging the door with his fists at the train station—that guy has disappeared. All of a sudden, Martin Hamilton-Smith is nowhere to be seen. He does not do the attacks any more, because he does not have the temperament to be premier of South Australia. You cannot be premier with a temper like that. Temperament and the way in which you handle tough decisions are important. You cannot go around putting people in a headlock and expect to govern for all South Australians. The make-up of the person is important when they become premier of South Australia—an even, decisive and well reasoned hand, not temper, not red-faced, not impulsive, and not making decisions on the run. You have to add up your costings and make sure you can afford them, not promise everything to everyone and deliver nothing to anyone.

Being in government is hard work. Saying no is hard. Saying yes is easy, I point out to the member for Schubert. Saying yes is easy. I love to say yes to people, but unfortunately I cannot say yes all the time. Saying no is tough. Leadership is tough. The current opposition has no capacity to say no to its interest groups, no capacity to say no to doctors and teachers, no capacity to say no to police officers, and no capacity to say no to public servants. It will just spend and spend and spend and bankrupt this state, and it will say and do anything to win an election.

What does it mean when you have an opposition that is prepared to say and do anything in order to win—prepared to tear down institutions and, as we saw yesterday, bring into question Australian banks and their liquidity and financial rigours? What does it tell you when we are facing the largest financial crisis the world has seen since 1929? What does that tell you about the ability and temperament of the Leader of the Opposition to govern this great state? It tells you that he is not up to the job. But his swagger is back.

Mr Rau interjecting:

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: Yes, or even worse—

Mr Rau: Warren Harding.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: Warren Harding. You cannot have a leader of the opposition who is prepared to tear down and scaremonger and frighten the horses to win an election. Leading and winning is about fighting for ideas that are bigger than yourself, not about tearing down straw men. What the Leader of the Opposition does is build up a straw man. Yesterday in question time he brought into question HomeStart and the government's ability to fund young home owners who are finding it harder and harder to buy a house because of the 10 interest rate rises that the opposition gave us. At the same time, the leader questioned us about housing affordability. So, he builds up this straw man and then he tries to tear it down.

Then the opposition brought up another straw man: infrastructure. They said, 'We have to bid for the Commonwealth Games.' They have no intention of bidding for it. They came out after the Olympics—in the warm glow with Australia doing so well at the Olympics, when we saw our brave athletes perform so well for their country—and they called for a Commonwealth Games bid, without thinking about how much it would cost or where we would build the infrastructure.

The Liberal Party of Victoria published a report that it commissioned on what it cost to put on the Commonwealth Games in that state, and it made a loss—a net loss. If there is one state in this country that has the infrastructure to put on massive sporting events, it is Victoria, and it still made a loss in the billions. So, the Liberal Party of Victoria said the Commonwealth Games was not worth the money, but the Liberal Party here says, yes, it is worth it. It builds up expectations and then it walks away from it. It is the same with the stadium—

Mr Rau: Build it and they will come.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: That is its motto: build it and they will come. Build a stadium, spend $1.5 billion of taxpayers' money instead of investing that money in services and infrastructure to help us go about our day-to-day business to make the economy work. It wants a stadium. Where are the costings? It will release them later. Where is the financial plan? It will release it later. The truth is that there is no financial plan and there are no costings; it has plucked them out of thin air. That is how this opposition works. It plucks things out of thin air and then runs away from them.

At the next election South Australians will be faced with a stark choice: good financial management/bad financial management—a very simple question. At a time when people are worried about inflation and worried about their mortgage repayments, we have a Leader of the Opposition who is spending like a drunken sailor. Members opposite who know better, who run businesses, who know that you cannot spend more than you earn and cannot borrow money to pay wages, who know that the fundamentals of a state budget are the same as the budgets we run in our households, will understand what I am saying. The reason why members opposite do not rein in the colonel is that they are prepared to do and say anything to win the next election, including saying things that simply are not true.

The opposition is without any ability on its frontbench to govern this state. As I said earlier, it is all about temperament and character. The Leader of the Opposition lacks temperament. We all know that he has a temper and how aggressive he gets. We all know that he plays the man instead of the ball and that he will attack—he will not attack the idea; he will attack the messenger. We all know that he cannot come up with alternatives on his own. The desalination plant was not his idea: it was the former leader of the opposition's. The stadium was not his idea: it was *The Advertiser*'s.

This is a person who is not fit to govern this great state, and his temperament will come out. When things get tough and he is in a tight spot we will see the real Leader of the Opposition emerge: the red-faced, Marty; the angry Marty; the Marty who makes impulsive decisions; the Marty who cannot be controlled; the Marty who will not take advice or listen to his backbench—

Mr Rau: The Marty who barks like a dog.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: The Marty who barks like a dog in the chamber during question time. The most important thing about this place, without any doubt, is question time. We have seen the Leader of the Opposition red-faced, screaming and barking like a dog. I have to say that, in my 10 years in this place (which I like saying now—in my decade in this parliament), I have never seen such behaviour.

An honourable member: It's like *Funniest Home Videos*.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: It's worse than *Funniest Home Videos*. Temperament is important—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: And language is important, too; I accept that—but it is temperament and behaving in a manner that befits the role to which one aspires. The role of premier of South Australia, whoever is in that position, is the most important one in this state's political system. It is a position that we all look up to. We look to the premier for leadership, cool decisiveness and a steady hand; not red-faced anger, bouts of temper that would scare anyone or bullying. It is not good enough. The premier needs to be better than this, and the Leader of the Opposition is lacking.

Members opposite know exactly what I am talking about but they dare not speak up, because in the Liberal Party they could be sacked at a minute's notice without caucus having a word to say about it. They know how it works. If members do not believe me, they should ask Michael Pengilly. Why was he really sacked: what was the real reason? Was he raising questions about economic mismanagement within the Liberal Party? Was he raising questions about how much money they had raised? Was he raising questions about their election promise and spending—how much they have spent?

The Hon. J.M. Rankine: Leadership aspirations.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: Or is it leadership aspirations? Who knows what it is? But I can tell you, red-faced Marty came out and said, 'Enough of that.'

An honourable member: 'He's too good; I don't want him near me.'

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: 'He's too good; I don't want him near me. I want to be surrounded by clones, people who say yes; the bullies—bullies like me. I don't want any free thinkers.' Just ask the member for Schubert about free thinkers and how far they get in the Liberal Party. As I said earlier, treason and treachery do not prosper, and members opposite will get to know that very well very soon.

In closing, I repeat that temperament is the key to leadership. John Howard, one of the great post war leaders—I think the most significant conservative leader since Menzies—showed a very cool temperament in a crisis. Our current Prime Minister, Kevin Rudd, never loses his temper. People like Mark Latham, Malcolm Turnbull and Martin Hamilton-Smith, who fly off the handle and do not have the temperament for the job, come unstuck. Every day the current Leader of the Opposition holds that position he reminds me more and more of Mark Latham. I know that members opposite—

Mr Pisoni interjecting:

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: I cannot vote for Mark Latham: I am in the state parliament, you fool. When leaders tell you to put your seat belts on because it will be a wild ride, you know trouble is coming. Members of the Liberal Party have racing harnesses on because they are so concerned about the roller-coaster ride on which their current leader has them. The anger, the outbursts, the temper: South Australians will come to know the Leader of the Opposition as the angry Marty. They will come to know—

Mr Venning interjecting:

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: The member for Schubert mentions his SAS military background. I do not care about his background. He served this country well—congratulations, no-one disparages that—but I am saying to you that, leading a platoon of men and leading a state is very different. You cannot put people in headlocks, you cannot scream at them, you cannot get red-faced and you cannot lose your temper in negotiations. You cannot put the green stuff on the face, the khaki on, walk into COAG and put them in headlocks with a knife to their throats. South Australians deserve leadership, not bad temper. I know that people might say that this is a long bow, but you do not want Rambo leading the state.

Mr Venning: What have we got?

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: Cold, cool, reasoned leadership, humble leadership, listening leadership, not arrogant oppositions.

Time expired.

Mr PISONI (Unley) (12:02): I, too, would like to make a contribution to the Address in Reply and the Governor's speech, the opening of the parliament. I would also like to remark on how pleased I am to be serving under Governor Kevin Scarce. I have met him and his wife on numerous occasions at functions around Adelaide. I must say that, as an elected member of parliament, it makes me feel very proud that a man of his calibre has accepted the job. The military background that he has, the discipline he has learnt, the understanding of his leadership role and his compassion for people is something that shines every time you hear him speak. I should also mention how proud I am for Hieu Van Le to be the Lieutenant-Governor of South Australia. Again he and his wife Lan do an excellent job representing the Governor and this state.

We heard the Governor read a speech, which, obviously, was prepared by the Premier's office. The Governor always has to act on the government's advice. We heard nothing new in that speech—more of the same. The Treasurer may consider that the Commonwealth Games is a B-grade event, but judged on the results of this government over the past seven years, one must see that the Treasurer and the Premier's side is very much a B-grade team from both the match fit and getting drubbed by interstate competition.

Let me expand on that. Under the Rann Labor government, South Australia is falling behind in its share of the national economy. The ABS figures show that employment growth lags, business investment is going backwards instead of forwards, whereas in every other state and territory it is moving forward. We are falling behind by a whopping 4.5 per cent in the June 2007 to June 2008 quarters, and more people, particularly our youth, leave the state than are attracted to South Australia.

They are disturbing figures. Why would they not leave? We have the highest youth unemployment in the country. We know that $19 million a year is spent on spin doctors; that is, over 250 spin doctors directing public servants on how to address their spin. We have media consultants working for the public sector and we have media consultants on the public payroll (paid for by taxpayers) working for ministers simply to direct the spin so that, when they receive a media inquiry or when they do some maintenance on the trains, for example, we see a big media event about an expenditure of $700,000 on some new windows.

Any other state government—or organisation, for that matter—would see it as normal maintenance. And isn't that a story in itself, that money spent on maintenance under this government is to become a media event! It happens so rarely that it is worthy of a drum roll and a press release.

Of course, the spin doctors have removed from the Strategic Plan the youth unemployment target, which says 'equal or better Australia's average within five years'. That has disappeared; it is not there any more. It was there in 2004 but it is not there now. They have obviously given up on that. Also, they have rewritten the migration target, pushing out predicted net inflows until after the next election. So we do not know what that is and we cannot judge them for that at the next election because it will not appear until after then.

State Labor does not need to burn books to correct or change history. They reprint them, and the story line is devised by their $19 million worth of spin doctors. I think it was Churchill who said, 'History will be kind to me because I will write it', and we are seeing that with the Rann Labor government. The Rann Labor government spent $19 million writing the daily history—the 24-hour *Hollowmen* media cycle of the Labor government.

In partnership, of course, with the Rudd federal government (which Premier Rann worked so hard to elect), Labor has delivered South Australia a seven-year high in industrial unrest and a place at the top of Australia's strike league table. That is 9,800 working days lost in South Australia in the three months to June, yet many South Australians were deceived into voting for Kevin07 and they realised they made a mistake in Kevin08. Along with Fuel Watch and Grocery Watch, apparently, soon we will be seeing principal watch, and there is no doubt that Kevin, Wayne, Julia and the new Labor team like to watch. The team Premier Rann spruiked about during the federal election campaign are watching a lot of things, but their intense observation is producing little in the way of positive results for Australia's working families.

We have seen unemployment rise, and pensioners have to wait for yet another review. It is an extraordinary situation in Canberra at the moment where the opposition in November last year was promising to do what the existing government was doing and, when they were elected, they did not want to make any decisions, so they had a summit. Then they came up with a whole lot of so-called budget savings which are, in fact, increases in the tax on luxury cars, alcopops and Medicare levies. None of this was mentioned before the election, of course. Then they accuse the opposition and the minor parties of getting in the way of democracy.

These are the very same people who, when John Howard won the 1998 election on the GST issue, said that the government did not have a mandate for the GST so they tried to block it in the Senate. There was no mandate for these tax measures, yet, for some reason, Mr Swan and his team in Canberra claim that the opposition is interfering in the democratic process. There was certainly no mandate. However, I digress.

So the Rann government has shown itself to be totally inept in negotiating with the public sector over work agreements. The Premier should be considering setting up a strike watch, because I think that is what we need in South Australia. When parents want to know whether they can send their kids to school that day, they can go to the website and see whether or not the schools are open. Or, if they want to know whether the after-school sport is continuing that week, they can go to the website and click on 'strike' or 'no strike' and they will be able to find out which schools are operating on that day. I recommend that course; as a matter of fact, I might bring it as a suggestion into the parliament. Perhaps we can hook it onto the end of the government's supermarket watch, and that will at least make it easier for parents to decide how to manage their child care and work situation. I would certainly recommend a strike watch in South Australia.

The reason for the federal government's supermarket watch or price watch is that we have seen an increase in supermarket prices over the past 12 months or so. Well, in South Australia we have seen an enormous increase in industrial strikes and industrial action, so I think we need a strike watch.

No doubt, the government will choose to watch rather than act as firefighters, tram drivers and ambulance drivers line up to join disgruntled teachers in what Peter Vaughan from Business SA has referred to as 'a conga line of public sector workers preparing new claims'. What is extraordinary about the current situation is that the government is offering teachers an increase of 9.75 per cent—less than inflation. I am not sure what skills one needs for tram driving, but I know that it is not a three-year or four-year education at university. The government offered them 12.5 per cent, but they rejected that and said, 'That's not enough, we want more than 12.5 per cent,' so the government has agreed to more.

But teachers are leaving, and some 40 per cent of those who are coming into the system with a TER score of only 65 per cent are leaving within 10 years. We have a real problem in our education system which the government is not addressing. Recently, a close ally of the Rann government, SA Unions secretary Janet Giles, said that this government's approach to public sector negotiations is ineffective and damaging to our industrial relations record. Well, we are breaking new records. A new record for the Rann government is a winter of discontent with industrial disputes.

In the teachers' dispute, the Rann government's appalling industrial management and its failure to listen—it took close to seven months before a minister would meet them—has caused disruption to families and children's education, not to mention the economy. Many parents had to stay home during those industrial strikes when schools were not opened. They had to stay home. It is hard to arrange child care at late notice. In some instances it is hard to get into child care in the first instance, but casual use of child care is difficult because people book in for months, sometimes years, in advance.

We have seen a total disinterest from the out-of-touch education minister who seems to hope that the whole disagreeable business will just go away—like the minister does. I think she has travelled overseas on 16 occasions since 2006. It was reported on the ABC this morning that she is doing so well with her overseas trips that she did not use her personal travel allowance. It is interesting how that was mentioned.

Such is this state government's contempt for teachers that, instead of negotiating a reasonable pay rise, under the cover of the Olympic Games it increased teacher registration fees by 50 per cent, pulling in another $3.2 million a year out of the pockets of teachers. When this government came to power, a teacher's registration fee was $69. It is now $270. In addition, for new teachers the $20 fee for a police clearance has increased to $28. The education budget is out of control and the government is grabbing any possible pocket that might be open in which to stick its fingers to pull out a couple of coins in order to try to top up the budget and deliver its promise to Kevin Foley to find cuts in the portfolio.

Under premier Rann, education in this state has been neglected and South Australian students, parents and teachers are paying the price. Education spending is static. In 2002 it accounted for 25.2 per cent of the budget and in 2009 it will be around 25 per cent of the budget. Estimates reveal that spending cuts of more than $25 million are being demanded under the new efficiencies and, on top of that, $153 million in cuts over five years were ordered in the 2006-07 budget.

Parents are voting with their feet and taking their children out of the public system. In 2002, we saw a loss of nearly 8,000 students from state schools, while private schools have increased their enrolments by nearly 9,000. Do not tell Al Gore or David Suzuki or Robert Kennedy—and yes, that is right, Mike Rann; he gets all the big names—but extending the Solar Schools Program to at least 250 schools in 10 years has also fallen off the Strategic Plan. The Premier might need to get back some of the $140,000 that he paid to Mr Kennedy for one speaking engagement here in Adelaide, of course, so he could attach his brand to the Kennedy legacy. We all know that Mike Rann likes the big names; he knows all the big names and he drops them whenever he can, so he paid $140,000 for Mr Kennedy to give a speech here in Adelaide to pump up his so-called green credentials. The money certainly could have been better spent in our state schools.

Many of the principals and governing councils that I speak with are finding that education funding does not work at all for their school community. Approval for their school facility upgrades remains in a permanent holding pattern, while the state government channels any money left from the overly bureaucratic system to our super schools; however, super schools' PPPs are certainly working well for Labor fundraising. Perhaps Premier Rann and Treasurer Foley could donate back to struggling schools some of the $2,000 to $3,000 per head lunches that they are conducting, and that is being collected out of hopeful business people who are hoping to get a piece of this government action. Labor's priority is 500 more education department fat cats at a cost of $50 million; money that could be spent on teachers and better classrooms.

In 2002, DECS employed 123 people earning over $100,000 per annum. Teachers do not earn that, of course—unless you are the principal of a fairly large school—but then in 2007, the Auditor-General's Report told us that there are 605 people out of the classroom—these are people who are not in the classroom—earning over $100,000 a year. That is where the money for essential infrastructure and teachers is going in South Australia: more fat cats, more bureaucrats, and higher wages for those who do not work in our classrooms. Many of the teachers whom I visit are doing wonderful things with their contracting budgets. Talented, enthusiastic and resourceful principals and school communities are making a little go a very long way. Last week a principal showed me the appalling state of furniture for students in his school, yet out of his school's $4 million budget, only $3,700 was allowed for furniture replacement.

Creative accounting and school fundraising can only go so far in filling the funding gaps left by the state Labor government. Some school governing councils are effectively seeking corporate sponsorship to pay for infrastructure. All schools are missing the previous federal Liberal government's Investing in our Schools grants. Investing in our Schools grants—used by schools to fund projects of their choosing under the previous Howard government—had made up for the Rann government's under-funding.

Of course, primary schools were included, which had been completely removed from any federal funding under the government's so-called digital revolution (its computer program). We have seen that applying only for year 9 to 12 students, but under the Investing in our Schools program, not only was every school able to apply—government or independent school—but they

could actually choose how they needed to spend that money, how they wanted to spend that money and how they could spend that money to the best effect for their school communities. So, school communities are frustrated with this state government and the expanding number of departmental fat cats who put more obstacles than incentives in their way.

Under this government an average of 9 per cent of our state school students are absent every day. That is 15,000 students who do not go to school. Despite the government's promises to combat this problem, the numbers have not been reduced. While section 7(6) of the Education Act makes clear the responsibility of parents in regard to school attendance and allows for a fine of up to $200, there is no record of any recent prosecutions. Again, we see a situation where the government is making rules, but it is not abiding by its own rules; it is not using those rules for the benefit of children. Any parent would understand how important it is that their child goes to school. Unfortunately, particularly in some of the safe Labor seats in the northern suburbs, some parents do not understand how important it is. What is the government's answer? They have a mechanism in place to deal with it, but they choose to ignore it.

When I attended the northern summit back in early September, as I was leaving the summit in the middle of the day in the car park there were half a dozen school-aged children who should have been at school. It was quite a sight for me to see these kids, who should have been at school, roaming the car park of the Elizabeth shopping centre, and I wonder how well the government is dealing with truancy, which has a long-term community cost for the state, not to mention the failure to provide opportunity for those children.

With a record like this, it is no wonder Prime Minister Rudd has come out now and endorsed the plans put forward first by Brendan Nelson in 2004 to give school principals more autonomy, to see how our schools are performing against each other and a whole lot of other reforms that would hold schools or the department accountable. Jane Lomax-Smith, as minister at the time, said that those reforms would not work and that it was political interference, but now we hear the acting minister, Jay Weatherill, agrees with Kevin Rudd and says they are good actions. Obviously he agrees that under Jane Lomax-Smith education in South Australia is a mess and needs federal intervention.

One has to wonder how serious are the federal government and the state government in making these reforms. We have seen no changes to the enterprise bargaining agreement being discussed at the moment, because these plans Kevin Rudd wants to put in place will come into effect in January or February next year, but the EBA goes for three years and much of what Kevin Rudd was saying are reforms needed at the industrial level. How will that work? We have not heard and do not know. I am sure the teachers union would have a lot to say about teachers and principals being sacked for under-performance. We agree with it, but it is a huge industrial challenge, and the Labor Party is a union-based party and will not have any problem implementing that, particularly as the orders have come from Kevin Rudd.

Recent reports have highlighted that one reason for truancy is that students are avoiding going to school because of the fear of bullying. School violence and bullying have become more prevalent in our schools, as have bashings, stabbings and sexual assaults. The minister's answer is that we live in a more violent society but, hang on, Mike Rann is saying that South Australia is a safer place to live under his guidance. However, Jane Lomax-Smith is saying we live in a more violent society and that there is more violent crime. She is right: there is more violent crime in South Australia under Mike Rann—the statistics do not lie.

FOI requests have found that, despite assurances to the contrary via the minister, no written or email record of any communication between the minister's office, the department and SAPOL existed in relation to recent high profile incidents of violence in our schools. Not only students but also teachers are now the victims of school violence, with parents becoming increasingly concerned.

Clearly the policies of the Rann Labor government are not working to prevent bullying and violent behaviour, and the lack of interdepartmental cooperation on mandatory reporting is allowing victims of neglect, assault and even rape to fall through the cracks. There has been publicity about providing teachers who are on yard duty with a mobile phone, a tool, of course, which none of them would have. I would have thought that just about anybody who is a wage and salary earner in South Australia would have a mobile phone. What does it say about the morale in the Department of Education and Children's Services if the only way a teacher can advise the police or make a phone call to report violence in schools is if they use a DECS phone? They will not use their own phone.

They are so annoyed and disappointed with the system that they will not spend 50¢ of their own money making a call to report violence that would save a child from injury. I find it very strange. It is almost a knee-jerk reaction for the minister to suggest that giving teachers mobile phones would give them the ability to report violence in schools. It is an outrageous claim. Of course, the digital revolution is ill-conceived and under-funded; and it has revealed the true extent of the state government's disregard for IT, taking into account the fact that the now Prime Minister waved laptops around at election time and promised to put one in the hands of every high school student—the tool of the future.

Just remember that, before the election, that promise was quite vague. As a matter of fact, a number of kids with whom my daughter goes to high school said they wanted their parents to vote for Kevin Rudd so that they could have a computer for home. I think that was a deliberate attempt by Kevin Rudd to mislead, and he has misled because now, when he is forced to deliver, we are seeing that it is not a computer for every school child—it relates only to students in years 9 and 12 and, hang on, it is every second student. Now students must share a computer. It is not a computer for every child; it is a computer for every second child.

Recently, as I was admiring the interactive white boards at a state high school, I inquired of the principal how they had been funded. 'By increased fees,' he said. Apparently increased fees, fundraising and federally-sourced funds are now the only avenue for IT improvements in our state's schools. Despite the stated aim of reducing the ratio of students to computers in recipient schools, the first round has confirmed that these computers are being used to replace old ones, not reduce the ratio.

We were told that we were getting more computers, but, instead, the digital revolution of the federal government is saving the state government money. The state government now does not have to replace its existing computers because it is using this money to replace existing computers—computers that should have been replaced a couple of years ago. Of course, Jane Lomax-Smith and Mike Rann (the education Premier) are walking away from their responsibility with respect to IT in our schools. It is nearly a year after the federal election and there is still no agreement about how additional costs for electricity, rewiring, software, upgrades and teacher training will be met.

What was interesting is that when this was discovered in June by the then Iemma government in New South Wales—the Labor government over there—that it would need nearly half a billion dollars to implement the computer program in their schools, minister Jane Lomax-Smith was asked whether she had a view about what it would cost in South Australia after what had happened in New South Wales, and she said, 'I do not know what happens in New South Wales. I was watching *Dr Who*.' Well, that is nice, isn't it? Of course, it is no wonder that the minister was not interested and did not know what was going on.

She told me several times in estimates that they were replacement computers. I was also told that we have sufficient licences in our schools, but now we find that DECS is withholding $250 per computer for licensing; and, on top of that, we are seeing a $40 transaction fee. So, the government is keeping a commission from the federal government of 4 per cent. There is no transaction fee for any other purchase a school makes. No transaction fee is charged by DECS to the school. This wad of federal government money has come in and the minister has seen a way of adjusting her budget and being able to deliver some savings to Kevin Foley. She said, 'Look, let's keep 4 per cent of that. Let's keep that and we'll call it a transaction fee.'

Instead of $1,000 per every second student, now we are getting $960 because the government wants its cut. I was misled at estimates, or the minister and DECS do not have any idea what is going on, or the minister and DECS are well-meaning but very inefficient, or it is a combination of all three. My suspicion is that the state government sees the digital revolution as an opportunity to make a quick buck.

The minister is using the digital revolution funds to underwrite the Rann government's investment in state schools and satisfy Treasurer Foley's demands for efficiency savings. The level of cynicism and confusion surrounding Rudd's digital revolution and its management at a state level is truly astounding, yet there is no interest whatsoever from the minister. In the glowing report card for its first 100 days in office the Rudd government gave itself, there is more spin, self-congratulation, tacky wording and figure fiddling than even that in the Premier's Strategic Plan.

As I have a minute to go, I must also explain to the house that even in my electorate water is the No. 1 issue. When I was doorknocking at the weekend and asking about people's concerns,

there is no doubt that water was the No. 1 issue. I am certainly pleased to be part of a Liberal Party that understands that and is putting forward some very strong arguments and policies for that problem to be dealt with effectively.

Mr HANNA (Mitchell) (12:32): I speak today in a formal response to the address to the members of parliament by His Excellency the Governor Kevin Scarce, a man for whom I have a lot of respect. Today, I will cover a range of issues that have been brought to me by people in my electorate of Mitchell, and I will conclude by outlining some of my key concerns, where I believe major reforms need to take place in South Australia.

First, I will deal with some of the key issues that come up time and again as I go around the streets knocking on doors and talking to people. In relation to health care, I acknowledge that minister John Hill has made a sincere effort to improve the health system, but I have to say that the expected benefits of the Generational Health Review do not seem to have transpired.

I say that because I have been contacted on numerous occasions by people who have been booked in for elective surgery and who have had that surgery cancelled. In some cases, this has happened on two or three occasions in respect of the same surgery. The anxiety and frustration this causes really cannot be described.

When we talk about elective surgery, it is important to consider what that might be. In one case that was brought to me, it was a matter of knee surgery. The person could not walk (certainly not more than a few steps), and they had a very painful condition that required surgery. So, although it was 'elective' in the official terminology, it certainly did not feel elective for the person who had a painful knee and who hobbled around at home trying to make do with painkillers and so on. To wait for months and months for surgery to fix the problem can be extremely frustrating.

Another case involved a tumour that was potentially malignant in terms of the spread of cancer. It was also considered elective, and surgery was postponed on one occasion, leaving the entire family extremely anxious about the outcome. The medical advice was that the problem would not worsen after waiting for a matter of a few weeks or perhaps a couple of months for the surgery to take place. However, of course, one cannot help thinking, when some sort of alien growth is in one's body, that one wants it removed as soon as possible. One cannot help thinking that there is a serious threat to life unless it is removed, yet this comes under the umbrella of 'elective' surgery.

As I have said, I know there have been improvements in the administration of hospitals, and so on, but the reality is that the demand for our health services has increased more rapidly than the hospital services that can be provided. I believe that there is a lot of fat to be cut within the hospital system. I still think that there is probably too much ineffective administration when it comes to our public hospital system. I mean no disrespect to the chiefs who look after these various services—which include Flinders Medical Centre, Noarlunga Health Services and the Repat—but I hear from medical personnel (doctors and nurses) of problems with shifts and with the administration of surgery rooms, which lead to some of these delays.

I turn to the topic of education. In terms of an overview, I think that the single biggest threat to our public education services in South Australia is the determined efforts by Treasury to cut costs in this sector. Admittedly, education, like the health budget, is about a quarter of our state budget, so one can understand Treasury officials wanting to reduce such a significant expenditure within our state economy. However, it is what people want, and it is essential not only to our children today but to our future society and economy.

This is where I think there have been some extremely shortsighted decisions taken by this Labor government in relation to cutting aquatic and music programs, forcing schools to take on WorkCover liabilities and taking the money in terms of interest from school savings accounts. All of these things are clearly driven by Treasury's desire to rein back education expenditure. We have managed to forestall some of these measures through action by teachers and by the community. We have protested and, in some cases, we have won. With some of these successes, though, one wonders how long it will be before the long axe of Treasury comes back to chop again.

I also raise the issue of planning in terms of our teacher workforce. There is no doubt that there is a severe shortage of teachers in specific areas, particularly in relation to maths and science, and in terms of high school teachers generally. It is not obvious that solutions are being planned by government in relation to the current shortage, which will become critical within the next 10 years. I understand that the average age of teachers in South Australia is somewhere in the 50s. In other words, we have a cohort of teachers who will be retiring in the next 10 to 15 years, if

not sooner. It is all very well to have graduates taking their place, but this will mean a very significant transformation of the teaching workforce.

I think that we need to pay our teachers more but, of course, the current pay dispute with teachers is not just about the money: it is about conditions, support and training for teachers, and we need all of these things to improve the delivery of teaching to our children whom, at the end of the day, this is all about.

I understand that there are probably more primary school teachers graduating than there are spaces available. So, again, because the government has not been able to plan effectively for teacher numbers, we do not have it right. We have people qualifying as primary school teachers who—after all the investment involved in training—are moving to other fields; yet, in high schools, there are many cases where there are vacancies crying out for teachers to move into. So, the long-term planning of the teacher workforce needs to be addressed urgently by the government.

On the topic of education I also express my concern for the Future SACE—that is, the curriculum and content planned for high school students which they must complete before graduating or, in the old language, matriculating. I believe the Future SACE waters down what is required of our students academically. Other forms of content such as planning their career path are mandatory in the Future SACE and, while one cannot dispute the value of spending time considering career options, researching university courses, trade options and job possibilities, whether this should come in at the expense of academic pursuits is debatable.

All of this takes place in the context where universities, since the Dawkins reforms of the 1980s, have become institutions, it seems, primarily with the goal of surviving financially so that there is enormous pressure to take on all comers for courses and to lower the points required to get into some of the professions and a variety of courses. The importance of fee-paying students from overseas has become first and foremost, it seems, in the management of universities and this is at the expense of the academic excellence which we have previously enjoyed in our universities. So, I express concern about that. I know that it is only in a very limited way able to be influenced by the state government but, nonetheless, it is a concern for the next generation.

I turn to environmental issues and I want to raise a couple of points here. In my electorate we have Glenthorne Farm, an historic site which was originally the home of Major O'Halloran, one of the first members of the House of Assembly in 1857. He lived there in a manor called Lizard Lodge, remnants of which remain on the site. It has a long history but, to come to the point, the CSIRO disposed of the land as surplus to its requirements some seven or eight years ago, from memory, and the Liberal government of the time under John Olsen agreed to a deed whereby the state government paid the CSIRO (that is, the commonwealth) $7 million and the University of Adelaide took on the land as trustee for pursuing agricultural, horticultural and viticultural purposes and so on.

It was stipulated in the deed that there should be no urban development on the land which everyone in the community understands to mean no housing. The University of Adelaide is now putting forward a proposal which is vast in its vision and encompasses recovery of species right across the Mount Lofty Ranges as well as in the vicinity of Glenthorne itself around O'Halloran Hill. The university, up to this point at least, insists that it must have an income stream based on funds of about $100 million in order for this initiative to proceed. After all, the state government has a poor record in relation to measures to prevent species loss in South Australia, so it is admirable that the university is taking measures to address this problem. It is one of those issues which is not a problem today. It is not that we go out driving through the Hills and notice that there are fewer birds. We do not notice it today or tomorrow but, when our children have the experience of going through the Adelaide Hills taking their children around, they are going to notice fewer species, less birdlife and so on. We need to act now to reverse that trend.

The problem that I have with the university proposal is this insistence on a massive amount of funding for it to proceed at all. Inevitably, the university's proposal involves housing being placed on Glenthorne Farm. Personally, I would prefer no housing there at all. I would prefer it to be kept as open space, and I sincerely believe that most residents in the area feel strongly that they want that land retained as open space. It is a wonderful feeling to drive down South Road over O'Halloran Hill and come across the pine forest on the left and Glenthorne Farm on the right. You do feel that you are leaving the city behind you to some extent. This is the experience of many people in Sheidow Park, Trott Park, Old Reynella and Reynella as they drive home for work. So, I would not want to see Glenthorne Farm covered with houses.

Admittedly, the university proposal is more modest than that. It might involve 200 houses or so, but even that will radically change the character of the place. It is something that I will seek to negotiate to avoid. Of course, the university cannot act on its own in this regard, and the deed itself by which it is bound cannot be changed unless the state government agrees to it. So, I am looking for an assurance from Premier Rann that there will not be housing on Glenthorne while Labor is in government.

In relation to environmental matters, I also refer to a letter which I received from the City of Marion. The substantive letter is one which the City of Marion, or the Marion council, as we call it, sent to the Local Government Association of South Australia. It is about the NRM levy. I think it makes some extremely good points. I am concerned that the NRM board process of restructuring has not led to good outcomes over the last few years. It seems that it has taken years for restructuring to take place and for new plans to be developed, when there have been lost opportunities to do work on the ground to improve environmental outcomes.

In my electorate, I am particularly mindful of the Field River, which is gradually falling into an environmentally damaged 21st century wasteland. Sadly, there is still some pre-colonial vegetation there which is gradually going to rack and ruin. It is something which I believe should be a high priority for my local NRM board. I have made representations to the board about that specifically. I return to the points made by the City of Marion. Its letter of 21 July 2008 states:

> For 2008/2009, the NRM levy has increased in the City of Marion by 16 per cent. Following an extensive community consultation process, the City of Marion determined that the community's tolerance of increases to rates was around 5 per cent. Given the councils collect the levy on behalf of the NRM board, an increase of this magnitude ultimately reflects poorly on councils, who by default are tasked with the already unpopular task of collecting it.

Further on, it states:

> ...the expenditure of the NRM levy now no longer based within the local community.

Meanwhile, a list of changes has been presented in this letter, and they refer to poorer environmental outcomes in my electorate. They include:

- Discontinued funding for the Marion and Mitcham and Environmental Education Project and project officer;
- Vacancy of the Southern Catchment Care Coordinator position since November 2007, leaving no clear direction on the supervision coordination of NRM volunteers within the City of Marion;
- The urban areas of the Central NRM Group have been disbanded providing a more limited opportunity for connection to the NRM communities;
- The investment strategy of the NRM plan indicates that funding for on-ground works previously available in urban areas appears to have been diverted to rural areas through the Sustainable Landscapes Program;
- Contacts in the NRM board for technical environmental support are harder to find and regular communication has reduced in some areas;
- It is acknowledged that the Sustainability Street pilot project in Morphettville area is a new partnership project with the City of Marion.

I draw some conclusions from that. I feel some sympathy for the Marion council and indeed for all councils that are the subject of cost-shifting from state government to local government. This is perhaps a classic example of where the council is left to be, in a sense, the tax collector, and yet they have very little to say about the outcomes that are derived from the use of that money.

There should not be taxation without representation: that is a long established principle. In this context, it means that if Marion council is expected to collect an NRM levy with a 16 per cent increase in the last financial year, there should be significant local input about how the NRM money is spent. I think that there is a lack of transparency about it. I think that there is a lack of effectiveness in how that money is spent, and I think the issue needs to be addressed. Perhaps the City of Marion is right and the state government needs to take responsibility for collecting those levies in a different way to the current measures whereby the levy is effectively attached to the rates.

I move on to speak about a particular hobbyhorse of mine and that is the Oaklands station. This over-budget and underperforming asset should have been, in fact, the subject of a major infrastructure investment. I refer to the intersection of Diagonal Road and Morphett Road where the Noarlunga train line also crosses over. It is called the Oaklands crossing by everyone in the area. The government chose to build a new railway station some short distance away from the previous railway station and closer to the actual road intersection. The traffic flow in that area certainly has not improved; if anything, I believe it has worsened. There is a wait of five minutes or more sitting in

the car stationary during peak hours trying to get through that intersection in whichever direction you are going in the relevant rush hour.

The station that they have actually built is deficient in a number of respects even though many millions have been spent on constructing it. There is still no ticket office. The last time I looked, there were no rubbish bins. The last time I looked, there was no security camera. As far as I could tell, there is still no electronic speaker to announce whether there are delays or otherwise. I question whether the toilets are open all the time. Very significantly, I had a number of complaints from elderly train passengers because there is almost no protection from the wind whatsoever on this platform. Strangely enough, the metal construction which frames the railway station has a series of large holes in it so that the icy wind can whip through during the winter.

I turn to the issue of crime prevention because, of course, everyone is concerned about their personal security and concerned about crime rates. As other members have pointed out, there have been some dubious claims made in relation to crime statistics in recent times. It is true that, in some respects, crime rates have gone down, but for other offences, including offences to the person, crime rates have gone up.

It was notable that the Premier yesterday was crowing about the significant contributions to victims of crime made by this government. I thought some of the claims being made were a bit rich. As one wit pointed out during yesterday's debate, perhaps the greatest contribution of this government to victims of crime is creating more of them. The Premier made an interesting claim yesterday, when he said:

> The government has refused to release notorious killers whose release has been recommended, sometimes repeatedly, by the Parole Board.

In other words, where the Parole Board has satisfied itself, based on evidence, that there is little likelihood of reoffending, there is little likelihood of there being a further victim, the government sees fit to overrule that and keep the person inside. If that is what they want to do, in opposition to the best medical evidence and the evaluation of community representatives who are on the Parole Board, as well as professionals, then why do they not take the same approach to all notorious killers? Why give the Parole Board all the work to do in interviewing prisoners, collecting psychiatric reports, collecting reports from prison officers about the behaviour of prisoners and their rehabilitation, only to rip all that paperwork up and make an arbitrary decision because it is going to get a good headline the next day? If you are going to do that for some murderers who come up for parole, why not simply do it with all of them? Perhaps there would not be such a media effect if it was done on every occasion. Interestingly, the Premier also claimed yesterday:

> This government will continue to increase penalties for cowardly crimes by violent offenders, child sex offenders and serious repeat offenders.

That sounds good, perhaps, but the reality is that we do not really have truth in sentencing in this state. If somebody is put into gaol for a term of less than five years, even if it is a violent crime and the victim has suffered terribly (like Mr Cheesman, in my electorate, who was the victim of a home invasion) the prison authorities can choose to release—in fact, they must release—a person at the end of the nonparole period no matter whether or not the person has improved their behaviour and, in fact, they can release the person much earlier on home detention. What is a sentence of a couple of years can rapidly become a sentence of merely five months. That is an issue that needs to be addressed, because victims are not happy with the lack of transparency and truthfulness in sentencing in this state.

I will conclude now but next year I will certainly go into more detail about some of the areas where I believe we need to undertake major reforms in South Australia. They include water reforms, certainly, both in terms of domestic pricing and our relations with the commonwealth in relation to water upstream. Secondly, I refer to pokies—and, although I am not as colourful as my friend, Nick Xenophon, I still believe much needs to be done to reduce the harm of poker machines in this state. Thirdly, I will be saying a lot more about democratic reforms and about how we need to introduce democracy not only in this parliament, not only in terms of our constitution, but also in relation to every government department and the way they make decisions about the communities they are meant to be working for.

Motion carried.

[Sitting suspended from 12:59 to 14:00]

HOMESTART FINANCE

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Port Adelaide—Deputy Premier, Treasurer, Minister for Industry and Trade, Minister for Federal/State Relations) (14:00): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Yesterday in the house the Leader of the Opposition asked a number of questions regarding HomeStart and its Nunga and Breakthrough Loans products. I now provide the following information, as I indicated to the house that I would.

The Nunga Loans product was launched in April 2004. As at 31 August 2008, 381 loans with a total book value of $60.8 million have been written, with $45 million of loans currently on the books. I am advised that the total losses for the Nunga Loans product since its inception is $296,000. That is to say, of the $60.8 million in loans written since April 2004, only $296,000 has been written off; that is only 10 loans. That equates to 0.49 per cent of the total loans written and, as a percentage of loans currently on the books of HomeStart, is 0.65 per cent. In the last financial year of 2007-08, write-offs were only $33,708.

I am advised that there is a debt consolidation facility available with the Nunga Loans to better enable mortgagees to manage their finances and repayments. This facility can only be used to enable a maximum lend of 105 per cent of the value of the property. Further, initial repayments are higher in order to repay the consolidated debt as quickly as possible and reduce the principal back to reflect the value of the property.

More outstandingly—and this is a very important point in terms of the social policy objective of this particular product—the Nunga Loan that this government introduced has helped lift the Aboriginal home-ownership rate from 30 per cent in 1996 to 36 per cent in 2006 (according to 2006 census data)—the highest increase over the last 10 years of all the states in Australia.

The leader also asked about the value of the Breakthrough Loans issued through HomeStart and the value of the debt write-off provisions in 2008-09 for these loans. Mr Speaker, the Breakthrough Loan product was launched in January 2007. I am advised that these loans aim to get more people into home ownership by allowing an applicant to share the equity of a house with HomeStart and only borrow funds for their equity share in the property. I am further advised that the HomeStart portion of the equity has an initial cap of 35 per cent, and will share the proportion of the home's equity and capital gain once the property is sold or paid out.

I am further advised that, as at 31 August 2008, 283 Breakthrough Loans have been written worth $19.7 million, totalling $62.5 million in HomeStart settlements. I am advised that the debt write-off provisions for these loans are part of HomeStart's total collective impairment provision, which was $11.7 million as at 30 June 2008. I am further advised there have been no current defaults on this product.

More generally, I am advised that the total value of HomeStart's loan book is $1.305 billion, and HomeStart has no direct exposure to the subprime crisis. Importantly, it should also be noted that HomeStart has never written low document home loans.

HomeStart's current 30 day (one payment down) arrears rate is 1.72 per cent by number and 1.92 per cent by dollar value, which compares very well to the standard prime Australian residential mortgage lending arrears rate of 1.45 per cent.

HomeStart established a risk transfer vehicle (RTV), which the leader inquired into yesterday, with an interpretation by me that he was suggesting that that somehow was a dodgy or questionable practice. I can advise the house that the risk transfer vehicle was, in fact, established under the previous Liberal government in the year 2000 to meet loan write-offs. You should do your homework, leader. After an injection of—

Mr Hamilton-Smith interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Sorry?

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: He said you made the inferences.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I made the inferences? Apparently, he has told the media today that I'm a dunce because I did not finish high school.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! A point of order; the deputy leader.

Ms CHAPMAN: On a point of order, Mr Speaker—

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Apparently, because I was not brought up in privilege and did not finish high school that somehow makes me—

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Premier will take his seat. The Deputy Premier has been given leave to make a ministerial statement, and he should stick to that statement.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I did not do an MBA on taxpayers' money like he did.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: More generally, I am advised—

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The deputy leader will come to order.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I just never did an MBA on taxpayers' money. After an injection of $20 million to establish the vehicle, on an ongoing basis, the vehicle receives loan provision charges—

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Anyone else making that point, it might have been a good point, Vickie, but not you. After an injection of $20 million to establish the vehicle, on an ongoing basis the vehicle receives loan provision charges levelled on new loans and returns on invested funds. These charges equate to around $900 per loan for someone borrowing 95 per cent of the property valuation. The RTV is an entity to provide loss-protection consistent with that delivered under commercial loan mortgage insurer (LMI) arrangements.

As at 31 August 2008, the RTV had net assets (capital) of some $33 million. The RTV (risk transfer vehicle) had assets of $3 million, less unearned premiums, and income of $5 million and provisions of $5 million. Actual losses to date are $732,000. The latest long-term projections indicate sufficient capital in the RTV to cover projected settlement volumes to June 2018, with a return of the injected capital of $20 million.

So, yesterday's foray by the leader was nothing more than an opposition trying to get a headline at the expense of the most socially disadvantaged people in our society.

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Minister for Education and Children's Services (Hon. J.D. Lomax-Smith) on behalf of the Minister for Police (Hon. M.J. Wright)—

State Lotteries Act 1966—Section 13D(3)—
Code Alteration (State Lotteries) (Advertising) (No. 1) 2008
Code Alteration (State Lotteries) (Responsible Gambling) (No. 1) 2008

By the Minister for Industrial Relations (Hon. P. Caica)—

Authorised Betting Operations Act 2000—Section 51(1)—
Code Alteration ([Name of Licensed Racing Club]) (Responsible Gambling) (No. 1) 2008

Code Alteration (<<Premise_Name>>) (Advertising) (No. 1) 2008
Code Alteration (SA TAB) (Advertising) (No. 1) 2008
Code Alteration (SA TAB) (Responsible Gambling) (No. 1) 2008
Casino Act 1997—Section 41C(3)—
Code Alteration (Adelaide Casino) (Advertising) (No. 1) 2008
Code Alteration (Adelaide Casino) (Responsible Gambling) (No. 1) 2008
Gaming Machines Act 1992—
[Name of Venue] Advertising Code of Practice—as in force on 1 December 2008
[Name of Venue] Responsible Gambling Code of Practice—as in force on 1 December 2008
Section 74A(3)—
Code Alteration ([Name of Venue]) (Advertising) (No. 1) 2008
Code Alteration ([Name of Venue]) (Advertising) (No. 1) 2008
Code Alteration ([Name of Venue]) (Responsible Gambling) (No. 1) 2008
Code Alteration ([Name of Venue]) (Responsible Gambling) (No. 1) 2008

MEMBERS, CONGRATULATIONS

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Ramsay—Premier, Minister for Economic Development, Minister for Social Inclusion, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Sustainability and Climate Change) (14:10): On behalf of all members on both sides of the house, I am sure, I congratulate the Hon. Rory McEwen on his 60th birthday and also the member for Morialta, Lindsay Simmons, on her engagement to Ken. Congratulations to you both.

ENVIRONMENT, RESOURCES AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

Ms BREUER (Giles) (14:11): I bring up the 62nd report of the committee on natural burial grounds.

Report received and ordered to be published.

LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE

Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens) (14:11): I bring up the second report of the committee.

Report received.

Mrs GERAGHTY: I bring up the third report of the committee.

Report received and read.

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: I advise members of the presence in the gallery today of members of the Adelaide Central Probus Club, who are guests of the member for Adelaide; students from Our Lady of the Sacred Heart College, who are guests of the member for Enfield; students from Mercedes College, who are guests of the member for Waite; and former premier the Hon. Lynn Arnold.

QUESTION TIME

FUNDS SA

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite—Leader of the Opposition) (14:13): Why did the Treasurer omit from his ministerial statement yesterday the size of the loss from Funds SA's growth fund for the 12 months to 30 June 2008? In his ministerial statement to the house yesterday, the Treasurer told us that Funds SA recorded a loss of 9.3 per cent for its balanced fund in 2007-08. This equates to a loss of $474 million. In his ministerial statement the Treasurer did not mention the more significant losses from the high risk growth fund. The 2006-07 Funds SA annual report states the high risk growth fund balance was $7.1 billion. The deterioration of the growth fund is understood to have been at least within the range of 11.17 per cent, a loss of $795 million in 2007-08. The two figures represent a loss—

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Attorney will come to order.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Attorney will not interject after I have just called him to order.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: The two figures represent a loss of $1.27 billion to the taxpayers in 2007-08.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Port Adelaide—Deputy Premier, Treasurer, Minister for Industry and Trade, Minister for Federal/State Relations) (14:15): What I did yesterday was to give the balanced fund. The leader now asks what is the growth fund loss. What he, of course, is now not telling us is what was the conservative funds loss, which would have been the cash and bonds that we invest in, which are far less volatile than equities. I will get that figure, because that would probably have been a loss far less than either the balanced or the growth fund. As the leader knows in his own share portfolio, which I think is down some 13 per cent as at 30 June 2008, the world economic cycle—

Mr Hamilton-Smith interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader of the Opposition will come to order!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: My luxury apartment—

Mr Hamilton-Smith interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Leader of the Opposition will come to order!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I have often made the comment that that has not been a particularly good investment.

Mr Hamilton-Smith: How much have you lost?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I don't value my apartment regularly, but my guess is that it has not been a particularly successful investment for me.

Mr Hamilton-Smith: Tell us about your investment portfolio.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: What investment portfolio?

Mr Hamilton-Smith: Well, you're talking about people's private portfolios.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I haven't got an investment portfolio. I own three properties.

Mr Hamilton-Smith: You have.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I've got an investment portfolio, have I? Okay. I have a superannuation fund.

Mr Hamilton-Smith: Well, do you want to tell us about it?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Yes, it is on the public record. I have an MLC private superannuation fund of a small amount and I have a Triple S scheme, as we all do, or most of us do.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Okay; most of us do. I bought an apartment in Sydney before the property boom and it went up in value, down in value and it is now starting to go back up. I have a house which I built at Parkside and a house which I am building at Norwood. So, how's that? I am quite upfront about it. But if you want to say to me what is the relative—

Ms Chapman: Anything at Port Adelaide?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I used to have a house in Port Adelaide until I got divorced, yes. Divorce does that to you, Vickie. Thanks, Vickie, for raising that; that's nice.

Ms Chapman: If I'd acted for you, you would have had to give me one.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Is that how much she charged as a lawyer? The Liberals, they know nothing about struggle street, do they? I had the Leader of the Opposition saying that I am a dunce today apparently and having a go at me because I never finished high school. When you do not come from a life of privilege, sometimes you have to leave high school and work. If the Leader of the Opposition wants to get down and personal about it, I am proud of being a western suburbs

person who left school at 16 and who has reached the office of Deputy Premier and Treasurer. I am proud of that. Back to the question: I will get a full, detailed answer for the leader.

OLYMPIC DAM

Ms BREUER (Giles) (14:18): My question is for the Premier. Would the Premier outline to the house information about the recently released resource estimates for Olympic Dam?

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Ramsay—Premier, Minister for Economic Development, Minister for Social Inclusion, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Sustainability and Climate Change) (14:18): I am delighted with the question from the member. I am delighted to inform the house today that South Australia's exceptional mining outlook continues to grow. This morning, BHP Billiton informed the Australian Stock Exchange that the estimated size of the mineral resource at its Olympic Dam mine has increased by 8 per cent in the year to June 2008. The company now believes Olympic Dam is a copper, uranium, gold and silver resource of almost 8.5 billion tonnes. The new mineral resource estimate is more than double the 3.98 billion tonnes estimated in 2005. It has been revalued once again. Olympic Dam has been reassessed and revalued and is now more than double what it was estimated to be in 2005.

This reflects the significant work that BHP Billiton has undertaken over the past three years as part of the Olympic Dam expansion project pre-feasibility study. These figures confirm that Olympic Dam remains the largest source of uranium in the world, with more than 2.3 million tonnes of uranium oxide. It is also one of the world's largest copper deposits and the largest gold resource in Australia. BHP Billiton has yet to discover the limits of this massive ore body. In the past 12 months, 487 holes have been drilled, totalling 192,000 metres of additional drilling. Presently, the ore body covers an area of six kilometres by 3.5 kilometres, with ore being found at depths of over two kilometres below the surface. These results, once again, confirm that Olympic Dam is an outstanding world-class resource.

The South Australian government will continue to work closely with BHP Billiton to develop Olympic Dam into one of the premier mining operations in the world. It will have multiple benefits for the South Australian economy—we are talking about 20,000 indirect jobs. It also estimates an increase in the mine's contribution to GSP from $1.65 billion to $4.2 billion per year. This has now been revalued. When the expansion was being talked about in 2005, it was regarded as the world's biggest resource, the world's biggest mine. It is now more than double what it was believed to be back in 2005. I look forward to getting updated estimates of the economic impact of the project when they are released by BHP Billiton. That is the point: it is a $US1 trillion resource—not a mirage in the desert.

The major regional impact will be felt in the Roxby Downs township and the surrounding region. However, other regions, such as Upper Spencer Gulf, stand to benefit from the expansion through related infrastructure improvements and the provision of services to the mine. Today's news confirms South Australia's prospects as a major contributor to the national resources boom. With the opening of the Terramin zinc, lead and silver mine in the Adelaide Hills last week, South Australia now has 10 operating mines—up from four when this government came to office. More than 20 new mines are now being planned and developed.

Production at OZ Minerals' copper and gold mine at Prominent Hill near Woomera is expected to begin shortly. With a capital cost of more than $1 billion, this mine is expected to create 1,200 jobs during its construction and mining phases. Just today OZ Minerals announced a substantially increased resource estimate for the Prominent Hill deposit, based on extensive additional drilling completed in the last year. Iluka Resources is developing a globally significant $420 million zircon resource at Jacinth-Ambrosia in the Eucla Basin. About 250 new jobs are expected in the initial construction stage of this mine, while 120 full-time jobs are expected during the life of the project.

Overall expenditure on mining exploration in this state has increased tenfold during the last five years. Spending on mineral exploration in the June quarter alone was $95.2 million—a record quarterly high. Over the past five years—and this is particularly for the Deputy Leader of the Opposition—South Australia has risen from 36th place to fourth place on the Fraser Institute's global rankings for mining prospectivity—the only Australian jurisdiction in the top 10—ahead of Western Australia and Queensland.

WATER SECURITY

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop) (14:24): Have they accepted the principle of global warming yet?

The SPEAKER: Is it that a question?

Mr WILLIAMS: No, sir. My question is to the Minister for Water Security. Will the minister make available the results of opinion polling conducted by SA Water through its feedback form delivered to residents in the area around the proposed desalination plant at Port Stanvac and also posted online? Residents have been asked to supply their name, address, email contact details, phone number, age and other details, along with their response to questions that really have little to do with actual construction of the plant. The form asks whether the respondent is in favour of, neutral towards or against a desalination plant. It also asks whether their interest is driven by environmental issues, technical matters or water security.

The Hon. K.A. MAYWALD (Chaffey—Minister for the River Murray, Minister for Water Security) (14:25): I commend SA Water for its efforts to inform and consult with communities in order to get an understanding of how they are feeling about infrastructure that will secure the water future for South Australia. The market information has been undertaken by SA Water. I will ask the SA Water board whether it is prepared to release the information.

HOSPITALS, WINTER DEMAND

Ms THOMPSON (Reynell) (14:25): My question is to the Minister for Health. What has been the demand on our hospitals over winter, and what is the government doing to cope with future demand increases for hospital services?

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Kaurna—Minister for Health, Minister for the Southern Suburbs, Minister Assisting the Premier in the Arts) (14:25): I am very pleased to answer this question from the member for Reynell, and I acknowledge her great interest in health. Our goal in government is to try to make our health care system sustainable, and essentially that means that we need to do two things: we need to increase supply and we need to reduce demand. A key component in managing demand is keeping people out of emergency departments (EDs) so that they do not go there unless they really need to, and that means providing other places where people can be looked after. This year members would be aware that we ran a major television campaign urging people not to go to EDs in winter if they had only minor ailments but instead to see their GP or to ring the call centre 'healthdirect' number. This strategy worked remarkably well.

In addition to it and other strategies, I can announce today that South Australia's metro public hospital emergency departments experienced a 7.1 per cent drop in presentations this winter compared to last year. That is an extraordinary thing, because members will know that I come in here all the time talking about increasing demand. Well, this is an example of reduced demand. Even more significantly, the lowest urgency categories of ED presentations dropped by 16.5 per cent—that is, 95 or fewer patients a day in these categories—after the commencement of the TV campaign.

The following reductions were recorded in categories 4 and 5 (that is, the lower levels of urgency) in ED attendances between August 2007 and August this year. There was a reduction across the board over winter but a particular reduction once the television advertising came onto the screens, and that was in August. Comparing August this year with August last year, the Women's and Children's Hospital had a 20.9 per cent reduction in attendances at emergency; the Lyell McEwin, 20.6 per cent; the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, 10.8 per cent; the Flinders Medical Centre, 15 per cent; the Royal Adelaide Hospital, 7.2 per cent; Modbury Hospital, 5.6 per cent; and Noarlunga Hospital a staggering 24.4 per cent. So, there were big reductions in attendances at emergency departments.

Not only did our television advertising have an impact, but it is an example that, when it does run ads, there is a benefit to the community from the government running television advertising, and this is a very clear example of that. We also have other strategies in place. I have to say that we were lucky, because the burden of flu was not as great this year compared to last year.

We also have other strategies in place. We have what we call our Hospital at Home strategy, which helps people with chronic disease to be managed at home so they do not have as great a likelihood of going to hospital, and that is working extremely well. Also, we distributed more

flu vaccines this year through GPs to people aged over 65. This year 229,665 people aged over 65 had flu shots compared to 225,000, and a few, last year.

Also, as members know, we are establishing GP Plus health care centres (we have them at Aldinga and Woodville), and we are providing chronic disease programs in addition to other primary care services. I do not think it is coincidental that the figures for Noarlunga are to some degree also affected by the Aldinga GP Plus Centre. We are allocating $35 million towards activities aimed at keeping people out of hospitals by better managing their conditions in 2008-09. They are the things we are doing to reduce demand, but we are also doing a lot of things on the supply side.

I can announce today that, since 2002, as a government we have created an additional 248 beds in Adelaide hospitals; and, of course, in addition to that, we have our home beds, but these are 248 hospital-based beds. So, 136 extra beds are staffed at the Flinders Medical Centre, 53 additional beds at the Lyell McEwin and 27 additional beds at the Royal Adelaide Hospital. We are also working on the upgrade of a number of our hospitals, of course, to create more beds. Therefore, an additional 58 beds will be available at the Lyell McEwin by the end of next year, and that is part of our $336 million redevelopment, which is virtually doubling the size of the hospital; and, of those beds, 38 will be available by December this year.

An additional 30 beds will open at the Flinders Medical Centre in mid-2010 as part of our $153 million redevelopment of that hospital, which will also see an expanded emergency department and new operating theatres. Over 120 additional new beds, of course, will become available at the Marjorie Jackson-Nelson Hospital when it opens in 2016. That hospital will have 800 state-of-the-art beds available to people in South Australia. It is the best option for launching South Australia's health care system for the 21st century and will provide the very best care for all South Australians. Of course, we are spending $127 million at the QEH on its second stage, with the new 72-bed inpatient wing, a 580-berth car park and a childcare centre already completed.

So I believe we are effectively managing demand within our hospital system and I congratulate the doctors, nurses and others who work in our emergency departments for being part of the solution to this big issue. To reduce the demand on our hospitals over winter I think is completely astonishing. It is a great testament to the good work of the people in the health system in South Australia and I praise them for it, but we have to do more and, as a government, we are committed to doing more.

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION

Mrs REDMOND (Heysen) (14:31): My question is to the Attorney-General. Does the Attorney-General stand by his demand, made while in opposition, that information gathered by government departments or agencies such as SA Water should always be made available to the public under freedom of information legislation and, if so, why is it that he is now silent on the matter? When he sat on the opposition benches, the Attorney-General introduced a bill into this house, on 7 November 1996, called the Freedom of Information (Public Opinion Polls) Amendment Bill. When speaking to the bill, he said:

The nub of this bill is that after opinion polling has been completed for the government, it should be available to the public under the Freedom of Information Act.

An honourable member: Why didn't you support it?

Mrs REDMOND: Because I was not here. He said:

Members of the public are entitled to have an avenue by which to view the results of that polling after it is read by government. By what reasoning can this be denied?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister for Environment and Conservation.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Minister for Environment and Conservation, Minister for Early Childhood Development, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation, Minister Assisting the Premier in Cabinet Business and Public Sector Management) (14:32): For the benefit of the house, I advise that the Freedom of Information Act legislation has been assigned to me, so I am responsible to the house for that matter. This government is proud of the reforms that it has made to the Freedom of Information Act. It was not that long ago when those opposite occupied the—

Ms Portolesi interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: That's right.

The Hon. P.F. Conlon interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: That's right. Who can remember the heady days when they were about to form a government with Peter Lewis and the one thing that they could not come at was Freedom of Information Act reform?

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: They struck it out of the deal.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: They struck it out of the deal because that was the one thing that they were never prepared to expose themselves to, and that is the scrutiny of the public. Who could forget the Liberals trying to suppress the Anderson report, the report on Dale Baker? They were forced to release it by Independents after the 1997 election. Those opposite really cannot be heard to complain or raise the question of access to information.

We have, indeed, in this state a Freedom of Information Act that actually provides for independence in decision making on the part of individual officers. Those officers consider applications. The reality is that there has never been greater scrutiny of a government in the history of this state. There has never been greater scrutiny. We have moved to close those outrageous rorts that those opposite engaged in, of wheeling truckloads—

The Hon. P.F. Conlon interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: That's right.

Mr Hanna interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: That's right. In happier days when Kris Hanna was sitting over here on this side of the house—

The Hon. P.F. Conlon interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: That's right. When we had the member for Mitchell, a great barrister in his day, acting on behalf of the Leader of the Opposition, seeking to drag those opposite kicking and screaming into the accountability that they now squeal about and ask for from us. What an absurdity! We will continue to apply the Freedom of Information Act and we will continue to defend the independence of the officers that administer that act.

SKILLS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

Ms BREUER (Giles) (14:36): My question is for the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education.

Mr Hamilton-Smith: You're a leader in waiting over there.

Ms BREUER: Me? Thank you, Leader of the Opposition. Leader in waiting—I have been promoted. Thank you, sir.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Ms BREUER: You can come over to my side and be a minister when I get there.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Ms BREUER: I am all excited and flushed now; I have gone all funny. My question is for the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education. What is the government doing to assist young people to access skills development programs, particularly in regional areas? Perhaps one day they may become leaders as well.

The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton—Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education, Minister for Science and Information Economy, Minister for Youth, Minister for Volunteers) (14:37): I thank the member for Giles for her question and acknowledge her support of employment programs in her electorate. I also acknowledge the support of the member for Schubert for employment programs in his electorate; he knows that a lot is being done.

I am pleased to inform members that South Australia will receive $673,400 in funding from the commonwealth government for three initiatives that specifically target the skills needs of our young people. The state government has, in fact, been very successful in obtaining approximately 20 per cent of the total $3.4 million allocation through the commonwealth Targeting Skills Needs in Regions program. The successful South Australian projects involve a variety of partnership arrangements between industry, government and industry skills boards. I am very pleased to inform the house that the Office for Youth has had significant involvement in two of these projects.

The first project that I would like to mention is called Ignite. It is an entrepreneur program that will help 40 young people to establish innovative agribusiness and enterprises—wait for this, Ivan—in the Barossa Valley and Kangaroo Island regions, which are expected to be commercially and environmentally sustainable. The participants will be mentored by business owners, coached by industry representatives, and involved in peer-to-peer industry networking, and they will receive training in business fundamental workshops.

The state government will contribute $294,000 to this project, to which the commonwealth is adding a further $262,000. Ignite will involve a partnership between the Office for Youth, Primary Industries and Resources SA, Conservation Volunteers Australia and the Primary Industries Skills Council.

The second project that I will briefly talk about aims to support young people to successfully participate in the seafood industry on Eyre Peninsula. Commonwealth support for this project will be $276,000, to complement the $1.4 million of state government support provided through, and to, the Seafood Training Centre of Excellence, which coordinates and brokers accredited training for the seafood industry. This project will target 36 school leavers and young unemployed people, including young Aboriginal people, and provide them with relevant training to help them gain employment with local seafood enterprises operating on Eyre Peninsula.

The final project that I would like to mention is called Southern Edge. Over two years, this program will provide 50 young unemployed people with skills designed to help them move into employment or further education and training within Adelaide's southern suburbs. A particular focus will be on better positioning the participants for jobs in manufacturing, community services and the health sector. This program will be delivered through a partnership between the Office for Youth, the Manufacturing Industry Skills Advisory Council and the SA Health and Community Services Board. The commonwealth will contribute $134,800, with the state government and industry combining to contribute a further $102,500.

The participants of this program will be provided with relevant industry training, access to youth development activities and exposure to employment opportunities. In addition, participating employers will be supported to better understand the needs of young people and to develop appropriate recruitment and retention strategies so that they can become an employer of choice for young people.

The government—and I know certainly Ivan and the opposition—recognises the economic and social importance of encouraging the participation of young people in the workforce and also acknowledges the critical role that industry and employers must play in working with government to achieve our common goals.

IRIS SYSTEMS

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:40): My question is to the Minister for Health. Has the minister maintained—

Mr Hamilton-Smith: He's asleep.

Ms CHAPMAN: He is waking up now. Has the minister maintained an intellectual property register and received an annual report each year from his chief executive, pursuant to the state intellectual property policy? If so, what particulars were disclosed in respect of the IRIS 2 system and its transfer for $1 on 12 September 2006 in the said register? Pursuant to clauses 2.3 and 6.2 of the state intellectual property policy of July 2006—

The Hon. K.O. Foley interjecting:

Ms CHAPMAN: You would know the state policy off by heart, Kevin. Pursuant to those clauses, chief executive officers are required to maintain intellectual property registers and report to their ministers each year about how they are managed.

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Kaurna—Minister for Health, Minister for the Southern Suburbs, Minister Assisting the Premier in the Arts) (14:42): I thank the deputy leader for her question. She is referring again to a matter that was raised in the house of week or so ago in relation to intellectual property matters which are the subject of police, Auditor-General, Government Investigations Unit, and now DPP consideration, so I do not want to go into the particulars of that.

This is a complex set of arrangements that we are investigating. As members would know, the government moved to get rid of the board which ran the IMVS. The IMVS itself owns a corporation called Medvet, a proprietary limited company which has its own board and which operates at arm's length. We are going through a process to understand exactly what has been going on in those organisations and how matters to do with intellectual property have been dealt with. In relation to the particulars of the matter about registers and the advice the department has, I am happy to get a full report for the member.

AFFORDABLE HOUSING

The Hon. P.L. WHITE (Taylor) (14:43): My question is to the Minister for Housing. What is the government doing to ensure that affordable house and land packages are available to low-income South Australians?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Families and Communities, Minister for Northern Suburbs, Minister for Housing, Minister for Ageing, Minister for Disability) (14:43): I thank the member for Taylor for her question. It probably would have been more timely to have asked this question yesterday, had we the opportunity. Unlike those opposite, we believe that providing affordable housing should be a priority for government. That is why this state government was the first in Australia to set an affordable housing target of 15 per cent for significant new developments, supported in legislation and delivering on-the-ground success.

The Affordable Homes Program was established by this government in September 2005, and there are already firm commitments for more than 700 new homes for low to moderate income earners, with many more properties in the planning stage or coming online soon. The Affordable Homes Program is designed to increase the supply of low-cost homes and ensure that 15 per cent of major residential developments will consist of homes valued at no more than $249,000.

Today, and particularly after the performance by the Leader of the Opposition yesterday, I am pleased to advise the house about an exciting new development in Hawkesbury Park at Salisbury North that will provide affordable housing options for eligible South Australians. As a result of our Affordable Homes Program, 15 per cent of this development has been reserved for homebuyers on low to moderate incomes. I am particularly pleased to advise the house of the Hawkesbury Park site, Salisbury North, as this development will not only provide affordable housing but it will also provide low maintenance, environmentally-sustainable housing. Eligible buyers will be able to choose from a range of attractive, high quality, environmentally sustainable and affordable homes for their allotment, and this will ensure that the ongoing costs of maintaining the home remain low whilst minimising the impact on the environment.

Today's announcement will result in 12 house and land packages for eligible buyers, priced between $217,000 and $249,000. Hawkesbury Park is the first of many affordable housing developments, and the house and land packages are available right now for eligible buyers on the property locator. This property locator, which has been a tremendous success itself, is a catalogue of affordable homes for purchase by low income earners, and it is helping people to find a home to purchase. Something like 200 affordable properties have been purchased through this website, and it is just one part of the Rann government's commitment to improving affordable housing outcomes for South Australians.

Possibly to the opposition's dismay, we have many other initiatives to assist low income earners into home ownership that have been equally successful. More than 55,000 people have been helped by HomeStart to enter into home ownership. Currently, almost 22,000 households have a HomeStart loan of one kind or another. Since its inception in 2005, HomeStart EquityStart has assisted over 860 social housing tenants into home ownership, through the home loan program, and more than 370 indigenous South Australians have been assisted into home ownership through the HomeStart Nunga program.

I want the Leader of the Opposition to listen to some examples of the impact the Nunga and HomeStart programs have had. Josephine Leyden became a HomeStart customer in 1998 and later refinanced in 2003. She said:

As a single mum, I have stability and my kids have a place to call home that will always be familiar.

Another customer the leader obviously believes should never have owned a home is Albert Hayward, a Seniors Equity client. He said:

HomeStart has changed my life—by letting me have a loan at my age it means that I can continue to stay in my home.

Then there is the former athlete Paul Vandenbergh, a Nunga—

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: Do you want me to go through the list of things that you got wrong? Do you want a list?

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: I'll finish this one, and then we'll go into your list.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: Do you want a list of what you got wrong?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: It is very big, but I've got it and—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: —if we've got time, I can go through it for you.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The deputy leader will come to order.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The deputy leader has been called to order.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: Paul Vandenbergh, a Nunga Loan customer, admits 'There were times when home ownership was out of my reach.' He said:

I guess the feeling that I had when I did purchase it was relief 'cause it did take some time, but I just had a smile on my face the whole day. I thought 'Wow, I own a property now, you know? I've got something that is actually mine. You get a feeling of satisfaction that you've got something that belongs to you and no-one can take that away.

These are the stories from the people the Leader of the Opposition says the state government should not help.

INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:49): My question is again to the Minister for Health. Has the minister or his department commenced or made a contribution to the review of the state intellectual property policy? The policy was published in 2006 and was due for review in two years from its introduction, that is, by June 2008.

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Kaurna—Minister for Health, Minister for the Southern Suburbs, Minister Assisting the Premier in the Arts) (14:50): I am not sure entirely what the deputy leader is driving at, but, certainly, in health we have contributed to the making of intellectual policy. In fact, we determined a year or so ago on a new approach to intellectual property that was developed within the health system and then commercialised to the extent that we now have an arrangement in place which is similar to the arrangement in place within the universities; that is, the individual researchers of the research team which produced the intellectual property which is commercialised get one-third of the commercialised benefits. The institution from which they were working, whether it is the Women's and Children's Hospital or the RAH or wherever, or the unit within those hospitals, gets one-third of the commercialised benefit. Then a third goes into the Health and Medical Research Fund we have established. That fund is then able to be used to further encourage research activity within the state.

All this was considered and thought through by John Shine, who is the head of the Garvan Institute in Sydney, and Mr Alan Young, who is the head of the Flinders Foundation. We asked them to provide us with a report on research in South Australia. They have given us a very good

report, which we are in the process of implementing. The goal of that is to increase the amount of research activity within our hospitals and universities, and to bring together the various institutes that we have that are focused on health and medical research into one large institute which is more capable of attracting national and international funding.

We are also going to beef up, where we can, that health and medical research fund to stimulate research in South Australia. We want it to be a fund that is focused on the very best research activity that we can get in South Australia, and also on new and emerging research teams and individuals, and we are working through the recommendation that we should have a new iconic centre for research activity in South Australia and create more capacity.

So, I think health made a very large contribution to the discussion about intellectual property and the development of good policies. The application of that, a one-third/one-third/one-third arrangement within health, makes us consistent now, of course, with other states and with the university sector, and that means that we are more likely to hold onto good research teams in our state and within the health system.

IRIS SYSTEMS

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:53): I thank the minister for that information confirming the third/third/third arrangement. Will the minister explain then why 14 members of the IMVS team, who developed the IRIS 2 software, were not consulted about the sale of the software or the assignment from IMVS to John William Mann for $1 on 12 September 2006? When the IMVS first sold the licence for the IRIS 2 software system in 2000, the 17-member team who delivered the program were entitled to a share of 30 per cent of the profit. Indeed, on 3 January 2002, they each received a cheque for $548.79. Subsequent proceeds of sale of the IRIS 2 software were paid to the partnership.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I rise on a point of order. You cannot give an explanation that leave has not been sought for. We should follow the rules slightly.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I was going to remind the deputy leader at the end of the question, that the appropriate form of words is to seek the leave of the house to explain.

Ms CHAPMAN: I am happy to do that, sir.

Leave granted.

Ms CHAPMAN: Subsequent proceeds of sale of the IRIS 2 software were paid to the partnership—

The Hon. K.O. Foley interjecting:

Ms CHAPMAN: He has nodded.

The SPEAKER: Leave is granted.

Ms CHAPMAN: Wakey, wakey, Kevin. Keep alert. Subsequent proceeds of sale of the IRIS 2 software were paid to a partnership comprising the wives and partners of three of the original team and, by deed of assignment on 12 September 2006, the IMVS transferred to Mr Mann, as I have indicated. IRIS Systems International was then registered on 8 September 2006 and thereafter the commercial benefit—notwithstanding the minister's previous answer—for the benefit of that product to others.

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Kaurna—Minister for Health, Minister for the Southern Suburbs, Minister Assisting the Premier in the Arts) (14:55): The matters that the member refers to are, of course, subject to the investigation which I myself referred to earlier today in answer to another question and, indeed, in answer to questions put to me a couple of weeks ago by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. I do not wish to go through the details of the allegations because it is a matter that is subject to an investigation as to whether or not there have been any actions which might be criminal or illegal in some way.

Of course, it is a matter of contention and we should not make judgments in here about that. It is subject to the proper processes and, as I said before, it has been subject to investigation by the Government Investigations Unit and the police, it has been referred to the Auditor-General, and I understand the DPP is currently considering whether or not further action should be taken.

The broader issue is: how should government manage the IMVS? I brought legislation to this parliament—and I am pleased to say that this parliament passed the legislation towards the end of the last financial year—which gives the government of the day and the CE of Health much greater and more direct control over the operations of the IMVS. We have established a new service, SA Pathology, which has its own chief executive and which is within the Central Northern Adelaide Health Service and under the management of that CE who then reports through to the CE of Health and through to me. That is a more direct form of governance than used to be the case—it had its own board. As I said when I introduced this legislation to the parliament, this would produce a much better form of accountability.

The deputy leader and the opposition opposed that every single inch of the way. The deputy leader defended the arrangements that were in place and accused me of outrageous behaviour in trying to get direct control of this service. She said that it would undermine the service and bring the service down in some way. She defended the organisation as it was. I had concerns about the way that organisation was being run and I went through the process of having it reformed. We now have more direct control and we are going through and having a very close look at what happened in that organisation before we had that direct control.

That has been the problem and I have to say that, generally within health, we have had so many boards running so many different parts of the organisation that it has been very difficult for government or for the administration of health system to really truly know what is going on. That applies to country health organisations, and I could give a whole range of examples chapter and verse of where things have not happened there properly and right across the health service—and the IMVS is within that category.

I am having proper process put in place to investigate all the matters raised by the deputy leader, and once those matters have been properly resolved, I will fully account to the parliament as to what happened, why it happened, to whom it happened, what should have happened and who got it wrong, but I do not want to interfere in the process of proper investigation by the proper authorities at this stage.

IRIS SYSTEMS

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:58): My question is to the Attorney-General. When did the Attorney-General first become aware that an investigation was underway by the Government Investigations Unit into the transfer and use of intellectual property from IMVS to the three former employees thereof?

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON (Croydon—Attorney-General, Minister for Justice, Minister for Multicultural Affairs, Minister for Veterans' Affairs) (14:58): I will ask my office for an answer to that by reference to our file.

IRIS SYSTEMS

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:00): My question is to the Minister for Health. Why was it necessary for the minister to allow his department to enter into a contract with IRIS Systems International Pty Ltd which was and which remains under investigation (as he has told the house) by the Anti-Corruption Unit; and was he informed that, having sold the intellectual property of IRIS for $1, they would need to buy it back for at least a year at a cost of $300,000 because it would cost millions of dollars to replace it under another system? The opposition has now been informed that, in allowing the intellectual property to be sold off for $1, the government failed to secure continued access to the system for its own purposes and was forced to buy back the access of the system from the new private owners that it sold it to for $1, as it would otherwise cost between $10 and $20 million to purchase or redevelop a new system as a replacement.

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Kaurna—Minister for Health, Minister for the Southern Suburbs, Minister Assisting the Premier in the Arts) (15:00): As is normal for the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, she bases her questions on assumptions which are false. The government did not do the things that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition claims it has done. The government became aware of this at a particular point of time and we are going through the investigation as to why things happened in the way that they did. As I pointed out to the house, this was an organisation which had its own board and was run at arm's length from the government. I have always disliked that arrangement and I have taken action to get rid of it. It is now directly run by the government, and we are in the process of understanding what happened, why it happened, to whom it happened and where it went wrong. I already answered the substance of the question last week.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The deputy leader will come to order.

The Hon. J.D. HILL: When the Deputy Leader of the Opposition asked me the same question last week, I said that we had no choice but to enter into a contractual arrangement to maintain the supply of software because Pathology SA could not deliver services to the community without that particular piece of intellectual property. One of the issues we are examining is why that transfer occurred and whether or not it was lawful. I am outraged by the circumstances that have arisen but, once we became aware of them, we took appropriate action to deal with them. The deputy leader can try as hard as she likes to slur the government, but the fact remains that it was she and her side of the house who defended the arrangements which were in place and which allowed this to happen.

ANDREWS v PAROLE BOARD OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA

Mr KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (15:02): Will the Attorney-General advise the result of the matter of Andrews v Parole Board of South Australia?

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON (Croydon—Attorney-General, Minister for Justice, Minister for Multicultural Affairs, Minister for Veterans' Affairs) (15:02): On 28 July 2008 I introduced to the house the Correctional Services (Application of Truth in Sentencing) Amendment Bill. As members may recall, the bill addressed a most serious matter that had only a short time earlier come to the attention of the government. A convicted murderer, Shane Andrews, was suing the state of South Australia, arguing that section 16 of the Acts Interpretation Act 1915—that is, the presumption against retrospective operation—applied to the 1994 Truth in Sentencing Act, so that, in accordance with the law that stood when Andrews was sentenced, the Parole Board had no authority to refuse his release.

The Crown Solicitor's Office advised me that Mr Andrews had a slight to moderate chance of success and that the consequences of a judgment against the government were dire for the public. First, Andrews would be released despite the Parole Board's repeatedly ruling against his parole and, secondly, about 20 other convicted criminals might quickly apply to the Supreme Court for release. As the judgment date was looming, the government knew it had to act swiftly to make absolutely sure that heinous, long-term prisoners were not released before their time.

Officers of the Crown Solicitor's Office and parliamentary counsel drafted a bill to amend the Truth in Sentencing Act in order to make expressly clear the intention of parliament in passing the bill—and I happen to know that intention because I was in parliament at the time—that the right to automatic release on the expiry of a criminal's non-parole period was abolished. I thank those officers for their efforts. I also thank members of this house, especially the member for Heysen, who supported the bill and gave it parliamentary time without the usual notice period and did so immediately. I appreciate that members were given less than the usual length of time to consider the bill and that the bill required careful consideration as it had the potential to affect liberty.

Unlike the Hons R.D. Lawson, S.G. Wade and R.I. Lucas, the member for Heysen did not try to sabotage the bill's progress through parliament. The Hons Sandra Kanck and Mark Parnell would cheerfully have let Shane Andrews onto the streets of Adelaide because they voted against dealing with the government's bill expeditiously by suspension of standing orders. If the Greens had their way, we would be dealing with the bill to close the possible loophole only this week.

I am pleased to advise that my efforts and the efforts of the member for Heysen and all in our camp—the camp of virtue—were rewarded when—

Mr Hanna: That's a bit arrogant, Michael.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: It's a joke, member for Mitchell; it's a joke. On 29 August 2008 the Full Court of the Supreme Court unanimously found in favour of the Parole Board. After hearing submissions from the parties on the effect of the bill, the court ruled that the Truth in Sentencing Act applied to Mr Andrews and that the effect of the act was to alter the procedures and circumstances relevant to his parole as per parliament's intention; and, for the benefit of the member for Heysen, the court also ruled that even if there was a loophole it had been plugged by the amendments passed in the bill. This was an outcome in the public interest.

EASLING, MR T.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (15:06): Will the Minister for Families and Communities advise the house whether it is acceptable to the government for government

investigators in the Special Investigations Unit to tape record only parts of interviews in relation to alleged sexual abuse and discuss key elements of investigations off tape, and, if this is acceptable, why? In the investigation into Tom Easling, investigators of the Special Investigations Unit took a deliberate decision to record only parts of interviews on the alleged sexual abuse. The transcript states:

Q. They were there for some hours, weren't they, before they turned on a tape recorder and tape recorded you?

A. It wouldn't be that long, maybe—

Q. If I suggested to you that the tape was turned on at 4.30—

A. Yes.

Q. —does that sound about right?

A. Yes.

Q. So they would have been there for at least an hour and a half, if not more—

A. Yes.

Q. —before the tape was turned on, is that right?

A. Yes.

Q. All the time during that hour and a half you are talking about issues involving sexual abuse, is that right?

A. Yes.

Q. You're talking about Tom Easling?

A. Yes.

Q. You're talking about massages?

A. Yes.

Q. You're talking about alcohol, him giving you alcohol?

A. Yes.

Q. Him allowing you to smoke cigarettes?

A Yes.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Families and Communities, Minister for Northern Suburbs, Minister for Housing, Minister for Ageing, Minister for Disability) (15:08): I appreciate the member for Davenport asking this question, because it gives me an opportunity to respond also to another issue he raised in this house a few weeks ago which related to a diary notation about a media alert. I think that, in seeking information from the Special Investigations Unit, the copy of the diary to which the honourable member referred was in fact the investigation diary, as I understand it, not a personal notation in an individual's diary. The note in the investigation diary, under the heading 'Discussion with the Paedophile Task Force, SAPOL' dated 23 July, related to a strategy meeting that was held between the members of SAPOL's Child Exploitation Investigation Section and officers of Families and Communities.

It is also indicated in the diary that SAPOL and DFC discussed informing the head of Families re the imminent arrest of Easling because of concerns of the impact on at least one of the young boys who was associated with the matter so that workers could respond promptly to anything to do with this young person. After a number of other entries, the diary states:

Media strategy has to be worked out.

And this is the bit that was missed out in the honourable member's quote, as I understand it—

This will occur between SAPOL and SIU.

The diary note further states:

SAPOL agreed to contact SIU when they are going to lock Tom up.

Page 32 of the investigation diary dated 30 July 2004 states:

Discussion with Steve Edgington. He stated he had received a phone call from Grant Stevens who informed him the arrest would occur tomorrow morning and that a media release had been prepared.

This was the investigation diary indicating discussions between SIU and the police and about what the police process would be. I do not think they were likely to diarise a leak.

Mr Hanna interjecting:

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: Sorry?

Mr Hanna interjecting:

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: I am saying that this is a clear diary entry in the investigations diary about what SAPOL intended to do, not leak information.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: They are hardly likely to diarise a leak. Let us be clear about this. I think if you listen to the radio every morning you will hear of arrests that the police have made.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The minister has the call.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: I do not know whether the member for Davenport is suggesting that the department should not have looked into the allegations of sexual abuse that were raised in relation to Tom Easling. When this matter was put before the courts, the court decided that there was a case to answer. It was not thrown out; it actually went to trial. It went to trial based on police investigations and following consideration by the Director of Public Prosecutions. The Special Investigations Unit has a mandate giving it responsibility for undertaking investigations into allegations of harm or abuse inflicted by a carer, staff member or volunteer towards a child or young person under the guardianship of the minister.

We know of all the issues that came out from the Mullighan inquiry into children in state care. This government has invested a great deal of money into the care and protection of children in South Australia. The summary of the Children in State Care Commission of Inquiry includes—

Mr Hamilton-Smith: Can you answer the question?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: —on pages 16 and 17 a section on 'Someone to tell', which states:

> In light of the evidence to the inquiry that many adults did not disclose sexual abuse when they were children in state care, it is important that strategies are in place to promote such disclosure.

Ms CHAPMAN: I rise on a point of order.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is a point of order. The minister will take her seat.

Ms CHAPMAN: Whilst child protection is important, this has nothing to do with the question, which was why the whole interview was not recorded and how long it takes to put a tape recorder on. Nothing to do with—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Ms CHAPMAN: —Commissioner Mullighan's report and what the government claimed to be doing about it.

The SPEAKER: Order! No, I do not agree with the deputy leader. The question was can the minister advise if it is acceptable—that is my annotation of the question—and the minister is explaining the provisions of the Mullighan inquiry, which I think is relevant. The minister.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: Thank you, sir. It goes to the very heart of it. You will see the point if you just sit quietly for a minute and listen. I know it is something unusual for you to do, you are not used to sitting there and listening, but perhaps if you just take a deep breath and listen and you might learn something.

The SPEAKER: Order! If the minister proceeds with her answer, it might help too.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: In the section 'Responding to disclosures', it states:

> The inquiry heard consistent evidence from alleged victims of child sexual abuse that when they did disclose they were generally not believed.

Ms CHAPMAN: I rise on a point of order. Clearly the minister is talking about the disclosure of alleged victims; nothing to do with the transcript of an interview of an accused defendant.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The minister will take her seat.

Ms CHAPMAN: Nothing to do with the interview and requirements in relation to that with respect to the accused. Nothing to do with it.

The SPEAKER: Order! No, the question was whether something was acceptable to the government. That is my recollection of the question, and the minister is providing an answer to that question. The Minister for Families and Communities.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: Thank you, sir. Ultimately this government is responsible for the care and protection of children. It might not be the member for Bragg's priority, but it is the priority of this government and I am explaining what happened under your regime and regimes prior to that. You might not like it—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: —but that is just bad luck. The inquiry heard consistent evidence from alleged victims of child sexual abuse that, when they did disclose, they were generally not believed. Many of the witnesses who told the inquiry that they did disclose sexual abuse when they were children in state care said that the responses were not only dismissive, but also punitive. All the evidence was in favour of an appropriate therapeutic response when a child in state care alleges sexual abuse. On pages 409 and 410 the inquiry states:

> When a child or young person discloses that he or she has been sexually abused, it is vital that the response is appropriate.

Children who gave evidence described a culture where they were either not believed or were expected to 'cop it'. Some said they were told that action would be taken, but they were never told what that would be, and it was never discussed again. Others were told that they were lying, confused or mistaken—they were not believed.

In her submission to the commission of inquiry, the Guardian for Children and Young People said:

> Arguably, the most fundamental and significant change we can make is to listen to and act on what children and young people have to say about their lives in care.

At the time, the department learned that a child had made serious allegations of sexual misconduct in relation to a person who had been entrusted with the care of some of our most vulnerable children. We have learned through the Mullighan inquiry of some of the most harrowing and heart-wrenching stories of abuse and neglect from the former guardianship of the minister children, those who were brave enough to share their pain.

There were processes in place when the Easling inquiry was undertaken. My understanding is that, apart from the establishment of the Special Investigations Unit, the processes that were undertaken were endorsed by the Liberal government. They were the very same processes that were in place when one of the foster carers was accused of child sexual abuse. After two subsequent inquiries, carried out under the opposition's regime, this person was finally found not to have committed that abuse and was reinstated. So, that is what was happening under the Liberal regime.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

MIGRATION

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:18): My question is to the Treasurer. Why is your government letting interstate migration reach a 12-year high while taxpayers' money is being spent to sponsor a London speed-dating campaign? The state

government will sponsor a speed-dating event in London next week and is running advertisements in the British tabloids and on websites throughout the UK to lure female British migrants to South Australia. Meanwhile, the ABS statistics released today confirmed that the government has not provided for the retention of local residents against the net interstate migration of 4,125 people in the 12 months to March 2008—the highest it has been since 1996.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Port Adelaide—Deputy Premier, Treasurer, Minister for Industry and Trade, Minister for Federal/State Relations) (15:19): This lot would criticise anything. First, as I said yesterday, the government population projections under the substantial and sustained policy development of this government will see our population go from what was expected to be—certainly at the legacy of the last government—a peak of some 1.76 million, from memory, in about 2036, and then heading into decline, to a position, where, under this government's policy, we are seeing that increase reaching two million by 2022, from memory, and going up, and showing no incidence of decline.

The ABS is saying that by 2010, we will be seeing some 11,000 immigrants coming into this state and outflows stabilising at about 3,000. What are we to do—chain young people to their homes and not let them travel the world and seek employment out of this state?

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: In a modern globalised world economy, people do move interstate, they do move overseas and they do seek employment opportunities overseas. As much as it would pain me and my children's mother, if our children one day said, 'We want to work, live or travel overseas,' I think that would be a good thing. I do not think any parent—

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I just fail to understand what—

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The deputy leader will come to order.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: What motivates the member's interjections? What dripping malice comes from her! Nothing can be positive—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Trying to help me? I have said that the ABS itself has stated that the figure will stabilise at 3,000. Do you honestly suggest that no South Australian should leave this state to better themselves interstate or overseas? What a silly, stupid policy position that would be. That would see this state become the narrow, insular, parochial economy that it used to be when those opposite were in office.

This is a globalised world; it is a world where Australia's success is in trading internationally. If we have 11,000 people coming to settle in this state and we have 3,000 going out to see the world, the population is increasing, and that's a damn good outcome. It is a better outcome than when that lot over there were in office. As for the programs being undertaken by our new Agent-General in London, Bill Muirhead, they appear to be working.

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: He knows a bit about advertising.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I will tell you how much he knows about advertising. Mr Bill Muirhead was one of the great appointments of any government on either side of politics in recent history. Bill Muirhead—a South Australian, by the way, who went overseas—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Fancy that! He went overseas and became the managing director of Saatchi and Saatchi, one of the world's great advertising companies.

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: He got Thatcher elected.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Funny you should say that, because Mr Bill Muirhead—whom I have got to know very well, and who is a fine gentleman—was intimately involved in the election of Tory governments, of Margaret Thatcher. He got John Major up.

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: Who else could?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Exactly; Bill Muirhead got John Major over the line—tragically, of course, it ended the great man Neil Kinnock's opportunity to be prime minister. Bill Muirhead was behind that. He was also behind the Qantas advertising campaigns, and British Airways, and is considered one of the great advertising icons of this world. Along with Maurice and Charles Saatchi he left Saatchi and Saatchi and set up M&C Saatchi, of which he is a part owner and partner—and that has become a truly great global advertising company.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: You asked the question. I'm having fun, I'm enjoying this; I have a lot more to come. Bill Muirhead said, 'I would like to give back to my state, because that is where I came from. I love South Australia,' and he is now working part time as our Agent-General. We have refurbished the office. I know the member for Morphett, Duncan McFetridge, was with Bill Muirhead. Isn't he a good bloke?

Dr McFetridge: Good ideas.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Good bloke, good ideas. Perhaps you could have a word with the deputy leader, because she does not think so. Bill Muirhead has had that office revamped, and he has a great young team of expatriate South Australians working there whom he has galvanised into a force of good for promoting our state. What he has asked us to do—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Bill told you about that; you thought it was a good idea.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Didn't he tell you about that? They have a shadow minister who thinks it is a good campaign.

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: She's so arrogant. She knows better than Muirhead.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Exactly. I would back ahead of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition to promote this state someone who has not only run the great advertising companies of this world but who has also built one. I have no doubt that when she is in London and wants to make sure she is looked after, she will be knocking on the door of the Agent-General.

Of course, Bill Muirhead came up with the great ideas of 'Screw London house prices. Come to Adelaide', or 'Sod Staines. Come to Adelaide', which uses a particularly British expression that I don't quite get. I actually received a message from Bill Muirhead about this very thing—and this is breaking news. Bill Muirhead has said, as it relates to the speed-dating service, that he has achieved national press, BBC TV and radio and GM TV, all very positive advertising. For a minimal amount of money, with a novel idea he has got national BBC coverage all around the United Kingdom promoting South Australia.

You know what else Bill Muirhead did with that 'Sod Staines' and 'Stuff London buses and house prices'? I do not have the exact figures but, from memory, he said to me that we got about £1 million worth of free advertising for a cost of only a matter of a few tens of thousands of dollars, because that program went international—I think it went international. It was the subject of massive talkback, and it was in the newspapers and on TV. Bill Muirhead is an advertising genius, who is promoting our state in a way that we could never, ever afford. How about we get behind Bill Muirhead and say, 'Thank you very much for promoting our state and doing it so cheaply, so innovatively and so successfully.'

MATERNITY LEAVE

The Hon. S.W. KEY (Ashford) (15:28): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. S.W. KEY: Yesterday, in grievances, I was discussing the ongoing campaign for paid maternity leave for Australian women workers. I referred to the International Labour Organisation (ILO) Maternity Protection Convention 183, including article 10: Breastfeeding Mothers. Article 10 provides:

1. A woman shall be provided with the right to one or more daily breaks or daily reduction of hours of work to breastfeed her child.

2. The period during nursing breaks or the reduction of daily hours of work are allowed. The number and duration of nursing breaks and the procedure for the reduction of daily hours shall be determined by national law

and practice. These breaks or the reduction of daily hours of work shall be counted as working time and remunerated accordingly.

As has been pointed out to me, this article does not specify the right to express milk along with breastfeeding, as I said yesterday. I apologise to the house for mixing up the claim for reasonable and practical provisions to assist working parents, particularly mothers, with the specifics of the ILO article.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

ADELAIDE PARK LANDS BILL

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:29): Today, I bring to the attention of the house correspondence to the Speaker of the House of Assembly (Hon. Jack Snelling MP) from the Adelaide Parklands Preservation Association which has come to my attention. The letter was sent subsequent to debate on the Adelaide Park Lands Bill. I refer to it because it raises a very concerning issue and, as the government is proposing to build the Marjorie Jackson-Nelson Hospital, where processes will need to be undertaken to satisfy legislation, both in the preparation of reports and the receiving and tabling of reports in this parliament, I think it is important that we understand that the minister who has the lead in relation to this matter (the Minister for Health) is the subject of this correspondence. He was also responsible for the jurisdiction covering the Adelaide Park Lands Bill 2005. The author of the correspondence wrote to the Speaker of this House claiming, as follows:

> ...statements made by The Hon. John Hill, M.P., during the second reading debate of the Adelaide Park Lands Bill on Tuesday 29 November 2005 do not reflect the facts of the matter. In my opinion the statements by the Minister are so contrary to the facts that I believe them to be misleading to the Parliament.

The letter goes on to detail the claimed part of *Hansard* that records the statement by the minister (the Minister for Health). *Hansard* records:

> The city council supports it, the government supports it, the opposition supports it and the Parklands Preservation Association supports it.

The letter goes on to confirm that as a member of the Adelaide Parklands Preservation Association the author was present at the meeting of the association held on 17 April 2005, in which the following resolution was passed, 'That APPA oppose the Adelaide Parklands Bill 2005.'

The author of the letter goes on to claim that the minutes record that and, in fact, what the minutes record (which is quite extraordinary) is that the minister himself was present at the meeting and, indeed, spoke in opposition of the motion. The letter goes on to state that the motion stood and 'it has not since been rescinded'. The letter also brings to the attention of the Speaker:

> Furthermore, when Hon. John Hill MP made the categorisation which is recorded in the House of Assembly *Hansard* on 29 November 2005, that whilst there were 'unbalanced people who have different views' and that 'the majority of sensible people supports the legislation', the minister failed to disclose to the house his knowledge of the fact that the report of the Adelaide Parklands Management Review evidences the majority opposed to the joint government ACC management model.

And the letter goes on. It also details the launching of the report, and the author claims to have been present at Rymill Park, in the presence of the minister, when this report was launched, in fact, by the minister.

The contents of this letter are very concerning. I am informed by the constituent that the Speaker, quite properly, responded to advise that it was a matter which he did not have jurisdiction to take up, but that it should be taken up with the minister. Well, of course, that is like asking Caesar to review Caesar on these things. That is, 'Dear minister, why did you mislead the parliament? Why did you tell them this when you were present at the meeting which recorded the motion to which you spoke to oppose and which recorded, in fact, that it was quite inconsistent with what you said in the parliament?'

It is interesting to note—and it is probably why the minister was able to attend—that he was a member of the APPA at the time. Why is this so important? It is so important because this is the same minister who is in charge of the process of ensuring that Parklands obligations under our legislation are complied with in the process of developing the Marjorie Jackson-Nelson Hospital.

Time expired.

CYS, MR K.M.

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (15:34): Keith Martin Cys was a Florey resident who, unfortunately, passed away on 2 September of this year. On behalf of many who knew and respected Keith and his commitment to working people, I attended his funeral and am indebted to his grandson, Mark Slatter, for his wonderfully moving eulogy that day, much of which I would now like to share with the house.

As a new resident to Modbury in 1975, it was not long before I met Keith and, much as Mark remembered as a child, I learnt that Keith was 'a living legend in the trade union movement, not only in his native South Australia but across the nation', and 'a giant of the union movement who refused to shrink'. He even earnt a chapter in the 2007 book, *Movers and Shakers,* on activists who made a difference in South Australia.

To go back to the beginning, Keith was born on 26 June 1926 at Unley, South Australia, to Arthur Jacobus Cys, a Dutchman who migrated to Australia in 1912, and Edith Anne (nee Aitchison), whose ancestors were of Scottish origin. The young Keith came to consciousness as the Roaring Twenties collapsed, along with the stock market, into the Great Depression: ironic when you think what times the world faces at the time of his passing.

He began his schooling at Thebarton Primary in 1931, moving on to Hindmarsh, Cowandilla and Sturt Street schools, where he completed year 7, but the economic necessities of the times forced him out into the workforce after only one year at Thebarton Technical High School. Despite his limited formal education, he went on to achieve much, and hold his own with politicians, business leaders and union heads. His employment began doing odd jobs in a tailor's shop for 10 shillings a week. He then found work as a junior 'improver' with butchering firm Turners Limited, but once again events in the world at large were shaping his destiny.

The grey years of the Depression developed into the storm clouds of World War II and in 1941 Keith's father, Arthur, quit his job at the Shell Company and joined the 7th Division AIF to sail to the Middle East. He saw active service in Syria and later returned to the Pacific to help turn back the Japanese in New Guinea. Anxious to join his father in the war effort, Keith had to wait until his 18th birthday in 1944, signing up a fortnight later with the RAAF as a technical trainee. After ground crew training in Victoria, he completed courses as an armourer and then an air gunner and became a waist gunner on a Liberator Bomber, but the mushroom clouds over Nagasaki and Hiroshima ended the war before his squadron flew out for active service. Keith said:

> At the time, like so many other young Aussies, I thought that life had cheated me, but the older I became, the more I realised just how lucky I had been.

He saw service in Borneo with the No. 24 Squadron after the war and was discharged in June 1946, returning to Adelaide in the butchering trade, but chest problems meant he could no longer work in freezers. He got a job as a truck delivery driver for Harris Scarfe, taught himself to drive double-articulated trucks and joined K.W. Thomas—soon to become Thomas National Transport (TNT).

Around this time, Keith had met an Adelaide girl, Gloria Coule, whom he charmed and married on 24 April 1948. In July 1949, they had their first daughter, Annette Denise, and in August 1951 their second, Pamela Lorraine. They purchased a block at Plympton Park and Keith built the house with his own hands, with Gloria assisting. In 1964, he joined Mayne Nickless as a driver, and took up the offer of becoming a yard delegate for the union, a move that was to shape his life in the years to come. He stood for the branch committee of management in 1965 and, three years later, was elected as an organiser for the South Australian Branch of the Transport Workers Union, responsible for Adelaide's southern area and later the Port area.

He was appointed a senior organiser in 1970 and in 1972 South Australian branch representative on the Federal Council of the TWU. By 1975, the South Australian branch made him the senior organiser assisting the branch secretary on industrial matters, and on 8 January 1980 he was elected South Australian branch secretary upon the retirement of union legend Jack Nyland, a position he was to hold until his retirement on 5 July 1991.

In 1983 and 1984, he was vice-president of the Federal Council of the TWU and in 1989-90 he served as federal president. He was also a member of the executive committee of the SA United Trades and Labour Council from 1982 to 1991, and president in 1989. Renowned for his honesty and integrity, Keith was a tough but straight talking union chief, and his 23 years of service were recognised in 1992 when he was made a member of the Order of Australia (General Division)

for service to the trade union movement and to the community. This was his proudest achievement in his working life and made even sweeter by the fact that his honour was of a higher degree than the one awarded to his father several years earlier.

Keith continued to serve the community in retirement on the South Australian Road Safety Advisory Council, the Commercial Transport Advisory Committee, the South Australian Waste Management Commission, the South Australian Taxi Board and the Modbury Hospital Board. Last year, Keith slipped into the fog of dementia and his family only caught brief glimpses of his former intellect, although I am told he smiled with delight upon hearing of the defeat of John Howard, but warned he felt both parties had shifted to the right.

Keith always acknowledged that he could not have committed so much time to the union movement without the support of his first wife, Gloria. She kept up his spirits during the long hours of negotiations which took their toll, while, at the same time, bringing up his daughters. After the sudden death of Gloria in 1985, Keith was lucky enough to find love once again. Meeting through a mutual love of music, Keith married Noeline on 18 October 1986, and they were together until Keith's death. Keith is remembered as a loving and fun-filled grandfather. He survived to see the birth of his great-grandchildren, Zach, Jake and Madison.

Time expired.

WATER POLICY

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop) (15:39): Yesterday I congratulated the government on adopting some of the Liberal Party's policies regarding helping Riverland horticulturalists. Today I will talk a little more about the project that the government announced yesterday but put it in the context of the way this government operates, because this government is operating in a very ad hoc manner. It has no plan for the future, and that is why Riverland horticulturalists are worried about their future. Riverland communities—and when I say the 'Riverland', I am including the Murraylands and the people around the Lower Lakes—have been treated extremely poorly by this government and received very little support. The reality is that it is the ad hoc nature of the way this government approaches these people, manages the drought, the low river flows and the impact it is having on those horticulturalists and the associated communities.

Let me explain. We all know that this government is about spin. Everything it does is about spin. I will read into *Hansard* a letter published in *The Advertiser* yesterday. The letter is headed 'Cheap government' and it states:

> I for one defend the Rann government's investment in spin doctors. Clearly it is far less costly to make it look as though you're doing something than to actually do it.
>
> Obviously, the more that needs to be done, the more spin doctors it's going to take to make it look as though things are being done.
>
> If the illusion costs $18 million a year, just imagine what the reality would cost. We should congratulate the Rann government on such ruthless pursuit of efficiency.

The letter is signed by Rob Silva of Houghton. It is a well-written letter which aptly describes this government. This government describes itself as 'acting now for the future'. If the government was acting now for the future, if it had done it at any time in the seven years it has been in office, we would not have the sort of thing that is happening today in the Riverland, Murraylands and Lower Lakes.

On Adelaide radio this morning, when asked about the two packages—one to give money to people to exit the horticultural industries in the Riverland and Murraylands and the other to support people to stay—the Minister for Water Security said 'the two packages are very closely linked'. In the *Sunday Mail*, only one of those two packages was announced; that is, the package to give money to irrigators and horticulturalists to exit the industry. There was no mention over the weekend of support for people to stay in the industry.

In the *Sunday Mail*, the Premier described the initiative as 'the last piece of the jigsaw to help the Riverland'. On Sunday, the last piece of the jigsaw was to give them some exit money—to take the $150,000 per property from the commonwealth government—so the people would leave the industry. Once they had sold their water and ripped out their permanent plantings—the grapevines and fruit trees—they could possibly get another $10,000. That was the last piece of the jigsaw as far as this government was concerned—this government which is acting now for the future. The last piece of the jigsaw was to give a financial incentive to people so they would sell their water to the federal government and exit the industry.

What would be the impact of that on communities in the Riverland? Hundreds of millions of dollars worth of production and many hundreds of millions of dollars of value-adding would be lost in those communities. Obviously, at the cabinet meeting on Monday, ministers looked at each other and said, 'What have we done?' On Tuesday they came out with the new policy: 'We will give a few dollars to people so they will stay.'

This is from a Premier who signed a historic agreement on 3 July. My question to the Premier is: how many rice growers in Deniliquin will be forced to sell their water and get out of the industry? Why is it that horticulturalists in South Australia have been given virtually no choice and large incentives to get out of the industry yet rice and cotton growers in New South Wales will survive this drought and produce rice and cotton in the future, when our communities in the Riverland and Murraylands are shutting down because they have received no support from this government?

Time expired.

PUBLIC TRANSPORT

Mr O'BRIEN (Napier) (15:45): In many cities around the world public transport within the city centre—the CBD and adjacent residential areas—is the responsibility of the local government authority. Movement of people into the city from the suburbs or countryside is the responsibility of state or national governments, but within the city the buses, trams or metros are run by city hall. London is a prime example where the underground is run by the City of London. San Francisco is another, where the bay area is serviced by the state of California's heavy rail BART system, but the cable cars, light rail and buses running in downtown San Francisco are managed by the Municipal Transport Authority.

In Portland, Oregon—a North American city of a scale more in keeping with that of Adelaide—the light rail and bus networks linking the suburbs of Portland are run by TriMet (a corporation of the state of Oregon), while light rail within downtown Portland—the Portland streetcar—is operated by the City of Portland.

The Portland Streetcar Project is an inspirational story and shows what a 'can do' local government administration is able to achieve when it sets its sights high. The Portland streetcar (or tram in our parlance) is a new project that opened in 2001. It runs on a 13 kilometre L-shaped loop that services most of downtown Portland, including several large areas that were formally run down warehousing and workshop precincts. It intentionally intersects the light rail lines from the suburbs at several points allowing suburban commuters to move then within downtown Portland to their places of employment or to the reinvigorated retail centre.

The central foci of the City of Portland in developing the Portland Streetcar Project were to promote investment at the city's core, encourage population growth within the core and support the urban amenities that, in their words, make great cities great. As of April this year $3.5 billion has been invested within two blocks of the streetcar alignment, which comprise 10,212 new housing units and 5.4 million square feet of office, institutional, retail and hotel construction. Prior to 1997 land located within one block of the yet to be built streetcar alignment captured just 19 per cent of all investment within the CBD.

Since the streetcar alignment was identified, 55 per cent of all new development has occurred within one block of the streetcar. Interestingly, developers are building new residential buildings with significantly lower parking ratios than anywhere else in the region, meaning that households are opting for one car or no car because of the convenience afforded by close proximity to the streetcar route. Ridership is nearly treble the projected ridership target of 3,500, hitting 9,000 riders each day in the fall of 2005. Total construction cost was $US103 million. How similar the strategic objectives of the City of Portland and the City of Adelaide.

In its Creating Our Future 2008-30 document, the City of Adelaide calls for an increase in the daily population of workers, students, visitors and residents by 50 per cent to 300,000 by the year 2030. The city also proposes a fleet of solar and green-powered buses and trams to carry people around the city. Adelaide City Council has unequivocally chosen a vision of a more vibrant, more populated city based on readily accessible public transport. I believe that Adelaide City Council has the financial wherewithal to realise this vision.

Its balance sheet is in excellent shape with total assets and, most importantly, total equity sitting at over $1 billion. Its borrowings sit at a very conservative $38.6 million (I am talking about long-term debt not overdraft). An eight kilometre track looping through the square mile using public

work committee report figures for the cost of a tram line per kilometre would come in at around $100 million. This would be a 10 per cent growth in the council's asset base—ambitious, but, like the project undertaken by the City of Portland, manageable. A line to North Adelaide could come later.

Time expired.

SELLICKS HILL/MYPONGA WIND FARM

Mr PENGILLY (Finniss) (15:50): I want to spend my few minutes this afternoon talking about the proposed Sellicks Hill/Myponga wind farm which was granted major project status some years ago. This project has been running around for five or six years. It has caused major concerns down on the plains country. Indeed, last week, the Yankalilla council moved a motion opposing the development. The scope of the development has changed so substantially from where it first was. The whole scenario has changed so much that, in my view and in the view of a great number of people down south, the thing should be stopped dead in its tracks.

I have had discussions with the appropriate minister and I know where he is coming from. I am not going to talk about that in here, but I do raise the issue in the house and put it on the record because five years is a long time. As I suggested, the whole scope, the size, the structure and the wind tower fans have all changed. I am a great supporter and a great advocate for alternative forms of power, particularly wind power. Indeed, the first wind farm in the state was in my electorate, at Starfish Hill near Cape Jervis, which was instigated by the former member for Bright, the Hon. Wayne Matthew.

However, time is up on this one. We cannot allow over five years to pass with no action taking place. My view is that the company, Trust Power, has had adequate time; far too much time. It has fiddled and fluffed around and done nothing. It has not done any substantive work whatsoever. For the residents near the site, not only do they have that as their view but there is impact from the noise to many sensitive ears. It is not widely known, but you can see the fans up there spinning around and the high intensity noise impacts on a considerable number of people.

The fact that the proposal has been varied so many times, that it is still sitting there and that nothing has happened is of major concern to me. It is of major concern to my constituents and also to constituents of other members on the plains. I met with a substantial group of people last Friday who asked me to raise the issue in the parliament. They want to know what is going on. They are very much of the belief that it should not go ahead, that five years is far too long and that time is up for Trust Power. There are serious questions about the involvement of different people in that project and serious questions are being asked about the relationship between some of the proponents, the PR and members of the government that are of concern, but I do not know how far that has really gone, quite frankly.

Research that has been conducted internationally since the original approval by the minister indicates that there is clear potential for negative health impacts caused by modern industrial wind farms in proximity to people. The other thing that the state government has done is change the urban growth boundaries substantially. Even members who reside in the metropolitan area are aware that the large expanses of paddocks down south that are owned by the government, by the LMC, are all going to fill up with residential development, in due course.

I put on the record also that I am aware that there are people who are quite happy with the wind farm, and that is always the case. But I am also aware that a petition produced some years ago is somewhat false and really does not hold true, and that there was some coercion and all sorts of things to get signatures on that petition and that, in itself, is of concern. Far more people are living in proximity to the proposed wind farm than were included in the original assessment by Planning SA. The group that I spoke to the other day have since been to see the EPA, and the EPA did not fill them with much hope of any sensible outcome whatsoever. Some of the things that were produced by the public officers within the EPA were seriously at variance with the approval process for the current proposed wind farm at Myponga\Sellicks Beach, so that worries them.

Time expired.

MEMBER'S REMARKS

Mr BIGNELL (Mawson) (15:55): First, I will correct something that the member for Finniss said. He said that the first wind farm in South Australia was started by the former member for Bright, Wayne Matthew. That is not correct. When we came to power in 2002, there were no wind farms in South Australia and the proposal for a wind farm at Starfish Hill—

Mr Pengilly interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr PENGILLY: I seek clarification on whether it—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Member for Finniss, I think that you might be seeking to make a personal explanation, which you do at the end of the member's contribution. The member for Mawson.

Mr BIGNELL: The proposal by Tarong Energy—a division of the Queensland government's energy arm—had actually reached a stalemate here in South Australia, because the government could not get agreement between government departments. I was actually there when the new Minister for Energy (Pat Conlon) sat the three different departments down in an office and explained to them that this was something that the new government in South Australia was very keen to do; that is, install wind energy in South Australia. In the eight and a half years that the Liberals were in government, they did not install a single wind farm. As we see today, we now have more wind farms installed, or on the drawing books, than every other state in Australia combined. It is wrong to claim credit for things that were not done by the previous government and the former member for Bright.

In the first speech that I made in this place in 2006, the very first person I thanked was a guy called Robert Brokenshire, the former member for Mawson, whom I defeated in the 2006 election. I find it quite amazing that, two and a half years later, Robert still does not seem able to get over the fact that he lost. We have all heard him on talkback radio, when he rings in from his tractor suffering attention deficit disorder, a little bit like another former member of this place, Mark Brindal. They always start with, 'When I was the minister—'. These people just cannot seem to get over the fact that they do not hold ministerial positions any more.

Up until recently, Robert Brokenshire did not hold a seat in parliament. He has now taken a casual vacancy in the upper house representing Family First. He was so desperate to get back in here that he changed parties. There are a lot of Liberals down in Mawson who are not very happy with the way he has carried on, and I know that some people in here, who used to sit alongside him, are not happy with him either. He is in there representing what is supposed to be a Christian party.

By way of contrast, when I came in, the very first person I thanked was Robert Brokenshire, his wife Mandy and their three children. In the very first week that Robert Brokenshire was in the upper house, he actually had a go at me about presenting a petition in here. He asked whether or not it went against the Australian Labor Party policy. Well, he should know; he was the local member for Mawson for 12½ years. He should know that, when residents of the seat that you represent come to you with petitions, it does not matter whether or not you agree with those petitions, you agree with their right to have those petitions lodged in this parliament; and you bring them in and present them.

Yesterday and again on radio today, Robert Brokenshire has criticised me for giving out certificates to primary school kids in the electorate. I made these certificates up after consultation with principals, teachers and parents of students in schools in my electorate. If Mr Brokenshire had himself spent some time in the schools, he would understand that that is what you do: you go out and put up suggestions to the schools. In this case, they said they would love to have the certificates, so I went ahead and printed them at a cost of 7¢ per certificate.

Mr Brokenshire says that this is an inappropriate use of taxpayers' money. He is the guy who should know; he is the guy who was the subject of an auditor-general's inquiry when he spent money set aside for a helicopter to build an ambulance station at McLaren Vale—an ambulance station for which he had no funding for ambulances, ambulance officers, stretchers, defibrillators, or anything else. This is the guy who wants to have a go at me for providing things for the children of Mawson when he was the subject of an auditor-general's inquiry. He was also the subject of an investigation into using public servants to go out doorknocking for him during an election campaign. This is a bloke who purportedly comes in representing a Christian party, but not acting in a very Christian way.

I might remind the former member for Mawson, Mr Brokenshire, that he might have been out there trying to help his mate, Kym Richardson, and deflect a little bit of attention from the poo that he was in yesterday when the company, of which he is CEO, let private health records fly all over Huntfield Heights.

Time expired.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (PROHIBITION OF HUMAN CLONING FOR REPRODUCTION AND REGULATION OF RESEARCH INVOLVING HUMAN EMBRYOS) BILL

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Kaurna—Minister for Health, Minister for the Southern Suburbs, Minister Assisting the Premier in the Arts) (16:00): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Prohibition of Human Cloning Act 2003 and the Research Involving Human Embryos Act 2003. Read a first time.

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Kaurna—Minister for Health, Minister for the Southern Suburbs, Minister Assisting the Premier in the Arts) (16:01): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Parliament is being asked to consider amendments to the South Australian *Prohibition of Human Cloning Act 2003* and *Research Involving Human Embryos Act 2003* to bring these Acts into line with the equivalent recently amended Commonwealth Acts. The amendments to both Acts are contained in a single Bill, the *Statutes Amendment (Prohibition of Human Cloning for Reproduction and Regulation of Research Involving Human Embryos) Bill 2008*, and it is proposed that they be considered in a cognate debate.

Human cloning and embryo research legislation has been subject to a conscience vote in every jurisdiction, including in the South Australian Parliament, when the Bills for these Acts were first debated in 2003. This Bill raises important moral and ethical questions that require deep consideration, and I note that both major parties have accorded their members a conscience vote on the amendments to the South Australian laws.

The national scheme and recent changes

The Commonwealth Acts were passed in 2002, and the South Australian Parliament passed equivalent legislation in 2003. The original Commonwealth legislation prohibited the creation of embryos for research, allowed research using embryos donated to research by couples who had completed their infertility treatment, but restricted what could be done with such embryos; the current South Australian laws are consistent with this original model.

The Commonwealth legislation, together with equivalent legislation in all States and Territories and the National Health and Medical Research Council Embryo Research Licensing Committee, creates a national legislative scheme for prohibiting human cloning and regulating embryo research. This national scheme regulates the use of human embryos that are excess to fertility treatment and hybrid embryos, but not animal embryos nor human embryonic stem cells. The Commonwealth amendments extended the national scheme to also regulate embryos created by means other than fertilisation and human eggs used for such processes. In South Australia, clinical reproductive medicine practice is separately regulated by the *Reproductive Technology (Clinical Practices) Act 1988*.

The national scheme needs to be responsive to developments in technology and shifts in community attitudes and standards. For that reason, the Commonwealth Prohibition of Human Cloning Act and the Research Involving Human Embryos Act included requirements for a 3-year review. The Review, chaired by the late John Lockhart AO QC, was conducted in 2005 and held consultations around the country. South Australian experts, academics and community representatives contributed to the inquiry.

On the basis of their consultations and background research, including into community attitudes to embryo research, the Lockhart Review made 54 wide ranging recommendations. The Review proposed changes to legislation to extend embryo research to allow the creation of embryos for research, but recommended that the prohibition on the creation of embryos by fertilisation for any purpose other than assisted reproductive medicine procedures be retained. They also recommended that certain research procedures be permitted on embryos created through laboratory techniques, but not on embryos created by the fertilisation of an egg by a sperm. Most of the recommendations aimed to streamline current processes for embryo research licensing and to strengthen oversight.

The recommendations of the Lockhart Review were referred to the Australian Parliament and the Council of Australian Governments in December 2005. Some recommendations required changes to legislation while others related to national policies and procedures. A Private Member's Bill tabled by Senator the Hon Kay Patterson reflected almost all the Lockhart Review's recommendations for legislative changes and was passed by the Australian Parliament on 12 December 2006. The Commonwealth amendments were promulgated on 12 June 2007.

Human reproductive cloning remains prohibited in Australia. The Commonwealth amendments retained limitations on research and training using embryos created by fertilisation, but now permit the creation of embryos for research by means other than fertilisation whilst prohibiting the implantation or development of any embryo created in a laboratory for more than 14 days.

Corresponding Act status

The Commonwealth legislation makes provision for the Minister for Health and Ageing to declare a State or Territory Act corresponding for the purposes of the national scheme. State and Territory laws rely on the NHMRC Licensing Committee established under the Commonwealth legislation to licence embryo research. Only a

corresponding State law can effectively confer regulatory powers and functions on the NHMRC Embryo Licensing Committee.

When the Commonwealth amendments came into force on 12 June 2007 the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister for Health and Ageing advised that he had revoked the previous declaration. The South Australian *Research Involving Human Embryos Act 2003* then ceased to be a 'corresponding Act', so the NHMRC Embryo Licensing Committee can no longer exercise functions under the State Act. If the Act is amended, South Australia will need to ask the Minister for Health and Ageing to determine whether the State Act is corresponding and make a new declaration. This Bill has been drafted to amend South Australian laws to make them substantially the same as equivalent interstate laws (where amendments have already been made). It is expected the amended legislation would be regarded as corresponding with the amended Commonwealth laws.

At the meeting of the Council of Australian Governments in April 2007, the Premier of South Australia, together with his colleagues from all Australian jurisdictions, signed an Agreement that commits all State and Territory leaders to use their best endeavours to introduce corresponding legislation into their legislatures by 12 June 2008 and for all parties to maintain nationally consistent arrangements over time.

State and Territory governments are considering the relevant Commonwealth amendments and their implications for local laws. The Victorian, New South Wales and Queensland Parliaments have amended their equivalent legislation, and Tasmania and Western Australia have tabled amendment Bills. This Parliament now has an opportunity to consider changes to these challenging but important laws.

Coverage of Commonwealth and State laws

Why do we need both State and Commonwealth legislation? Commonwealth legislative powers are not wide enough to cover all agencies and individuals in South Australia that might possibly undertake reproductive technology activities or human embryo research. In summary, the Commonwealth laws cover Australian Government authorities, constitutional corporations, and trade and commerce. The Commonwealth laws do not cover South Australian Government agencies, non-trading corporations nor individuals operating outside a trading corporation; these are covered only by the South Australian Acts.

The South Australian and national laws are currently different; embryos can be created under Commonwealth laws that would be unlawful under State law. As Members would know, the section 109 of the *Australian Constitution* provides that *when a law of a State is inconsistent with a law of the Commonwealth, the latter shall prevail, and the former shall, to the extent of the inconsistency, be invalid*. Since 12 June this year, South Australian researchers regulated under the Commonwealth Acts have been able to apply for a licence under the Commonwealth legislation to conduct research that is currently not permitted by State legislation. The corresponding Act declaration has been revoked, so researchers covered only by South Australian Acts are currently not permitted to seek a licence from the NHMRC Licensing Committee.

All current South Australian human reproductive medicine and embryo research and training activity is being conducted within either a corporation (Repromed laboratories) or a university (the University of Adelaide Medical School laboratories). It is thought to be unlikely that future research or training proposals will emanate from facilities that are not a university, a research institute or a corporation. There is, however, some legal uncertainty about whether our universities are constitutional corporations and are therefore facilities covered by the Commonwealth legislation.

To date, no South Australian researchers have sought a licence to conduct human embryo research, but have focussed their efforts on either animal embryos or human embryonic stem cell lines developed elsewhere which do not require a licence. However research teams are planning to apply for such research licences in the near future, and since embryonic stem cell research is often conducted as part of national collaborations, legal clarity and national consistency is important.

If Parliament does not pass this Amendment Bill, then researchers will still be able to apply for a licence to conduct research that is legal under the Commonwealth Acts provided they are clearly operating within a corporation. However the capacity of researchers operating within the university environment to contribute to national research collaborations may be compromised if their legal status remains uncertain.

Amending the South Australian Prohibition on Human Cloning Act and the Research Involving Human Embryos Act to ensure consistency with the equivalent Commonwealth Acts will ensure that, wherever they conduct their work, all South Australian researchers will be covered by substantially identical legislation, providing regulatory consistency where the legal coverage of Commonwealth and State laws is considered uncertain.

Summary of the proposed amendments

The proposed amendments mirror the changes to the Commonwealth laws and apply them to the South Australian Prohibition on Human Cloning Act and the Research Involving Human Embryos Act. The Bill retains a prohibition against human reproductive cloning, which is universally unacceptable, and a strict licensing, monitoring and compliance regime. Not all the Commonwealth amendments need to be reflected in the South Australian Acts as some relate only to the activities of the NHMRC Embryo Licensing Committee established under the Commonwealth legislation.

The Bill amends each Act to include a new definition of an embryo that changes the point of identification from the *commencement* of fertilisation (which is impracticable to ascertain) to its *completion* (which is detectable microscopically). The Bill extends the scope to regulate the creation, development and use of all embryos, not just excess ART embryos, and to regulate the use of donated eggs (oocytes).

The amendments differentiate between embryos created by fertilisation of an egg by a sperm for the purpose of creating a baby, and embryos created by technical manipulation of cells and DNA for research and potential therapies. For clarity I will refer to embryos created by fertilisation as *reproductive embryos* and embryos created by technical manipulation as *research embryos*.

Creating reproductive embryos for research purposes remains prohibited; they can only be created for the purpose of establishing a pregnancy but couples undergoing infertility treatment will still be able to donate their excess embryos to research.

Strict legislated criteria must be met before a licence will be issued to create research embryos; implanting embryos not created through fertilisation is prohibited.

Neither reproductive embryos nor research embryos will be able to be developed for more than 14 days in a laboratory; this is the point at which the rudimentary nervous system—the 'primitive streak'—first appears.

The amendments required to the SA *Prohibition of Human Cloning Act 2003* to ensure it corresponds with the amended Commonwealth Act include:

- changing the name to reflect that it is reproductive cloning that will be prohibited; and
- increasing penalties for breaching prohibitions to 15 years; and
- reclassifying prohibited practices into those completely prohibited and those prohibited unless authorised by a licence.

In general, prohibitions on using reproductive embryos for research will be retained. The 'embryo parents' decide whether to donate their excess embryos to research and the type of research to which they are prepared to donate them, and can set binding conditions on researchers when they consent to their use.

Creating a chimera by adding components of an animal cell to a human embryo and implanting any type of human embryo in an animal will remain completely prohibited. Creating embryos with genetic material from more than two persons or from precursor cells will remain completely prohibited for reproductive embryos, but permitted for research embryos under licence.

Creating hybrid embryos by combining human and animal cells will remain completely prohibited, with the single exception of a diagnostic test for sperm quality which will be permitted only under licence in reproductive medicine clinics. A licence will be permissible for using animal eggs to test the fertilisation capacity of sperm, but embryo development will only be permitted in this case until a detectable change indicates a result, which is the first cell division on day 2.

The amendments required to the SA Research Involving Human Embryos Act 2003 to ensure it corresponds with the amended Commonwealth Act include:

- extending criteria for licences issued for research and training to include the use of embryos not created by fertilisation; and
- clarifying what constitutes *proper consent* by donors and *embryos unsuitable for implantation*.

Somatic cell nuclear transfer and other research techniques

The Bill will legalise the creation of embryos under a licence by a range of laboratory techniques now allowed under the amended Commonwealth Acts.

These will include:

- somatic cell nuclear transfer or SCNT, where the nucleus of a human egg is replaced by the nucleus of a somatic cell (a cell from a human body) and the resultant cell is stimulated to develop for 5 to 7 days to blastocyst stage when embryonic stem cells can be removed; and
- parthenogenesis, where a human embryo could potentially be formed by stimulating a human egg to undergo spontaneous activation; such embryos may have the capacity for limited development.

SCNT was used to create 'Dolly' the sheep, but since development past 14 days and implantation of such embryos will be prohibited, SCNT in humans will only be licensed to derive embryonic stem cells or for laboratory research, not to produce babies.

Embryonic stem cell research seeks to generate patient-matched stem cells for research to enable development of specific cellular therapies with the potential to overcome problems such as tissue rejection, so this process is sometimes called 'therapeutic cloning'. SCNT will also allow the development of embryonic stem cells containing specific disease genes, which may assist better understanding of the causes of disease and identification of drugs and treatments.

Excess ART embryos are not suitable for this type of research because stem cells derived from ART embryos would not be a genetic 'match' to the patients for whom potential cellular therapies were being developed or would not carry the disease in question. However, maintaining and improving the quality and safety of infertility treatment and procedures and minimising the risks to children born of assisted reproductive medicine relies upon excess reproductive embryos generously donated by parents to research and training.

Protections

The *Research Involving Human Embryos Act 2003* will retain its stringent licensing and reporting requirements. Before the NHMRC Embryo Licensing Committee issues a licence for research, diagnostic testing or training, very strict criteria must be met, including:

- research ethics approval from the local Human Research Ethics Committee; and
- restricting the number of embryos to that likely to be necessary for the project; and
- the likelihood of significant advance in knowledge, treatment technologies or other applications from the proposed project; and
- evidence of proper informed consent by those donating cells or embryos and their partners; and
- accounting for every embryo licensed and abiding by conditions set by donors; and
- transparent reporting requirements.

The Bill does not change any of these criteria, but strengthens and extends the consent provisions to include all donors whose genetic material is incorporated in the cells used, and their spouses if the embryo is a reproductive embryo.

The Commonwealth Amendment Bill extended the monitoring, oversight and search provisions for NHMRC inspectors. However, the amendments required to State laws are minimal because the South Australian provisions are already more comprehensive than those in other jurisdictions' legislation.

NHMRC Guidelines

Researchers and clinicians are required under Commonwealth and State law to abide by guidelines issued by the NHMRC. The NHMRC has produced criteria to define embryos unsuitable for implantation, and recently revised and released their *National Statement* and their *Ethical Guidelines on the Use of Assisted Reproductive Technology in Clinical Practice and Research*, which are referenced in the South Australian *Research Involving Human Embryos Act 2003*.

A clause was added during the Act's passage in 2003 requiring that any NHMRC guideline or policy referenced in the legislation be tabled in Parliament within 3 sitting days from changes taking effect and referred to the Parliamentary Social Development Committee, both initially and each time it is changed. This requirement is unique to South Australia.

The NHMRC reviews and revises its guidelines routinely every 5 years and South Australia keenly engages in its national consultations. The Social Development Committee considered revised NHMRC Ethical Guidelines in 2005, and will consider further revisions to both the NHMRC Ethical Guidelines and the National Statement in 2007. The Social Development Committee cannot in fact change nationally agreed guidelines issued under the Commonwealth *NHMRC Act*.

The Bill retains the requirement for relevant new or revised NHMRC guidelines to be tabled in Parliament and referred to the Social Development Committee, but extends the time period from 3 to 6 sitting days (which is the usual period in South Australian legislation) from commencement of their operation to allow final printed copies to be procured for tabling in the Parliament.

National consistency and transparency

This is an area of rapid change, not only in research capability but also in community attitudes and standards. Governments and Parliaments have a responsibility to encourage high quality and ethically sound scientific research and medical practice. Society generally needs to be assured that research that uses embryos is strictly regulated under a coherent national scheme. South Australia hosts a recognised centre of excellence for infertility research at the University of Adelaide, and scientists and researchers are seeking the surety of nationally consistent regulation and licensing so the public can be confident that they operate according to nationally endorsed legal and ethical standards, with strict oversight and monitoring and transparent accountability requirements.

This Bill will ensure that further advances in this field are made within a responsible regulatory framework with strong oversight and protections and transparent public reporting. The Commonwealth Acts provide for a further review in 3 years, allowing for continuing Parliamentary oversight into the future.

An explanatory guide with more detailed explanations and fact sheets for the public have been prepared and are available on the Department of Health website.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Explanation of Clauses

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Commencement

3—Amendment provisions

These clauses are formal.

Part 2—Amendment of *Prohibition of Human Cloning Act 2003*

4—Amendment of long title

5—Amendment of section 1—Short title

These clauses amend the long and short titles of the Act to reflect the fact that the Act, as amended by this measure, will no longer prohibit the creation of human embryos for research purposes.

6—Amendment of section 3—Interpretation

This clause amends section 3 of the Act to replace the existing definition of *human embryo* with a new definition developed by the NHMRC. It also clarifies that 'human embryo' refers to a living embryo only and does not include a human embryonic stem cell line or a hybrid embryo, and that a reference to a human oocyte is the same as a reference to a human egg.

7—Substitution of Part 2

This clause substitutes Part 2 of the Act. The new Part contains 2 Divisions. Division 1 deals with practices that are completely prohibited and Division 2 deals with practices that are prohibited without a licence issued by the NHMRC Licensing Committee.

Part 2—Prohibited practices

Division 1—Practices that are completely prohibited

5—Offence—placing a human embryo clone in the human body or the body of an animal

This section makes it an offence for a person to place a human embryo clone in the body of a human or in the body of an animal. The effect of this provision is to ban human cloning for the purposes of reproduction. The maximum penalty is imprisonment for 15 years.

6—No defence that human embryo clone could not survive

This section provides that it is no defence that the human embryo clone did not or could not survive.

7—Offence—creating a human embryo for a purpose other than achieving pregnancy in a woman

This section makes it an offence for a person to create a human embryo by fertilisation of a human egg by a human sperm outside the body of a woman, unless the person's intention in creating the embryo is to attempt to achieve pregnancy in a particular woman. The maximum penalty is imprisonment for 15 years.

8—Offence—creating or developing a human embryo by fertilisation that contains genetic material provided by more than 2 persons

This section makes it an offence for a person to create or develop a human embryo by fertilisation of a human egg by a human sperm outside the body of a woman if the embryo contains genetic material provided by more than 2 persons. The maximum penalty is imprisonment for 15 years.

9—Offence—developing a human embryo outside the body of a woman for more than 14 days

This section makes it an offence for a person to develop a human embryo outside the body of a woman for more than 14 days, excluding any time that the embryo's development is suspended. The maximum penalty is imprisonment for 15 years.

10—Offence—heritable alterations to genome

This section makes it an offence for a person to intentionally alter the genome of a human cell in such a way that the alteration is inheritable by descendants of the human whose cell was altered. The maximum penalty is imprisonment for 15 years.

11—Offence—collecting a viable human embryo from the body of a woman

This section makes it an offence for a person to remove a human embryo from the body of a woman, intending to collect a viable human embryo. The maximum penalty is imprisonment for 15 years.

12—Offence—creating a chimeric embryo

This section makes it an offence for a person to intentionally create a chimeric embryo. The maximum penalty is imprisonment for 15 years. A chimeric embryo is a human embryo into which a cell of an animal, or any component part of a cell of an animal, has been introduced. It includes anything else that is declared by the regulations to be a chimeric embryo.

13—Offence—developing a hybrid embryo

This section makes it an offence for a person to intentionally develop a hybrid embryo for a period of more than 14 days, excluding any period when development is suspended. The maximum penalty is imprisonment for 15 years.

14—Offence—placing of an embryo

This section makes it an offence for a person to intentionally place a human embryo in the body of an animal, or in a part of a human body other than a woman's reproductive tract. It also makes it an offence

to intentionally place an animal embryo in the body of a human for any period of gestation. The maximum penalty is imprisonment for 15 years.

15—Offence—importing, exporting or placing a prohibited embryo

This section makes it an offence for a person to intentionally import an embryo into South Australia knowing that, or reckless as to whether, the embryo is a prohibited embryo. It makes it an offence for a person to intentionally export an embryo from South Australia knowing that, or reckless as to whether, the embryo is a prohibited embryo. The section also makes it an offence for a person to intentionally place an embryo in the body of a woman knowing that, or reckless as to whether, the embryo is a prohibited embryo. The maximum penalty is 15 years.

A prohibited embryo is—

(a) a human embryo created by a process other than the fertilisation of a human egg by human sperm; or

(b) a human embryo created outside the body of a woman, unless the intention of the person who created the embryo was to attempt to achieve pregnancy in a particular woman; or

(c) a human embryo created using human egg and human sperm and containing genetic material provided by more than 2 persons; or

(d) human embryo that has been developing outside the body of a woman for a period of more than 14 days, excluding any period throughout which development is suspended; or

(e) a human embryo created using precursor cells taken from a human embryo or a human fetus; or

(f) a human embryo that contains a human cell whose genome has been altered in such a way that the alteration is heritable by human descendants of the human whose cell was altered; or

(g) a human embryo that was removed from the body of a woman by a person intending to collect a viable human embryo; or

(h) a chimeric embryo or a hybrid embryo.

16—Offence—commercial trading in human eggs, human sperm or human embryos

This section makes it an offence for a person to intentionally give or offer valuable consideration to another person for the supply of a human egg, human sperm or a human embryo, or to intentionally receive, or offer to receive, valuable consideration from another person for the supply of a human egg, human sperm or a human embryo. The maximum penalty is imprisonment for 15 years. However, valuable consideration does not include the payment of reasonable expenses incurred by the person in connection with the supply.

Division 2—Practices that are prohibited unless authorised by a licence

17—Offence—creating a human embryo other than by fertilisation, or developing such an embryo

This section makes it an offence for a person to intentionally create a human embryo by a process other than fertilisation of a human egg by a human sperm, or to develop a human embryo so created, if the creation or development of the embryo by that person is not authorised by a licence. The maximum penalty is imprisonment for 10 years.

18—Offence—creating or developing a human embryo containing genetic material provided by more than 2 persons

This section makes it an offence for a person to intentionally create or develop a human embryo by a process other than fertilisation of a human egg by a human sperm, if the human embryo contains genetic material provided by more than 2 persons and the creation or development of the embryo by that person is not authorised by a licence. The maximum penalty is imprisonment for 10 years.

19—Offence—using precursor cells from a human embryo or a human fetus to create a human embryo, or developing such an embryo

This section makes it an offence for a person to use precursor cells taken from a human embryo or fetus, intending to create a human embryo, or to intentionally develop an embryo so created, if the person does so without being authorised by a licence, and knows or is reckless as to the fact that the person is acting without a licence. The maximum penalty is imprisonment for 10 years.

19A—Offence—creating a hybrid embryo

This section makes it an offence for a person to intentionally create or develop a hybrid embryo. The maximum penalty is imprisonment for 10 years. A person does not commit an offence if the creation or development of the embryo by the person is authorised by a licence.

Part 3—Amendment of *Research Involving Human Embryos Act 2003*

8—Amendment of section 3—Interpretation

This clause amends section 3 of the Act to replace the existing definition of *human embryo* with a new definition developed by the NHMRC. It inserts definitions of *hybrid embryo*, *unsuitable for implantation* and *use*, and substitutes the definitions of *proper consent* and *responsible person*. It clarifies that 'human embryo' refers to a living embryo only and does not include a human embryonic stem cell line or a hybrid embryo, and that a reference to a human oocyte is the same as a reference to a human egg.

9—Substitution of heading to Part 2

This clause substitutes the heading to Part 2 of the Act.

Part 2—Regulation of the use of excess ART embryos, other embryos and human eggs

10—Insertion of sections 5A and 5B

This clause inserts 2 new sections into the Act.

5A—Offence—use of other embryos

This section makes it an offence for a person to intentionally use an embryo if the embryo is—

(a) a human embryo created by a process other than the fertilisation of a human egg by a human sperm; or

(b) a human embryo created by a process other than the fertilisation of a human egg by a human sperm that contains genetic material provided by more than 2 persons; or

(c) a human embryo created using precursor cells taken from a human embryo or a human fetus; or

(d) a hybrid embryo,

and the use is not authorised by a licence. The maximum penalty is imprisonment for 5 years.

5B—Offence—certain activities involving use of human eggs

This section makes it an offence for a person to undertake research or training involving the fertilisation of a human egg by a human sperm up to, but not including, the first mitotic division, outside the body of a woman for the purposes of research or training in ART if the person is not authorised by a licence to undertake the research or training. The maximum penalty is imprisonment for 5 years.

11—Amendment of section 6—Offence—use of embryo that is not an excess ART embryo

This clause amends section 6 of the Act to make it an offence for a person to intentionally use, outside the body of a woman, a human embryo created by fertilisation of a human egg by a human sperm if it is not an excess ART embryo and the use is not for a purpose related to the assisted reproductive technology treatment of a woman carried out by an accredited ART centre under a South Australian clinical practice licence, and the person knows or is reckless as to that fact.

12—Insertion of section 7A

This clause inserts a new provision.

7A—Person not liable for conduct purportedly authorised

This section makes it clear that a person is not criminally responsible for an offence against the Act in respect of particular conduct if—

(a) the conduct by the person is purportedly authorised by a provision of a licence; and

(b) the licence or the provision is invalid, whether because of a technical defect or irregularity or for any other reason; and

(c) the person did not know, and could not reasonably be expected to have known, of the invalidity of the licence or the provision.

13—Amendment of section 10—Person may apply for licence

This clause amends section 10 of the Act to expand the classes of activities for which a licence may be sought. Currently only the use of excess ART embryos may be licensed. Under the proposed changes a person will be able to apply to the NHMRC Licensing Committee for a licence authorising 1 or more of the following:

(a) use of excess ART embryos;

(b) creation of human embryos other than by fertilisation of a human egg by a human sperm, and use of such embryos;

(c) creation of human embryos other than by fertilisation of a human egg by a human sperm that contain genetic material provided by more than 2 persons, and use of such embryos;

(d) creation of human embryos using precursor cells from a human embryo or a human fetus, and use of such embryos;

(e) research and training involving the fertilisation of a human egg by a human sperm up to, but not including, the first mitotic division, outside the body of a woman for the purposes of research or training in ART;

(f) creation of hybrid embryos by the fertilisation of an animal egg by a human sperm, and use of such embryos up to, but not including, the first mitotic division, if—

(i) the creation or use is for the purposes of testing sperm quality; and

(ii) the creation or use will occur in an accredited ART centre.

The section makes it clear that (a), (b), (c) and (d) do not permit the NHMRC Licensing Committee to authorise any use of an excess ART embryo or other embryo that would result in the development of the embryo for a period of more than 14 days, excluding any period when development is suspended.

14—Amendment of section 11—Determination of application by Committee

15—Amendment of section 14—Licence is subject to conditions

The amendments made to sections 11 and 14 of the Act by these clauses are consequential on the amendments to section 10. It ensures that the provisions relating to the determination of applications for licences and the imposition of licence conditions apply in relation to licences authorising activities relating to human eggs and embryos other than excess ART embryos.

16—Amendment of section 16—Suspension or revocation of licence

This clause amends section 16 of the Act to alter the reference to legislation the title of which is amended by this measure.

17—Amendment of section 19—NHMRC Committee to make certain information publicly available

This clause amends section 19 of the Act to require the NHMRC Licensing Committee to include in its licence database the number of ART embryos or human eggs authorised to be used under a licence, and the number of other embryos authorised to be created or used under a licence.

18—Amendment of section 21—Interpretation

This clause amends section 19 of the Act to enable the holder of a licence to apply for a review of a decision to modify NHMRC guidelines in respect of the licence. The relevant guidelines are those issued by the CEO of the NHMRC under Commonwealth legislation and prescribed by regulations under the Commonwealth *Research Involving Human Embryos Act 2002* for the purposes of the definition of 'proper consent' in that Act.

19—Amendment of section 22—Review of decisions

The amendment made to section 22 of the Act by this clause is consequential on the insertion of section 14(8) in the Act.

20—Amendment of section 23—Powers of inspectors

This clause amends section 23 of the Act so that if, during a search of premises, an inspector believes on reasonable grounds that there is at the premises, a human egg or embryo other than a human embryo that may afford evidence of the commission of an offence against the Act, the inspector may secure the egg or embryo pending the obtaining of a warrant to seize it.

21—Amendment of section 30—NHMRC guidelines

This clause amends section 30 of the Act so that alterations to NHMRC guidelines are required to be tabled in Parliament within 6 sitting days of taking effect under the Act.

Part 4—Transitional provision

22—Transitional provision

This clause provides that if an application for a licence under section 10 of the *Research Involving Human Embryos Act 2003* made before the commencement of this clause has not been determined at the commencement of this clause, the application is to be determined as if it had been made after that commencement.

Debate adjourned on motion of Ms Chapman.

PLASTIC SHOPPING BAGS (WASTE AVOIDANCE) BILL

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Minister for Environment and Conservation, Minister for Early Childhood Development, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation, Minister Assisting the Premier in Cabinet Business and Public Sector Management) (14:02): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to restrict the supply of single use plastic shopping bags. Read a first time.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Minister for Environment and Conservation, Minister for Early Childhood Development, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and

Reconciliation, Minister Assisting the Premier in Cabinet Business and Public Sector Management) (14:03): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

This bill will prohibit the supply of lightweight plastic shopping bags to reduce littering, prevent environmental harm and improve resource efficiency.

The estimated national consumption of plastic bags for 2007 was 3.93 billion, of which 40 million were estimated to have ended up as unsightly litter on our beaches and in our parks and streets. They also kill marine life and damage waterways on land. Most go to landfill, where they take many years to break down. In comparison with reusable 'green' bags, lightweight plastic bags have been found to be less efficient in terms of resources used for manufacturing, embodied energy, contribution to global warming, and primary energy used.

The former governor, in her speech to open Parliament on 27 April 2006, stated that 'South Australia has set the pace nationally by announcing the abolition of single-use plastic shopping bags from the start of 2009.' A voluntary scheme to reduce the use of plastic bags has only been partially successful, while attempts at agreement on a national regulatory approach have not been realised. Whilst South Australia cannot solve the plastic bag problems of the entire nation, we can show leadership in our own backyard by preventing retailers from supplying lightweight plastic shopping bags to customers. The ban will not prevent retailers from providing customers with plastic bags that are biodegradable in accordance with the relevant Australian Standard.

The bill describes the product to be regulated (plastic shopping bags) and the policy objective (avoidance of waste). The bill provides that a retailer must not provide a plastic shopping bag to a customer as a means of carrying goods purchased or to be purchased from the retailer. The government's intention is that this prohibition will come into effect on 4 May 2009.

Bags that would be subject to the ban are those made from polyethylene which are used or intended for use for the carrying or transporting of retail goods, which have handles and which are less than 35 microns in thickness. Other thicknesses or types of bag could be prescribed by regulation in the future to ensure that the intent of the bill is preserved.

Barrier bags will be excluded from the ban. These are bags without handles, typically presented on a roll in retail outlets, which are used to hold unpackaged foods—for example, loose fruit and vegetables, nuts, breads, cakes and products that may leak or contaminate other foods if not placed in a barrier bag. Boutique-style reusable plastic bags are also excluded from the ban. These are not subject to the ban, because they are made of a heavier material than conventional shopping bags and are designed to be reused on a number of occasions.

The ban will occur following a transitional period. The intention is for the transitional period to begin on 1 January 2009. The transitional period has been requested by retailers to overcome challenges associated with introducing an absolute ban in the Christmas retail period. During the transitional period, retailers who supply plastic bags will also be required to supply alternatives. This will provide consumer choice and ensure that retailers are adequately prepared for the introduction of the ban. The types of alternatives that would be stocked are prescribed as either being biodegradable, that is, designated as compostable through testing against the Australian Standard, or reusable, that is, designed for regular use over a period of approximately two years.

Signage requirements will apply during the transition phase, from 1 January 2009. Signage requirements will be prescribed by regulation, requiring notification of a prescribed size to be displayed in a prescribed locality within retail outlets. The signage will remind customers that a plastic bag phase-out is in place and notify customers that alternatives to plastic bags are available.

A public information and education program will be undertaken in the lead-up to the ban coming into place. Consumers and businesses will be targeted to assist in managing all the impacts of the phase-out. Occupational health, safety and welfare education will be included to assist retail staff to be ready to manage alternative shopping bags.

A Plastic Bag Phase-Out Task Force has been established, chaired by Zero Waste SA, which comprises representatives from the Environment Protection Authority; Restaurant and Catering SA; Keep South Australia Beautiful; the State Retailers Association; the Local Government Association; the Consumers' Association of SA; the Conservation Council; the Shop Distributive and Allied Employees' Association and the Hardware Association of SA. Throughout the lead up to the phase-out, the task force has advised the government of impacts on industry.

Offences apply to retailers who provide plastic shopping bags to consumers following the introduction of the ban. Retailers have a defence where it can be shown that the retailer had reasonable grounds to believe that the plastic shopping bags were not of a type prohibited by the legislation. An additional offence applies to persons who supply, sell or provide plastic shopping bags and represent that these are not plastic shopping bags. The bill allows for a maximum penalty of $20,000 (supply offence) and $5,000 (retailer offence), and an expiation fee of $315 (for the retailer offence only). Compliance will be undertaken by the Environment Protection Authority.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

1—Short title

This clause is formal.

2—Commencement

This clause provides for operation of the measure to commence on a day to be fixed by proclamation.

3—Interpretation

Clause 3 provides definitions of a number of terms used in the measure.

An *authorised officer* is a person who is an authorised officer for the purposes of the *Environment Protection Act 1993*. A *biodegradable bag* is a carry bag comprised of material of a type that has been assessed and tested in accordance with Australian Standard *AS 4736/2006* and can be designated as 'compost able' in accordance with that standard. A carry bag with handles is a *plastic shopping bag* for the purposes of the Act if the body of the bag comprises (in whole or part) polyethylene with a thickness of less than 35 microns. Other kinds of bags may also be brought within the definition of 'plastic shopping bag' by regulation. Biodegradable bags, and plastic bags that constitute, or form an integral part of, the packaging in which goods are sealed prior to sale, are not plastic shopping bags. The regulations may exclude other bags from the ambit of the definition of 'plastic shopping bag'. The *prescribed day* is a day prescribed by regulation. This will be the day on which the prohibition against the supply of plastic shopping bags under clause 5 will commence.

4—Retailer must provide alternative shopping bag until prescribed day

During the period beginning on the commencement of clause 4 and ending on the day before the prescribed day, retailers who make plastic shopping bags available to customers as a means of carrying purchased goods will be required under this clause to also be in a position to provide alternative shopping bags. An alternative shopping bag is a carry bag that is a biodegradable bag or is designed to be used on a regular basis over a period of approximately 2 years. The regulations may bring other kinds of carry bags within the ambit of the definition of *alternative shopping bag*. Retailers will not be prevented from charging a fee for the provision of an alternative shopping bag.

Retailers will also be required to display a notice, or notices, in compliance with requirements specified in the regulations.

The maximum penalty for a failure to comply with these requirements is a fine of $5,000. An expiation fee of $315 is also included.

5—Retailer not to provide plastic shopping bag

If a retailer provides a plastic shopping bag to a customer as a means of carrying goods purchased, or to be purchased, from the retailer, the retailer is guilty of an offence. However, if the retailer proves that he or she believed on reasonable grounds that the bag was not a plastic shopping bag, he or she has a defence to the charge of the offence. This prohibition has effect from the prescribed day. The section applies whether or not a fee is charged to the customer for provision of a plastic shopping bag.

The maximum penalty for a breach of the section is a fine of $5,000. An expiation fee of $315 is also included.

6—Person must not represent that supplied plastic shopping bag is not a plastic shopping bag

A person who sells, supplies or provides a bag to another person knowing that the bag is a plastic shopping bag is guilty of an offence if he or she represents to the other person that the bag is not a plastic shopping bag. The maximum penalty for the offence is a fine of $20,000.

7—Interaction with Environment Protection Act

The *Plastic Shopping Bags (Waste Avoidance) Act 2008* and the *Environment Protection Act 1993* are to be read together and construed as if the two Acts constituted a single Act. This clause authorises authorised officers to exercise their powers under the *Environment Protection Act 1993* for the purposes of the administration and enforcement of the *Plastic Shopping Bags (Waste Avoidance) Act 2008*.

8—Review of Act

This clause requires the Minister to appoint a person to prepare a report on the effect on the community of section 5 and the extent to which the Act has been effective in restricting the supply of plastic shopping bags. The Minister may also require the person to report on other matters determined by the Minister to be relevant to a review of the Act. The person who is to conduct the review must be appointed as soon practicable after the second anniversary of the prescribed day and must report to the Minister within six months of his or her appointment. The Minister is required to have copies of the report laid before both Houses of Parliament.

9—Regulations

This clause provides a power for the Governor to make regulations contemplated by, or necessary or expedient for the purposes of, the Act.

The regulations may exempt specified persons or classes of persons from the operation of the Act or of a specified provision of the Act.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Griffiths.

LONG SERVICE LEAVE (UNPAID LEAVE) AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton—Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education, Minister for Science and Information Economy, Minister for Youth, Minister for Volunteers) (16:09): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Long Service Leave Act 1987. Read a first time.

The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton—Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education, Minister for Science and Information Economy, Minister for Youth, Minister for Volunteers) (16:09): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

The Long Service Leave Act 1987 provides entitlements to long service leave for the majority of the South Australian workforce. A worker who has 10 years or more service is entitled to 13 weeks paid leave for the first 10 years of service and 1.3 weeks leave for each subsequent year of service. A pro rata entitlement is also available on certain conditions after attaining seven years of service. In most circumstances, any untaken leave is paid to the worker upon termination of employment.

Payment for long service leave is based on the worker's ordinary weekly rate of pay at the time of taking leave. However, if the worker's ordinary weekly rate of pay fluctuates, certain averaging provisions apply. This bill deals only with those averaging provisions. These provisions require averaging weekly earnings over the preceding 12 months for workers employed on commission or any other system of payment by result, or by averaging the number of hours worked per week over the preceding three years for workers whose ordinary weekly hours vary.

There have been reported instances where employees have had their monetary entitlement artificially reduced due to a narrow interpretation of the averaging provisions. This can occur when an employee has had a period of unpaid leave during the relevant averaging period and that leave has been included in the averaging calculation.

Those likely to be most affected by this narrow interpretation are workers who have taken a large quantity of authorised unpaid leave. The most common form of long-term unpaid leave would be parental leave; however, family care and study leave are other examples.

The interpretation of the act is unclear for both employers and employees and should be resolved by the parliament. The narrow approach to the act as outlined is at least arguable but is clearly unsatisfactory and inequitable. Unpaid leave is otherwise not counted as service for other purposes of the act and, for consistency, should not be included in any calculations used to ascertain monetary entitlements under the averaging provisions.

Today, I introduce into this house a bill that aims to remove ambiguity from the current act and ensure a consistent approach to the treatment of paid leave and unpaid leave when calculating long service leave entitlements.

The bill has been developed through open and extensive consultation. In September 2007, SafeWork SA wrote to the state's key industrial relations stakeholders seeking comments on a consultation bill to amend the Long Service Leave Act 1987. Most of those consulted gave in-principal support to the proposed amendments; however, some technical concerns were raised. Feedback was collated and presented to the November 2007 meeting of the Industrial Relations Advisory Committee for discussion. IRAC noted the views of those consulted and agreed to form a working group to make recommendations on issues raised by the consultation.

The working group considered the issues arising from the original consultation bill, and SafeWork SA liaised with parliamentary counsel to establish a bill that reflected the commonly agreed concepts and simplified the provision. The improved bill was finally considered at the 12 June 2008 meeting of IRAC. The key changes proposed in the bill are:

- unpaid leave is now clearly disregarded from the averaging provisions;
- the averaging period would now be taken to be the previous 12 months or three years of actual service (whichever the case may be), after any unpaid leave is disregarded;
- the inclusion of weeks when a worker was on paid leave, when averaging weekly hours for workers whom the three-year averaging period applies; and
- clarification that only whole weeks of unpaid leave are to be disregarded from the averaging calculation.

The changes introduced by the bill bring much needed clarity to the calculation of long service leave entitlements.

Long Service Leave legislation was first introduced to South Australia in 1957. The occurrence of workers taking lengthy periods of unpaid leave and subsequently returning to their employment is more common today than it ever was. The need to ensure that the act reflects the contemporary requirements of the workplace is evident. These changes eliminate the potential for ongoing uncertainty when these circumstances arise, without adding to the red tape burden on business.

The government recognises the important contribution made by all organisations and individuals who participated through the consultative process, particularly members of the Industrial Relations Advisory Committee. This collaborative approach is testimony to the capacity and commitment of all stakeholders and demonstrates that a co-operative approach results in fairer industrial relations outcomes. I commend the gill to members of the house. I seek leave to have the explanation of the clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

This clause is formal.

2—Commencement

The measure will be brought into operation by proclamation.

3—Amendment provisions

This clause is formal.

Part 2—Amendment of *Long Service Leave Act 1987*

4—Amendment of section 3—Interpretation

These amendments are intended to clarify the handling of unpaid leave when calculating a worker's ordinary weekly rate of pay for the purposes of the Act. The reference to weeks when the worker was on paid leave in section 3(2)(b) of the Act gives rise to an element of doubt as to the position of unpaid leave. The provision is to be amended to provide that any week when the relevant worker was on unpaid leave is to be disregarded for the purposes of the relevant calculation and that the relevant periods for the calculation will be full periods (which need not be made up of consecutive weeks) after disregarding any weeks when the worker was not at work due to unpaid leave. Finally, it will also be made clear that all periods of *paid* leave may be taken into account for the purposes of making the relevant calculations.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Griffiths.

PSYCHOLOGICAL PRACTICE BILL

Consideration in committee of the Legislative Council's amendments.

Amendments Nos 1 and 2:

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

That the Legislative Council's amendments Nos 1 and 2 be disagreed to.

This amendment is not supported by the government. It is not consistent with the objectives of the bill. What the amendments moved by the Hon. Ann Bressington in another place attempt to do is to give the board responsibility for commenting on competition and other matters which are really outside the scope of that board.

The board, like every other health practitioner board, is established to protect the health and safety of the public by maintaining, in the public interest, a register of persons deemed competent to provide psychological services. It is not the role of the board to advise government on competition policy issues, nor does the existing board support this proposed role. It is not the role of any registration board to provide policy advice in this area to the government. It is not consistent with the functions of any of the other health practitioner registration boards recently established under their particular pieces of legislation.

Indeed, if the amendment were to be carried, it would muddy the role of the board by requiring it to provide a type of industry advice. The composition and expertise of the board is appropriate to its primary function, which is to protect public health and safety by maintaining a register in the public interest and ensuring that the profession of psychology is conducted appropriately. It would be the only one of nine boards with this kind of provision, and the types of people who would be appointed to the board would necessarily have the expertise in this area.

So, we would be asking the board to give us advice in an area where it would have no skills and that would mean either that: (a) it would have to attempt to do something which it was not equipped to do, and probably not get it done very well; or (b) it would have to pay somebody to do it for it, which would place a burden on those who are registered and who would then have to pay for that advice. Of course, it would also be the only board that would have that kind of provision.

This place previously rejected this amendment as it would not be workable, nor is it in the interests of the board or, indeed, the psychologists who are covered by the board.

Ms CHAPMAN: I have listened to the minister's position on this, because I think it is important if the amendment is inconsistent with the jurisdiction of the board and clearly outside of its remit. If that were the case, it would be a valid argument. However, the opposition supports this amendment as it has come from the upper house on the basis that it does purport to provide for expansion. It may not have been raised by the Hon. Ann Bressington when the parliament dealt with other bills and, indeed, many of the other bills relating to health disciplines were dealt with and passed certainly before my time as the shadow minister for health, and I think they predate the Hon. Ann Bressington's coming into the parliament.

We have dealt with an extensive number of these bills consistent with reforming the obligations of registration, and the like, in respect of various health disciplines and, from memory, a number of them predated 2006. Therefore, I do not think that should be used as an excuse not to accept it. In fact, if it is a valid and useful addition then it would be a matter that could be quickly cured by reintroducing the other legislation and amending legislation to expand in those areas as well.

It is important to remember that the very thrust of the need to reform and be able to ensure that there is an expansion, which is essentially what has occurred in relation to those who may be permitted to practise in whatever the health discipline is, in this case psychology, and indeed to then be subject to the level of regulation and obligation in respect of registration that is then attracted, had its origins in the directives in respect of our obligations for competition.

Whilst there have been other interests and other advantages gained by various different people practising in the disciplines, or wanting to get into the practice of the disciplines, the truth of the matter is that these have all come into the state parliaments to ensure compliance with obligations that have been issued under our competition laws. This is very much an issue that is important to the heart of this legislation and, indeed, for other health disciplines.

I applaud the Hon. Ann Bressington for bringing it to the attention of the parliament and for pursuing it in another place. I think it is a worthy amendment and I think that it should be accepted by the government as a helpful amendment. I remind the government that it does not impose any obligation on the minister, other than to receive the advice, rather than to accept the advice. So, there is no requisite from this for the minister to have to take it into account or anything else, but for the board to provide that advice. I see it as only an instrument of assistance rather than any harmful impediment to the carrying out of the obligations of the board and also the effect of the act.

Motion carried.

Amendment No. 3:

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

That the Legislative Council's amendment No. 3 be disagreed to.

This amendment (which was moved in the other place by the Hon. Michelle Lensink) will establish a prohibition on the administration and interpretation of 'prescribed psychological services' by persons unless they are a psychologist or psychiatrist, or approved by the board. This amendment will require psychological tests to be prescribed by regulation. It would also require the board to approve other persons who may be qualified to provide a psychological test prescribed by regulation, and it is not supported by the government.

This amendment will require regulation to identify and list those psychological tests that psychologists or psychiatrists may administer or interpret, or directly supervise others in their administration and interpretation. It will establish a prohibition on the performance of prescribed psychological tests by any person other than a psychologist or a psychiatrist, or through their direct supervision, unless the person has the approval of the board.

The amendment moved is similar to the one put in this place and was not supported by the government in this place because:

- Access to significant psychological tests used by the profession is already effectively regulated by the industry that produces or distributes these tests. The publishers make the tests available only to those persons who can present them with evidence of qualifications and/or acceptable training in a particular test. A number of medical practitioners other than psychiatrists, occupational therapists, speech therapists and some human resource practitioners may be appropriately qualified to administer one or more specific psychological tests usually restricted to psychologists by the publishers.
- This amendment will severely obstruct legitimate access of appropriately qualified persons to these tests in ways that have not been applied or been necessary in the past or, indeed, in any other jurisdiction. For over 30 years, the current Psychological Practices Act 1973 has allowed for the regulation of the psychometric test by prescribing them in regulations. None of them has ever been prescribed and no evidence of harm to the public or the profession has been presented.

The amendment is, for these reasons, not consistent with the government's commitment to national competition policy.

The amendment will place additional and significant regulatory responsibilities on the Psychological Board of South Australia and government to meet the gatekeeping requirements of the national competition policy agreement. The board will be required to provide solid evidence of harm to the government in seeking to regulate any psychological test. The government, in turn, will be required to undertake a review of a regulation that will place restrictions on competition. No legislative provision would be introduced unless there is clear evidence of a net public benefit—that is, the public benefit to the community as a whole exceeds any anticompetitive detriment and that the objectives of the legislation can only be achieved by restricting competition.

In a letter to the opposition dated 28 August 2007, Mr Peter Vaughan, the Chief Executive Officer of Business SA, urged the deputy leader and her colleagues to withdraw this amendment and allow the passage of the original bill. I must say that the letter was copied to me. He noted that the original bill met National Competition Council's approval by satisfying national competition policy principles: minimum regulation and consistent application of regulatory restrictions throughout the nation. He also noted the amendment would limit the use of psychological tests used by employers and businesses to individuals authorised under the act or approved by the Psychology Board of South Australia. He also noted that other jurisdictions do not regulate this practice, with industry successfully self-regulating their practices.

Mr Vaughan also drew attention to the potential to harm South Australian businesses since they would not operate in an equally competitive manner with their interstate counterparts. Previously, Business SA called upon the government to reduce the South Australian regulatory burden by 25 per cent by July this year. The government agreed to commit to this target, recognising the challenges businesses in South Australia face when dealing with bureaucracy. There should be no doubt that this amendment would hinder the competitiveness of our state and add to the regulatory burden borne by businesses. Further, it is not considered wise to regulate in

an act a particular test, since that test may be superseded or change its name, in which case the act would need amending in each instance.

I previously gave an undertaking to the parliament that I would examine the possibility of some sort of power to determine whether a particular individual or particular classes of individuals could be suitably registered or regulated, or allowed to conduct tests of this sort. I also undertook to provide an estimate of how much extra work would be involved and what the effect might be on the board's fee schedule should psychological tests be regulated.

I therefore wrote to the South Australian Psychology Board requesting its views on this particular type of amendment and costs of administration. The board advised that an amendment of this type would place significant administrative, as well as regulatory responsibilities on the Psychological Board of South Australia. An alternative was suggested by the board to regulate suppliers and distributors of psychological tests. This alternative was rejected on the grounds that it would place restriction on competition and would be ineffective since a state jurisdiction would be attempting to regulate national and international suppliers and distributors.

These matters were examined and reported on in the other place. I nevertheless bring to the attention of this committee that the cost of meeting this responsibility and administering this type of provision was estimated by the registrar of the psychological board to be approximately $200,000 to establish the administrative system and $125,000 per annum to maintain. This cost, if fully passed on to the profession, as it would have to be I believe, would increase their registration fee and their annual practice fee by approximately 50 per cent. That is, from currently $250 to about $375 per annum per practitioner. This cost will be primarily met by the profession since the board is self-funding. The board may charge other persons seeking to be approved to administer a specific test; however, this cost should be proportionate to the cost of administration only and not include the costs of generally regulating a practice restriction that benefits the profession.

The board also recommended that, since national registration of psychologists is proposed to be implemented, it would be better to leave this matter for the proposed national psychologists board to research and consider the need for an appropriate national policy, given the significant scale of the task to regulate psychological tests. This bill is one of only two new health practitioner registration bills yet to be passed, the nursing and midwifery bill being the other which I have also presented to the parliament. With the passage of these bills, South Australia will have updated all its health professional registration acts and will have established a consistent, modernised legislative framework that will stand this state in good stead for the future. In mentioning the Council of Australian Governments national registration scheme, it will be important for South Australia to have a consistent, modernised legislative framework so that all registration boards can operate efficiently and effectively until such time as the national registration scheme is implemented.

The COAG process will be complex. It will rely on each state and territory passing consistent legislation. We need to be mindful that progress towards the establishment of a national registration scheme will be subject to how speedily this takes place. In the interim we still need to have effective modern legislation in place to protect the health and safety of the public by providing for registration of psychologists and ensuring high standards of competency and conduct in the provision of psychological services.

In conclusion, the provision that has been put into this legislation would create an offence only in South Australia. The maximum penalty would be $75,000. In every other jurisdiction a person could conduct these tests without being supervised by the board, yet in our state, if someone were to do that, they would be subject to a maximum penalty of $75,000. Even those who advocate for this particular regime to be in the legislation—and I am certainly not one of them—would have to recognise that the fine they have put in place is absolutely disproportionate to any evil that might follow from someone not being a psychologist and applying this test.

This is really about psychologists wanting to protect their patch—nothing more, nothing less. This is not about community good. It is about psychologists wanting to protect their patch. The COAG process is about breaking down those barriers and loosening up the system so more services can be delivered appropriately by people who are properly trained. This will be a burden on the business community and a burden on psychologists themselves because, if it were to be properly implemented, it would cost them money. I have received letters from a number of psychologists who have expressed concern about this issue because, if they are part time, not highly paid or registered in multiple states, it will create difficulties for them.

Ms CHAPMAN: The opposition supports the amendment. The government's insistence on continuing to oppose what is a sensible way in which to resolve the issue and allow effective passage of the bill is a concern. It is also concerning that, for a government that purports to say that the safety and quality of health service is a high priority—which, I note, was repeated by His Excellency in the speech opening parliament—we now find it is keen to ensure that there is not a protection at this level.

Essentially, we are talking about ensuring there is a regime to protect against the use or interpretation of psychological tests that are administered in a number of different areas. They are used for the purpose of assessment in relation to mental health. They are used for the purposes of employment. Often they are used during assessment for compensation and the like. These are important areas in which psychometric tests (as they are often described) are utilised. They can be a useful tool in relation to these areas. For example, in the appointment of someone to a senior level of employment, an assessment is often sought as a prerequisite for consideration in order to assess the general character of the applicant.

However, I am concerned that the government should say, with full knowledge of a considerable dispute in the professional and public communities about concerns raised, that assessment under the test, or the use of such tests—and, indeed, the abuse of them—can cause considerable harm if an untrained person interprets a test. For example, the use of a psychometric test in an application for employment, which is poorly interpreted or administered in an incorrect way, could deny a person the opportunity for employment and/or compensation and cause considerable detriment and potential emotional harm to the applicant.

These are not things to be dealt with lightly. The government's answer to this, with an acknowledgment that there needs to be some monitoring, is that they are already regulated by the publishers or the people who supply or distribute them; that is, the people who create these things. That is true, that is the position at present, but it does not mean that it cannot change. What happens if a publisher decides that, rather than be discriminatory as to whom they should sell these tests, they can make a lot of money out of them? They are not regulated by this parliament; they are not under the control of this parliament.

We are the parliament that has the responsibility to make laws to protect people who may be the victims of a mal or poor application of these tests or the interpretation of them. That is our responsibility. We cannot say to the suppliers, 'You can only provide it.' They do it at the moment because they want to keep some control over the market. It is in their commercial interest to do that, but that could change. It is important and it is our responsibility to do this. I am concerned that the government would leave this to a body that can be motivated by its own commercial gain, ultimately, rather than accepting its responsibility to make sure we protect the public. I find it quite concerning that the government would seem to take such an approach.

I hear the minister saying that, on the advice he has received from the board, this would place an enormous administrative burden on them. The situation is that the amendment provides a restriction on the use or interpretation of these tests to either a psychologist or psychiatrist, or someone who is supervised by a psychologist or psychiatrist, or a person who administers or interprets a test with the approval of the board. What we are hearing from the minister is that in 30 years people have not sought that.

It is a little like the hypnotherapy argument, which matter has been referred off to the Social Development Committee, yet the reverse argument is used here. The truth is that if you want to apply for special consideration to convince the board that you are a person who is not prepared to be supervised or who does not have the qualifications as a psychiatrist or a psychologist and you submit that to the board for its approval, why should they not pay for that application? Of course they should. The government is trying to scare people into supporting its position by saying, 'Look, this will cost money if we have to hear these applications.'

I say, user pays. If you want to apply and it is a costly exercise to do a search on someone, to prepare training or to analyse the cost of the board's sitting fees, the applicant should pay—not all the other psychologists or psychiatrists who are under regulation. That is a nonsense. The government has said, 'Well, look, if this costs an extra $200,000 to administer, we will therefore raise the fee from $250 to $375.' That is a scaremongering tactic amongst the psychologists who say, 'Well, hang on a minute. We don't want to have that extra fee. So, minister, get rid of that idea.' That is just a complete nonsense. That is quite a furphy to this debate. What we are considering here is ensuring that, in the wrong hands by an untrained person, these psychometric tests can cause damage and harm.

We know that and the minister knows that. We cannot leave it to the commercial publishers or distributors based on whether or not they will make a profit. We cannot rely on that. We need to ensure that those who want to apply without getting qualification (as has been previously allowed), and if there is some lesser level with which the board is satisfied (because there is a whole mix on that board), they should be paying for it. It is not acceptable that we just open slather on this and then not make sure that there is proper training. The inconsistency of the minister's argument in relation to this (and he said it again today) is that it is important that this be a whole reform of the law in relation to upgrading and modernising, etc., but making sure there is adequate training.

That is exactly what this amendment does. This amendment says that a person can administer and interpret the test with the approval of the board. All they have to do is satisfy the board that they have adequate training in some other profession or that they have some other qualification, or whatever. That is a matter for the board to determine, and so it should. That gives an avenue to open up to competition but with a reciprocal important qualification to ensure that they are suitably trained. That is a prerequisite and one that will fit the original object of the act to ensure that we open up the opportunities rather than keeping it restricted only to psychologists or psychiatrists while at the same time protecting the public.

To me that is a sensible way to resolve this matter, and I am very disappointed that the government would present its opposition to it. I do note that Mr Vaughan, to whom the minister referred, wrote to me and, indeed, as I understand it, wrote to the government. A number of submissions have been put forward by various stakeholders. We do not ignore those. We have listened to those. I have met with Mr Vaughan. I have listened to his view on the matter, and I make the following observation. It is true, as he points out, that this would mean that it is different from any other state. This would be something that other states have not seen the need to address and therefore we do not need to.

Well, that is why I am a federalist, because I do not accept that just because someone in some other state or some other level of government says that it is right they will always get it right because, clearly, they do not. That is why we have the protection of a federation, and that is why we have a responsibility in this parliament to assess properly every piece of legislation and not be just forced into it and have it shoved down our neck as though we have some expectation to comply because some other donkey in some other state decides that it is a good idea.

That is not acceptable to me. It would be shelving my responsibility as a legislator of this parliament, and I will not do it. If it is meritorious it needs obviously, first, our consideration and our support. I have not, nor have members of the opposition, ignored the submissions put by Mr Vaughan, but I do say that, again, it is not satisfactory for us to accept blindly that, because this might impose some extra cost to employers, we should accept it. It is a consideration. For me the paramountcy is the overwhelming submissions I have received which say that whoever applies these tests should have the qualifications as were originally required, and they should be extended to others provided the board gives them that tick.

We are not saying, 'keep it exclusive'; we are saying that, consistent with this amendment from the other place, we broaden it but we ensure that that safety mechanism is in there. Why is it that the commercial position of a business should suddenly supersede the safety of the public—some poor person who misses out on a compensation claim, someone who misses out on a job, someone who is scarred emotionally for life or who needs further psychological therapy and support because a test has been maladministered? That is completely unacceptable. Furthermore, I make the observation that I have spoken to a number of employment agencies who currently employ psychologists to administer the tests at the request of employers (and sometimes, of course, I am sure often, consistent with their recommendation) who say that this can be a useful tool and instrument for assessment.

What I find is that the agencies, consistent with the current law, use fully-trained psychologists, generally (they do not use psychiatrists, they use psychologists), to access, use and interpret consistent with the current law. They advise me, and I accept this, that they are not used for every application for employment. If you are applying for a position which is relatively unskilled, perhaps relatively low in remuneration, these tests are not used at all. These are not used for everyone. These are used for a cost where there is a significant level of responsibility (usually) in which that person will be involved. Not even every public servant, as I understand it, is expected to do that, yet they all carry out quite a level of responsibility.

My understanding is that, in the Public Service, it is frequently used in areas such as the police department. One would expect that, because these are people who will be managing very

important and responsible areas of administration on behalf of the government. They will be dealing with the people and they will be dealing with people, many of whom are in a fairly difficult state (self-imposed maybe), but nevertheless these are important levels at which the psychometric testing is administered. I support that but, again, it must be done with due care as to who should administer it.

The people who will save money by this, I suggest, are government departments having to budget for some of their senior staff and also staff in specialty areas who have to submit to these psychometric tests and, therefore, they have to be paid for. Whether they use a private agency or it is done within the department, they are going to have to pay that price, but it is not for every job. Another thing is that, out in the private sector, again on consultation with the agencies, notwithstanding Mr Vaughan's statements—which have been repeated by the minister—they do not see this as a problem because, in fact, there are two aspects: one is the seniority of the level of the employment at which the psychometric test is being applied; but secondly, there is no obligation whatsoever at any time on any employer to actually have to exercise psychometric testing for applicants for employment. It is just a complete furphy, so I am puzzled as to why the minister would suddenly latch onto this other than, of course, to try to bolster support for his position.

One of the things that is quite concerning is that in the course of consultation in this matter—which has been very long; as we know, this bill has been around for a long time—the relevant lead agencies or peak bodies, as you might want to describe them—in this case, the South Australian division of the Australian Psychological Society—during the course of this debate at one stage were completely bypassed. I would hope that, during the time that the bill has been debated, there has been at least one further consultation with the society since 2007, because Mr Jack Metzer, the president, made public on 13 August 2007 his concern that, notwithstanding numerous approaches to actually meet with the minister about their concerns as an industry peak body, that had been refused.

However, here is what is even more concerning: while this was being refused, the government chose to write individually to each of the psychologists around the state to try to get some support. As the president says publicly, he does not actually object to the members of the psychological society being contacted. That is very thorough consultation, except that, if you then ignore the peak body completely in making an assessment, then all you do is narrow the information before you as a government (as we would as opposition if we did the same), in excluding information that is not consistent with what you want.

You know what they are going to say and you think, 'I just won't see them; I just won't hear from them. I just won't accept their argument,' and, therefore, they somehow sit under a mushroom as though they do not exist. That is not acceptable. That is not consultation which is acceptable, and it is important that when any government accepts a consultation process it is thorough and that it does include the relevant peak bodies, not just the ones that you know are going to agree with you.

In another place, members of minority and Independent parties have also expressed their view in relation to this. Obviously, I do not want to reflect in any way on what they have said. Ultimately, with the support of a number of them, these amendments were supported. They have also carefully listened. The only one not listening in this debate on this issue is the government. It seems to me that, in the absence of any other adequate protection (other than hoping that the publishers will still want to make money so they will keep them fairly exclusive to protect the public), that is not acceptable and it ought to be rejected by this house, that is, the oppositional application for this amendment be disallowed.

With those words I indicate that this is a very important issue for the opposition. We have raised it previously. We thought that this would be a sensible compromise. Clearly, in another place they have debated it again at length. They see the merits of it, as have other parties; however, it still puzzles me why the government would be so insistent when there is not adequate protection and where the financial costs can be placed on the applicants if they seek it. If it is going to be so expensive and the burden not placed on the body of psychiatrists and if this is allowed, then that protection should remain.

I will say that, although it is not specifically covered by this amendment, as I understand it, progress has been made on another area of concern in relation to hypnotherapists, to the extent that the government has excluded obligations in relation to hypnotherapists from this bill, and we have accepted the government's undertaking that it would refer an inquiry into this to the Social

Development Committee. Some time after April 2008 I received, courtesy of the government, a copy of the Department of Health's report on any harms associated with the practice of hypnosis and the possibility of developing a code of conduct for registered and unregistered health practitioners. It is quite a comprehensive report.

I thank the government for providing a copy of that. I understand that it has been referred to the Social Development Committee. I am a little puzzled as to why we are bringing this issue back for consideration before that process has been looked into, but I give advance notice to the government that, whatever method we resolve to protect people in relation to hypnotherapy, that we place a caveat on the application of people exercising hypnotherapy in the same way as psychometric testing.

There is potential for very significant harm, and we will be looking to the recommendations of the Social Development Committee and any government take-up of those recommendations. We will certainly be looking for some protection. The key to it will be to ensure that the level of training of someone who either applies these tests or hypnotherapy must be at a level which would satisfy the board before they can undertake that practice. That is something that we are very clear about, and we want to ensure that the government is alert to it when it brings that issue back to the parliament, and I have accepted the minister's undertaking to do that.

Motion carried.

Amendments Nos 4 and 5:

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

That the Legislative Council's amendments Nos 4 and 5 be disagreed to.

The effect of these amendments would be to increase the board for the purpose of proceedings from three to four and require that two of those four are psychologists. The government does not support these amendments. The current requirement is for three members of the board to constitute the board for the purpose of disciplinary proceedings. One must be a legal practitioner (or deputy) and one must be a psychologist. The provisions are silent on who the third member should be, giving the board itself the flexibility to select the most appropriate board member, depending on the nature of the matter.

As I understand it, the majority of the board members are psychologists so, if the majority decided they needed another psychologist on the board, they could come to that determination. If it is a professional practice matter, the board is likely to select another psychologist. If it is a matter of professional misconduct, the board may select either a peer or another member of the board who is not a psychologist.

The proposed amendment was considered as part of a submission from the Australian Psychological Society (APS) to the department during consultations for this bill. I also met with the executive director, Professor Lyn Littlefield, and other senior officers, in April this year to discuss the bill and the amendments made in the other place.

In a letter sent by the APS on 27 June this year, Professor Littlefield disputed the capacity of the disciplinary board to inform itself by seeking expert evidence by drawing attention to the judgment made in the matter of Heywood-Smith v The Physiotherapy Board of South Australia in the District Court of South Australia. This matter was subsequently appealed by the crown and heard before a full court of the Supreme Court (The Physiotherapy Board of SA & Anor v Heywood-Smith [2008] SASC 253). The court allowed the appeal noting that, among other things, the board did not err in having regard to expert evidence. This judgment removes any doubt that may have existed about the current provisions in the bill. As I understand it, this matter was only determined within the last week or so, and I have written to Professor Littlewood to give her that advice.

This particular amendment is not supported by the government since there is clearly the capacity in the provisions to allow the disciplinary board to be comprised of either one or two psychologist members. The board can also seek to inform itself as it sees fit and it can do this by seeking evidence from other psychologists with expertise in a particular matter if required.

With the exception of the medical practice and dental practice acts, all other health practitioner registration acts initiated by the government have the same provisions as drafted in this bill. The differences arise from the need to respond to a greater number of specialities and complexity in the medical and dental professions.

There are no special requirements of the profession or the Psychological Board which warrant increasing the size of the board for disciplinary hearings as proposed by the amendment. More importantly, increasing the number of board members for disciplinary hearings from three to four may result in a situation whereby the decision of members is equally split and a majority decision of members cannot be reached. Given that the presiding officer of the board in disciplinary proceedings cannot exercise a casting vote, the board would be hung and would therefore be unable to make a decision. The situation would be intolerable for the board, the public and the profession.

Finally, I point out that a psychologist has a right of appeal against decisions of the board to the District Court under part 5 of the act. I think those explanations should satisfy anybody, including the APS, as to the merits of the original proposition.

Ms CHAPMAN: The opposition had determined to support this amendment. I have listened to the minister's explanation as to why the government is opposing it. I am not familiar with Heywood-Smith & Anor v The Physiotherapy Board. I think the minister indicated that the matter has just been determined, which may or may not relate to a question of expert evidence affecting the number of psychologists to be put on this board. However, it may be that it does lay to rest some concerns previously raised by the Australian Psychological Society on the mechanics.

Again, I think there is some merit in what the minister says. There are other ways to resolve this, of course; that is, you can exercise powers to the chairman to ensure that that is covered. So, if the move to have two psychologists in relation to the aspect of their responsibility has merit, we can sort out the machinery. I hear what the minister says. Unfortunately, for those who want a quick resolution of the bill, the matter will not be resolved here today. I am quite prepared to have a look at that issue and consider whether the opposition will take a different view. If the matters raised by the minister are appropriate, I am sure that we can look forward to supporting that; but otherwise, at this stage, I indicate the opposition's position.

The Hon. J.D. HILL: I thank the deputy leader for that, and for her offer to consider it. I will make sure she gets a copy of the judgment. As I said, it was handed down just a few days ago and I was made aware of it myself only a couple of days ago. I will make sure the deputy leader sees it.

Motion carried.

ADJOURNMENT DEBATE

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

That the house do now adjourn.

STATE CORONER'S OFFICE

Mr VENNING (Schubert) (17:02): I want to raise a concern I have had for some time. It has been widely known for at least the past two years, if not longer, that the Coroner has been warning about the unacceptably long delays affecting his office; however, nothing is being done to fix the problem. It is clear that the delays in coronial inquiries are a result of the office being understaffed and under resourced, yet unnecessary stress continues to be placed upon already grieving families as they await coronial reports—in some cases, for more than two years.

State Coroner Mark Johns has acknowledged that there is a problem. He said, as reported by the ABC, that:

> I have had many discussions with representatives of the Department of Justice about this matter. I have expressed the view that a period of six months or longer between post mortem and formal report is unsatisfactory.

In July last year a spokesperson for the Attorney-General told *The Advertiser* that the delays were being investigated. He said, 'The investigation is looking at measures that will have immediate impact on backlogs and underlying causes for delays.' I do not believe that any progress has been made in regard to reducing the backlogs and having cases completed within a reasonable period of time.

A constituent, Robyn Knight, has contacted me, and I was horrified to hear of her experience with the Coroner's Office. Her husband was tragically killed in a motor vehicle accident on 18 June 2006 in Eden Valley, which is in my electorate. The circumstances of the accident have been extensively investigated by the SA Police Major Crash Unit, which has provided a report to the DPP and the Coroner.

Following the accident Mrs Knight was informed by Major Crash that the investigation into the accident should take about four months. It took over a year. Following investigation by Major Crash, she was advised that no criminal charges would be laid and that the matter was with the Coroner's Office. It is now well over two years since the death of Robyn's husband and the issue still has not been resolved.

The last update from the Coroner's Office was provided to Mrs Knight this week, when it reported that it was still investigating the matter and was not willing to put a time frame on how long the investigation might take. A similar update was provided by the Coroner's Office in March, six months ago, when it said that there were older cases in the office waiting to be dealt with and that they would take priority.

I find two things absolutely despicable about this. First, that there are cases older than that of Robyn's husband still sitting with the Coroner's Office and, secondly, that this constituent was told that the case relating to the death of her husband was not a priority. Surely the Rann Labor government does not honestly think this is a satisfactory practice? To extend the grief of a widow with two young children by failing to complete a coronial report for over two years is a disgrace, and the government should be ashamed that this has been allowed to occur.

I appeal to members to consider this case on a personal basis; there should be no politics in this. A full death certificate still has not been issued from the Coroner's Office, and it will not be until its investigation is complete. Not having a full death certificate prevents this lady from attending to many housekeeping matters—particularly with respect to accounts she held with her husband, which were in joint names. She and her family may also have entitlements pursuant to a loss of dependency claim for wrongful death under the Civil Liability Act, provided a person or persons at fault can be determined. However, as a report from the Coroner is necessary for her solicitors to determine this, they have been unable to proceed. Aside from the legal issues, this constituent is having her grief extended, as it is impossible for her to obtain closure with regard to her husband's death when she does not even know how or why he died.

I have written to both the Minister for Police and the Attorney-General regarding this but to date have not had what I consider to be a satisfactory response. The response from the minister was:

> The State Coroner has sole responsibility for the issuing of a death certificate and inquiries would have to be made with the Coroner's Court regarding the status of the file.

The Attorney-General's response was:

> The government is aware of the need to reduce the stress on families experiencing these tragic circumstances by reducing waiting lists in these processes. Accordingly, we are pleased to have recently acquired the services of Dr Neil Langlois, a well-respected and experienced forensic specialist, who has accepted a position at Forensic Science South Australia.

Well, one person will only be able to do so much. It seems that a much larger response is needed. I find these responses completely unsatisfactory, and I have assured Mrs Knight that I will continue to lobby on her behalf.

The last budget contained funds to help clear the backlog in the court system, so I asked the Rann Labor government to also contribute in some way to fix the backlog in the Coroner's Office so that more people do not have to endure the same delays my constituent has, resulting in nothing but pain and added grief. I apologise to Mrs Knight on behalf of us all for what she has had to endure for over two years now, and I appeal to the government, particularly to the Attorney-General, to immediately address this problem. I also hope the media hear about this, because I think it is simply despicable that a woman with a young family who loses her husband, her loved one and provider, has to put up with this. It is appalling.

In the few minutes I have left, I will finish by referring to a favourite subject of mine, and that is Gomersal Road. Six years ago, under a Liberal government, through the then transport minister Hon. Diana Laidlaw, the road connecting Tanunda to Main North Road (known as Gomersal Road) was bitumised. This was carried out despite the then opposition's claim that the road was not heavily utilised and therefore it would be a silly investment and a waste of taxpayer dollars. Well, how wrong they were.

Gomersal Road can now be classed as a main arterial road to the Barossa Valley. It is extremely busy, and I am sure that, once the Northern Expressway is completed, it will be even busier. I am led to believe that the traffic volumes are eight times what initial predictions estimated during the design process. Gomersal Road is one of the major freight routes used to transport

goods to Tanunda and other parts of the Barossa Valley. This road is also well utilised by commuter traffic, tourists and visitors travelling from Adelaide, along with Barossa residents who commute to Gawler or south of the valley.

It is fantastic to see that this project of a previous Liberal government has been so successful, but, unfortunately, the popularity of this road is causing problems. The 14-kilometre road is mainly owned and managed by the Light Regional Council (in the electorate of the member for Light) and a small portion by the Barossa. However, due to the huge volume of traffic that travels along this road, it is obviously beyond the council's capacity to maintain the condition of the road to a main highway level.

I wrote to the Minister for Transport in August last year requesting that consideration be given to reclassifying Gomersal Road to a state arterial road. In his response in October last year, the minister said:

> The Department of Transport, Energy and Infrastructure...has advised that it is currently conducting a review on behalf of the Local Roads Advisory Committee...of the guidelines used by the Committee in determining road classifications.

The minister went on to say:

> I also consider it appropriate to await the outcome of the current review of the road reclassification criteria before considering a change to classification of Gomersal Road.

However, since this correspondence from the minister, I have not heard anything more about reclassifying the road, and the council continues to struggle to keep up with the maintenance required of such a busy arterial road. Potholes are an issue along the road and, despite the council's best attempts to carry out repair work and fix the holes, the work required is more than a local council can afford, a point I keep on coming back to.

Several constituents have contacted me regarding the damage to their vehicles as a result of their driving over potholes along the road. Many have reported damage to their tyres and rims, and those who swerve to miss the potholes to avoid damaging their vehicle pose a danger to other road users. The Light Regional Council cannot keep up with the maintenance required of such a busy road and does not have the funds to do it. Mr Roger Kemp, Light Regional Council's Corporate Manger of Infrastructure, said:

> We have suggested to State Cabinet that because it's such a heavily used road it's beyond the council to maintain that to a fair degree. It really should belong to the State Government, rather than a local council.

But it seems that the council's request has been ignored by the state Rann Labor government, with no change in ownership of the road forthcoming. So, the council continues to struggle to undertake the work required to keep the busy freight and commuter route up to an acceptable standard. I urge the state government to reclassify this road straightaway and to take over the care and maintenance of it, and I ask the member for Light to support me as well.

Time expired.

GOODALL, DR JANE

Ms SIMMONS (Morialta) (17:12): I rise today to inform the house of the upcoming visit to Adelaide of Dame Dr Jane Goodall PhD, DBE, founder of the Jane Goodall Institute, primatologist, ethnologist and UN Messenger of Peace. Jane is best known for her 45-year study of chimpanzee social and family interactions in Gombe Stream National Park, Tanzania, and she is considered the world's foremost authority on chimpanzees and the most significant forerunner in the substantial changes in zoos around the world in the last 30 years. She first became involved with the inappropriate way in which chimpanzees, gorillas and orang-utans were maintained in 1959, when working with Ramona and Desmond Morris at London Zoo. She vowed that she would do all she could to improve the plight of animals in zoos.

In 1960, she was invited by Dr Louis Leakey, a famous anthropologist, to study the chimpanzees of the Gombe Stream National Park. Although unheard for a woman to venture into the wilds of the African forest, the trip would prove more successful than anyone had imagined. Jane was instrumental in the study of social learning, primate cognition, thinking and culture in wild chimpanzees. Her major breakthrough in the field was the discovery of toolmaking abilities among these primates. Although other scientists at the time had clearly observed animals using tools, it was thought that only humans made tools. This skill was considered the defining difference between humans and other animals. This discovery convinced many scientists to reconsider their definition of being human.

Living with the chimps in their own environment and gaining their confidence yielded even more surprising insights, such as the unsettling discovery that chimps engage in a primitive form of brutal warfare and bizarre courtship patterns, where males force females into consortship in remote spots for days or even months. She and her staff also observed an adolescent called 'Spindle' adopt a three year old orphan 'Mel', even though the orphan was not a close relative. Her mentor, Louis Leakey then said, 'Now we must redefine the word "tool", redefine man, or accept chimpanzees as humans.'

The international support of the Gombe research project and Jane's acceptance as a global leader in her field enabled her to establish the Jane Goodall Institute, whose aim is to advance the power of individuals to take informed and compassionate action to improve the environment for all living things. The institute is widely recognised for establishing innovative community-centred conservation and development programs throughout Africa.

Jane has also worked hard to improve not only the habitat of primates in zoos but also to give them an environment where these large brained animals are provided with mental stimulation, to use their toolmaking and using skills, and to try to alleviate some of the crippling boredom experienced by these beautiful animals prior to her intervention. It is also through Jane's initial work that chimps at zoos in the UK and America were provided with proper outdoor platforms, so they could get off their cold concrete floors, and also a cover on the outside cage to provide shade in the heat of summer.

I would also recommend to members that, if they have not done so recently, they should visit the wonderful primate enclosures of the Adelaide Zoo, and especially take the opportunity to visit one of our own orang-utans, Pusung, who is provided with amazing enrichment activities by his keepers.

I have been very privileged to watch Pusung break off a twig from a branch, chew it until it resembles a brush and push it into a pipe so that he can collect the honey he loves so much onto the brush end of his twig. The honey would not stick to the twig without it being chewed into the brush shape. This is an amazing and life-changing experience. Not all of us can visit these amazing animals in the wild, but we can visit them behind the scenes in our own Adelaide Zoo to try to understand better their character and their vivid personalities.

The Jane Goodall Institute is also responsible for the Roots and Shoots program which I have spoken about previously in this place. The program, aimed at school age children and youth, is now widely recognised in 96 countries, including Australia, with 8,000 schools involved, and several South Australian schools now host the program.

Roots and Shoots encourages children to roll up their sleeves and design projects to help make the world a better place for animals, people and the environment. I was very lucky to visit the Marree Aboriginal school in the Far North of our state and to see the success of the Roots and Shoots program at that particular school. I believe that the methodology of teaching children of indigenous descent through this program is extremely valuable, because it is very similar to the way their elders use to teach them about their own heritage.

It has been very successful in that particular community, I must say, and that is probably almost entirely due to the work of Campbell Whalley (now retired), an amazing teacher who is able to really engage with children and to get them occupied through this Roots and Shoots program, ably assisted, I must say, by an Aboriginal elder of that area, Reg Dodd. The two of them working together really got behind Roots and Shoots and made it work for these kids.

I believe that we are very privileged to have Jane in South Australia and congratulate Chris West, the CEO of South Australian Zoos, and his staff on coordinating her visit. Jane arrives on 4 October, World Animal Day, which is very appropriate. I encourage all members here, and the South Australian public, to try to see her, either at the special Monarto family day on Sunday 5 October, hear her speak at a public lecture at the Adelaide Town Hall on 6 October (her talk will be entitled, 'Hope for nature'), or at a fantastic networking opportunity lunch on Tuesday 7 October at the National Wine Centre. This luncheon will be entitled, 'The woman who redefined man redefines leadership'. It is especially targeted at the corporate boardroom, and probably at politicians, too.

Dr Goodall will use some of the examples that she has collected over her 45 years of studies, in which she redefined man, take that into the boardroom and talk about some of the leadership qualities that she has observed in the colonies and communities that she has been

working with. It should be very stimulating. If people want tickets, they can get them from www.fullystocked.com.

Motion carried.

At 17:20 the house adjourned until Thursday 25 September 2008 at 10:30.